



नैष्कर्म्य सिद्धि
Naiṣkarmya siddhi

of

सुरेश्वराचार्य
Surēśvarācārya

Commentary by
Swami Paramarthananda

Chapters I, II and III (Part only)

(the remaining classes, as and when transcribed will be uploaded later)

Class Notes by Sri S. Viswanathan, a disciple of Swamiji

Swami Paramarthananda has not verified the transcription of these talks. The transcriptions have been done with his blessings by Swamiji's disciple.

Published by:



**Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad,
Coimbatore 641012, India
Phone: +91 94873 73635**

**Email: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in**

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction: 25-02-2006 | 7 |
| 2. Introduction & Avadharika to Chapter I: (04-03-2006) | 12 |
| 3. Avadhaarika Gadhyam to Chapter I (11-03-2006) | 17 |
| 4. Avadharika Gadyam to Chapter I cont'd (18-03-2006)..... | 22 |
| 5. Chapter I, verses 1 and 2 (25-03-2006) | 28 |
| 6. Chapter I, Verse 3 to 5 (01-04-2006) | 34 |
| 7. Chapter I, Verses 6 to 8 (08-04-2006)..... | 40 |
| 9. Chapter I, Verses 9 to 12 (15-04-2006)..... | 46 |
| 9. Chapter I, Verses 12 and 13 (03-06-2006) | 53 |
| 10. Chapter I, Verses 14 and 15 (10-06-2006) | 58 |
| 11. Chapter I, Verses 16 to 18 (17-06-2006)..... | 63 |
| 12. Chapter I, Verses 19 and 20 (01-07-2006) | 69 |
| 13. Chapter I, Verses 21 to 24 (08-07-2006)..... | 75 |
| 14. Chapter I, Verses 24 to 27 (15-07-2006)..... | 83 |
| 15. Chapter I, Verses 27 to 29 (22-07-2006)..... | 90 |
| 16. Chapter I, Verse 29 (29-07-2006) | 98 |
| 17. Chapter I, Verse 29 (05-08-2006) | 104 |
| 18. Chapter I, Verse 29 and 30 (12-08-2006)..... | 109 |
| 19. Chapter I, Verses 30 to 32 (19-08-2006)..... | 115 |
| 20. Chapter I, Verses 32 to 35 (26-08-2006)..... | 120 |
| 21. Chapter I, Verses 35 and 36 (02-09-2006) | 126 |
| 22. Chapter I, Verses 36 (09-09-2006)..... | 133 |
| 23. Chapter I, Verses 36 to 38 (16-09-2006)..... | 139 |
| 24. Chapter I, Verse 38 to 40 (23-09-2006) | 145 |
| 25. Chapter I, Verse 40 to 42 (30-09-2006) | 152 |
| 26. Chapter I, Verse 42 to 44 (07-10-2006) | 159 |
| 27. Chapter I, Verse 45 to 47 (14-10-2006) | 165 |
| 28. Chapter I, Verse 47 and 48 (28-10-2006)..... | 173 |
| 29. Chapter I, Verse 48 to 52 (04-11-2006) | 180 |
| 30. Chapter I, Verse 52 to 54 (11-11-2006) | 187 |
| 31. Chapter 1, Verse 54 to 56 (18-11-2006)..... | 195 |
| 32. Chapter I, Verse 56 to 60 (25-11-2006) | 204 |
| 33. Chapter I, Verse 60 to 63 (02-12-2006) | 213 |
| 34. Chapter I, Verse 63 to 67 (09-12-2006) | 220 |
| 35. Chapter I, Verse 67 (16-12-2006) | 227 |
| 36. Chapter I, Verses 67 and 68 (23-12-2006) | 234 |
| 37. Chapter I, Verses 68 to 70 (30-12-2006)..... | 240 |
| 38. Chapter I, Verses 70 and 73 (06-01-2007) | 247 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 39. Chapter I, Verses 73 to 76 (13-01-2007)..... | 254 |
| 40. Chapter I, Verses 76 to 78 (20-01-2007)..... | 261 |
| 41. Chapter I, Verses 78 to 80 (27-01-2007)..... | 268 |
| 42. Chapter I, Verses 80 to 81 (03-02-2007)..... | 276 |
| 43. Chapter I, Verses 81 to 83 (17-02-2007)..... | 283 |
| 44. Chapter I, Verses 83 to 85 (24-02-2007)..... | 290 |
| 45. Chapter I, Verses 85 to 88 (03-03-2007)..... | 297 |
| 46. Chapter I, Verses 88 and 89 (10-03-2007)..... | 302 |
| 47. Chapter I, Verses 89 and 90 (17-03-2007)..... | 307 |
| 48. Chapter I, Verses 90 and 91 (24-03-2007)..... | 313 |
| 49. Chapter I, Verses 91 and 92 (31-03-2007)..... | 320 |
| 50. Chapter I, Verses 92 to 94 (07-04-2007)..... | 327 |
| 51. Chapter I, Verses 95 to 97 (14-04-2007)..... | 335 |
| 52. Chapter I, Verses 97 to 100 (21-04-2007)..... | 342 |
| 53. Summary of 1 st Chapter (09-06-2007)..... | 350 |
| 54. Chapter II, Verse 1 (16-06-2007)..... | 358 |
| 55. Chapter II, Verse 2 and 3 (23-06-2007)..... | 364 |
| 56. Chapter II, Verse 3 to 5 (30-06-2007)..... | 373 |
| 57. Chapter II, Verse 5 to 8 (07-07-2007)..... | 380 |
| 58. Chapter II, Verse 8 to 12 (14-07-2007)..... | 386 |
| 59. Chapter II, Verse 12 to 16 (21-07-2007)..... | 393 |
| 60. Chapter II, Verse 16 to 19 (28-07-2007)..... | 400 |
| 61. Chapter II, Verse 16 to 19 (04-08-2007)..... | 408 |
| 62. Chapter II, Verse 23 to 25 (11-08-2007)..... | 417 |
| 63. Chapter II, Verse 25 and 26 (18-08-2007)..... | 425 |
| 64. Chapter II, Verse 25 to 28 (25-08-2007)..... | 433 |
| 65. Chapter II, Verse 28 to 30 (01-09-2007)..... | 442 |
| 66. Chapter II, Verse 30 to 33 (08-09-2007)..... | 449 |
| 67. Chapter II, Verse 33 to 36 (15-09-2007)..... | 459 |
| 68. Chapter II, Verse 36 and 37 (22-09-2007)..... | 468 |
| 69. Chapter II, Verse 37 to 40 (29-09-2007)..... | 477 |
| 70. Chapter II, Verse 40 to 42 (06-10-2007)..... | 488 |
| 71. Chapter II, Verse 42 to 45 (13-10-2007)..... | 497 |
| 72. Chapter II, Verse 45 and 46 (27-10-2007)..... | 508 |
| 73. Chapter II, Verse 46 to 49 (03-11-2007)..... | 517 |
| 74. Chapter II, Verse 49 to 52 (10-11-2007)..... | 526 |
| 75. Chapter II, Verse 51 to 54 (17-11-2007)..... | 536 |
| 76. Chapter II, Verse 54 to 56 (24-11-2007)..... | 546 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 77. Chapter II, Verse 56 to 58 (01-12-2007) | 557 |
| 77. Chapter II, Verse 56 to 58 (01-12-2007) | 568 |
| 78. Chapter II, Verse 58 and 59 (08-12-2007) | 579 |
| 79. Chapter II, Verse 59 to 61 (15-12-2007) | 588 |
| 80. Chapter II, Verse 61 to 63 (22-12-2007) | 597 |
| 81. Chapter II, Verse 61 to 67(29-12-2007) | 605 |
| 82. Chapter II, Verse 67 to 69 (05-01-2008) | 615 |
| 83. Chapter II, Verse 69 to 72(12-01-2008) | 625 |
| 84. Chapter II, Verse 72 to 75 (26-01-2008) | 636 |
| 85. Chapter II, Verse 75 to 77 (09-02-2008) | 644 |
| 86. Chapter II, Verse 77 to 80 (16-02-2008) | 654 |
| 87. Chapter II, Verse 80 and 81 (23-02-2008) | 665 |
| 88. Chapter II, Verse 81 to 83 (01-03-2008) | 675 |
| 89. Chapter II, Verses 83 and 84 (08-03-2008) | 686 |
| 90. Chapter II, Verse 84 to 87 (15-03-2008) | 695 |
| 91. Chapter II, Verse 87 to 89 (22-03-2008) | 706 |
| 92. Chapter II, Verse 89 and 90 (29-03-2008) | 715 |
| 93. Chapter II, Verse 90 to 92 (05-04-2008) | 725 |
| 94. Chapter II, Verse 92 to 95 (12-04-2008) | 737 |
| 95. Chapter II, Verse 95 and 96 (19-04-2008) | 747 |
| 96. Chapter II, Verse 96 and 97 (07-06-2008) | 756 |
| 97. Chapter II, Verse 97 (14-06-2008) | 767 |
| 98. Chapter II, Verse 97 and 98 (21-06-2008) | 779 |
| 99. Chapter II, Verse 98 and 99 (28-06-2008) | 791 |
| 100. Chapter II, Verse 99 to 101 (05-07-2008) | 801 |
| 101. Chapter II, Verse 101 and 103 (12-07-2008)..... | 813 |
| 102. Chapter II, Verse 103 and 104 (19-07-2008)..... | 823 |
| 103. Chapter II, Verse 104 to 106 (26-07-2008) | 833 |
| 104. Chapter II, Verse 106 to 108 (02-08-2008) | 845 |
| 105. Chapter II, Verse 108 to 110 (09-08-2008) | 856 |
| 106. Chapter II, Verse 110 to 112 (16-08-2008) | 869 |
| 107. Chapter II, Verse 111 to 113 (23-08-2008) | 881 |
| 108. Chapter II, Verse 113 and 114 (30-08-2008)..... | 895 |
| 109. Chapter II, Verse 115 to 119 (06-09-2008) | 907 |
| 110. Summary of Chapter II (13-09-2008) | 923 |
| 111. Chapter III- Verses 1 (20-09-2008)..... | 936 |
| 112. Chapter III- Verses 1 (27-09-2008)..... | 949 |
| 113. Chapter III- Verses 1 (04-10-2008)..... | 962 |

| | |
|---|------|
| 114. Chapter III- Verses 1 (11-10-2008)..... | 974 |
| 115. Chapter III- Verses 1 (01-11-2008)..... | 989 |
| 116. Chapter III- Verses 1 (08-11-2008)..... | 1000 |
| 117. Chapter III- Verses 1 and 2 (15-11-2008)..... | 1012 |
| 118. Chapter III- Verses 1 and 2 (22-11-2008)..... | 1025 |
| 119. Chapter III, Verses 2 and 3 (29-11-2008)..... | 1038 |
| 120. Chapter III, Verses 3 and 4 (06-12-2008)..... | 1052 |
| 121. Chapter III, Verse 4 (13-12-2008)..... | 1064 |
| 122. Chapter III, Verses 4 to 6(20-12-2008)..... | 1078 |
| 123. Chapter III, Verses 6 and 7 (27-12-2008)..... | 1090 |
| 124. Chapter III, Verses 7 (03-01-2009)..... | 1102 |
| 125. Chapter III, Verses 7 and 8 (10-01-2009)..... | 1115 |
| 126. Chapter III, Verses 8 and 9 (17-01-2009)..... | 1128 |
| 127. Chapter III, Verse 9 (24-01-2009)..... | 1141 |
| 128. Chapter III, Verse 9 to 11 (31-01-2009)..... | 1153 |
| 129. Chapter III, Verse 11 to 13 (07-02-2009)..... | 1166 |
| 130. Chapter III, Verse 11 to 13 (14-02-2009)..... | 1179 |
| 131. Chapter III, Verse 13 to 15 (21-02-2009)..... | 1190 |
| 132. Chapter III, Verse 15 to 17 (28-02-2009)..... | 1202 |
| 133. Chapter III, Verse 17 to 19 (07-03-2009)..... | 1213 |
| 134. Chapter III, Verse 19 to 21(14-03-2009)..... | 1224 |
| 135. Chapter III, Verse 21 and 22 (21-03-2009)..... | 1235 |
| 136. Chapter III, Verse 22 to 24 (28-03-2009)..... | 1247 |
| 137. Chapter III, Verse 24 to 26(04-04-2009)..... | 1259 |
| 138. Chapter III, Verse 26 and 27(11-04-2009)..... | 1272 |
| 139. Chapter III, Verse 27 to 29 (18-04-2009)..... | 1283 |
| 140. Chapter III, Verse 29 (06-06-2009)..... | 1296 |
| 141. Chapter III, Verse 29 and 30 (13-06-2009)..... | 1308 |
| 142. Chapter III, Verse 30 and 31 (20-06-2009)..... | 1321 |
| 143. Chapter III, Verse 31 to 33 (04-07-2009)..... | 1333 |
| 144. Chapter III, Verse 33 to 35 (11-07-2009)..... | 1346 |
| 145. Chapter III, Verse 35 (18-07-2009)..... | 1358 |
| 146. Chapter III, Verse 35 to 38 (25-07-2009)..... | 1370 |
| 147. Chapter III, Verse 38 and 39(01-08-2009)..... | 1383 |
| 148. Chapter III, Verse 39 and 40 (08-08-2009)..... | 1395 |
| 149. Chapter III, Verse 40 and 41 (15-08-2009)..... | 1409 |
| 150. Chapter III, Verse 41 to 43 (22-08-2009)..... | 1425 |
| 151. Chapter III, Verse 43 to 44 (27-08-2009)..... | 1438 |

| | |
|---|------|
| 152: Chapter III, Verse 44 and 45 (05-09-2009) | 1451 |
| 153: Chapter III, Verse 45 to 48 (12-09-2009) | 1466 |
| 154: Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (19-09-2009) | 1479 |
| 155: Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (26-09-2009) | 1492 |
| 156: Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (03-10-2009) | 1506 |
| 157: Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (10-10-2009) | 1518 |
| 158: Chapter III, Verse 49 to 51 (24-10-2009) | 1531 |
| 159: Chapter III, Verses 51 to 53 (31-10-2009) | 1543 |
| 160: Chapter III, Verses 53 to 54 (07-11-2009) | 1557 |
| 161: Chapter III, Verses 54 and 55 (14-11-2009) | 1569 |
| 162: Chapter III, Verses 55 and 56 (21-11-2009) | 1583 |
| 163: Chapter III, Verses 56 and 57 (28-11-2009) | 1596 |
| 164: Chapter III, Verses 57 and (05-12-2009) | 1608 |
| 165: Chapter III, Verses 58 (12-12-2009) | 1621 |
| 166: Chapter III, Verses 58 (19-12-2009) | 1635 |
| 167: Chapter III, Verses 58 and 59 (26-12-2009) | 1648 |
| 168: Chapter III, Verses 59 and 60 (02-01-2010) | 1662 |
| 169: Chapter III, Verses 60 (16-01-2010) | 1674 |
| 170: Chapter III, Verses 60 (23-01-2010) | 1686 |
| 171: Chapter III, Verses 60 to 62 (30-01-2010) | 1701 |
| 172: Chapter III, Verses 62 to 64 (06-02-2010) | 1717 |
| 173: Chapter III, Verses 64 to 64 (13-02-2010) | 1733 |
| 174: Chapter III, Verses 64-66 (20-02-2010) | 1751 |
| 175: Chapter III, Verses 66-70 (27-02-2010) | 1767 |
| 176: Chapter III, Verses 70 (06-03-2010) | 1781 |
| 177: Chapter III, Verses 70 (13-03-2010) | 1796 |
| 177: Chapter III, Verses 70 and 71 (20-03-2010) | 1808 |
| 178: Chapter III, Verse 71 (20-03-2010) | 1822 |
| 179: Chapter III, Verse 71 to 73 (27-03-2010) | 1836 |
| 180: Chapter III, Verses 73 to 75 (03-04-2010) | 1848 |
| 181: Chapter III, Verse 75 (10-04-2010) | 1862 |
| 182: Chapter III, Verses 75 and 76 (10-04-2010) | 1876 |
| 183: Chapter III, Verses 76 and 77 (05-06-2010) | 1891 |
| 184: Chapter III, Verses 77 and 78 (12-06-2010) | 1905 |
| 185: Chapter III, Verse 78 (19-06-2010) | 1918 |
| 186: Chapter III, Verse 78 and 79 (26-06-2010) | 1932 |
| Please Note: | 1945 |

Class notes typed out by Shri Viswanathan

1. Introduction: 25-02-2006

As is well known, the final parts of the *Vedas*, is known as *Vedhaanthaa – Vedasya antha bhaaga*: - *Vedaanthaa* - which is also known as *Upanishad*.

The word "*Upanishad*", is interpreted, in several ways.

One manner of interpretation is as below:

- '*upa*' refers to '*aathma*'. '*upa*' literally means 'something close by'. Many objects may be physically located close to one. Travelling inwards, from the external objects, going through the *pancha kosaas-s*, one finds one's *aathmaa*, as the closest. Hence, '*upa*' can be interpreted as '*aathma*'.
- '*ni*' means '*nischaya jnaanam*' - 'firm knowledge'.
- '*shad*' means 'destroyer of sorrow/samsaaraa'; *samsaaram avasaadhayathi / samsaaram naasayathi ithi shad*.

'*Upanishad*' would, therefore, mean '*samsaaraa – destroying self-knowledge*'.

Of course, the words and verses of *Vedhaanthaa* or *Upanishad*, are themselves not 'knowledge'; but, since they **generate** knowledge, the *sabdapramaanam* itself is called *Upanishad*. In other words, '*Upanishad*' thus, has two meanings :

- (1) Knowledge - *vritthi roopena*.
- (2) Knowledge generating works – *sabda roopena*.

In any pursuit of knowledge, four factors are involved:

- (1) The subject i.e. the one that seeks the knowledge – called *pramaatha*,
- (2) the instrument used to acquire the knowledge – called *pramaanam*,
- (3) the object of knowledge – called *prameyam*, and
- (4) the resulting knowledge – *pramaa* or *vidhyaa* or *jnaanam*.

An example can make this clear. When one's eyes view objects, the result is the knowledge of forms and colours. In this instance, the eyes are the *pramaanam*, the forms and colours are the *prameyam*, the mind is the *pramaatha* and the *pramaa* is the "knowledge of forms and colours".

In the study of *Upanishads*, *Upanishad* is the *pramaanam* (the instrument of knowledge), the study covered by the *Upanishad* being *aathmaa*, *aathmaa* is the *prameyam* (the object of knowledge), the student is the *pramaathaa* (the knower or enquirer) and the *pramaa* (the resulting knowledge) is *aathmajnaanam*.

But, very often, it is found, that, the expected result, *aathmajnaanam*, is not achieved even after years of study of the *Upanishads*. In a study of *any* subject, when the three factors, the *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* and the *prameyam* (collectively referred to as *thriputi*) come together, *prama* should be the natural result. When this does not happen, one has to conclude that there must be an obstacle – *prathibandha*: - or deficiency, with regard to at least one of these three factors. An analysis has to be done, the deficiency should be diagnosed and remedial measures have to be taken, to make the assemblage of the *thriputi* effective. It has to be seen whether there is a *prameyadosham* or *pramaanadosham* or *pramaathrudosham*.

In the case of Upanishadic study, the *prameyam*, *aathmaa*, is ever available as “svayam prakasa chaithanya thathvaa - the self evident Consciousness”. It is available in all the three avasthaas – “jaagarthsvapanasushupthishu sputatharaa yaa samvidh vijrumpathe” (Maneeshaa Panchakam – sloka 1). There can, thus, be no doshaa in *aathmaa*; it is nithya upalabdha svaroopam. There is, therefore, no *prameyadhoshaa*.

As for the *pramaanaaa*, the *Vedas* are teachings given out by the Lord Himself and therefore, there can certainly be no deficiency in them. *Pramaanadoshaa* also is not there.

If, therefore, ‘knowledge’ does not result from the study of the *Upanishads*, the *doshaa* should be only of the *pramaathaa* – the student. The *pramaathrudoshaa* should be identified and rectified, so that *vedhaantha vichaaraa* will give the desired result of *aathmajnaanam*, since resort to any means other than *vedhaantha vichaaraa* – such as *japaa*, *paaraayanaa*, *dhyaanam* or *samaadhi* - will not help the seeker acquire knowledge. In his treatise, *Panchadasi* (Ch. IX), *Vidhyaaranyaa* stresses this: “Keep applying *Vedhaanthic* knowledge, till you get *jnaana*”.

In the venture of acquiring *aathma jnaanam*, the most common *pramaathrudoshaa* is “lack of *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaith*”.

The second major deficiency is *samsayaa* - doubt regarding the *Vedic* teachings. The nature of *thathpadhaartham* (*Paramaathmaa*) and the nature of *thvampadhaartham* (*Jeevaathmaa*) have confused even scholars, who have discussed, at length, on the subjects. *Saguna Paramaathmaa* and *saguna jeevaathmaa* are **not** identical. Only when the world is understood as *mithyaa* and the *aathmaa* is understood as the only *sathyam*, *advaita siddhi*

can be achieved. But, acceptance of *mithyaathvam* – even in the standards example of the *rajjusarppa*, leave alone of the *jagath* – is a major problem for most seekers. Such lack of conviction with regard to the *nirguna vasthu* and the unreality of the world is an intellectual problem.

A more fundamental problem, is, when one gets the doubt, as to whether *Veda* itself can be accepted as a valid source of knowledge. Science or sense organs cannot prove the authenticity of the *Vedas*. The seeker gets the doubt, whether, the statement "*aham brahma asmi*" is just a belief or a proven fact.

Such intellectual doubts are clubbed as "*purusha buddhi doshaa*". Traditional *aachaaryaas* had to handle all these *dhoshaa-s* in the minds of their students and help to rectify these *dhoshaa-s*.

As already pointed out, other *saadhanaas*, such as *paaraayanaa*, *dhyaanam* etc., cannot remove intellectual problems. Only intellectual discussions can remove the intellectual problems. With this purpose, the *aachaaryaas* have authored a number of treatises, known as *prakarana granthaa-s*, which do **not** generate knowledge (which is the work of the *Vedas*), but, remove doubts. In short, the *prakaranaa-s* are useful and necessary for *purusha dosha nivritthi*.

Anubhoothi Prakaasaa points out "Intellects are many; doubts, therefore, are also many. Innumerable *granthaa-s* are required to remove the innumerable doubts". The problem is more so, now. Scientific knowledge is expanding and fresh objections to *Vedic* teachings are being raised. New *prakarana granthaa-s* will have to be continuously written to counter the new *poorva pakshin-s* (opponents).

The available *prakarana granthaa-s* are of three types.

- Type (1) *granthaa-s*: Give a bird's eye view of the *saasthraa-s*. They are comprehensive and preliminary in nature. *Thathva Bodhaa* and *Viveka Choodaamani* belong to this category.
- Type (2) *granthaa-s*: Take a particular aspect of the *Vedic* teachings, analyze all possible doubts that can arise on that particular aspect and clear the doubts. In the *prakaranaa* "*sarva vedhaantha siddhaantha saara sangrahaa*", Adi Sankara has compiled 250 verses on the subject of *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* alone, while in his "*dhrukh dhurusya vivekaa*", he talks about only *thvampadhaartha*. "*Saasthra eka desa sambhandham /*

saasthra kaaryaanthare sthitham" are the functions of such *prakaranaa*-s. "*Samsaya nivritthi*" (removal of doubts) is their purpose.

- Type (3) *grantha*-s: Primarily concentrate on refuting philosophies other than *Vedhaantha* and on defending *Vedhaanthic* teachings. *Paramatha dushtathva dharsanam* is their main function, as in Chapter II – *Paadha* 2, of *Brahma Soothra*-s. '*Siddhi grantha*' is the name given to such *prakaranaa*-s, which negate other philosophies, wherein, *siddhi* means "defending *Vedhaanthic* teachings".

Brahma Siddhi, *Ishta Siddhi*, *Advaita Siddhi* and *Naishkarmya siddhi*, are a few of the *Siddhi grantha*-s, defending *Vedhaanthic* teachings and refuting other philosophies.

Naishkarmya Siddhi is believed to be authored by Sureswaraachaaryaa, a direct disciple of Adi Sankara. He is also famed as *Vaarthikakkaaraa*, since he has written several *vaarthika*-s. A *Vaarthika* is "analysis in verse form of some other text, which text may be an original text (*moolam*) or a *bhaashyam*". *Thaithreeya Bhaashya Vaarthika*, consisting of about 4, 000 verses, on the *Sankara Thaithreeya Bhaashyam* and *Brahadhaaranyaka Bhaashya Vaarthika*, consisting of about 10,000 verses, on the *Sankara Brahadhaaranyaka Bhaashyam*, are the better known *vaarthika*-s of Sureswaraachaaryaa.

Legend also has it, that, Sureswaraachaaryaa was a *Poorva Meemaamsakaa* initially, known as Mandana Misra and after losing a debate with Adi Sankara, converted into an *Utthara Meemaamsakaa*, took *sanyaasaa* and assumed the name Sureswara. Another *prakaranaa*, by name *Brahma Siddhi*, is also credited to a Mandana Misra. Opinions differ as to whether the two treatises, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* and *Brahma Siddhi*, were authored by the same Mandana Misra or by two different people of the same name. It is more likely that the two are different, since the styles of the two are different and certain views expressed in the two treatises are also different.

'*Naishkarmya*' means 'actionless'. Since *aathmaa* is *karma rahitha*: (without action), in the term *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, '*naishkarmya*' means '*aathmasvaroopam*' and '*siddhi*' means 'attainment / accomplishment / *praapthi*'. The term *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, therefore, means '*aathma svaroopam siddhi*' – 'attaining my own nature'.

The term appears contradictory. '*Svaroopam*' means 'intrinsic nature'. Then, where is the need to 'attain' it? The answer: Though *aathmaa* is available always. One does not realize it because of 'ignorance'. When 'ignorance', which makes *aathmaa seemingly* unattainable, is removed, the *svarooopam* is *seemingly* attained.

“Accomplishment of the ever accomplished *aathmasvaroopam* through knowledge” is *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. Since this is the subject matter of the treatise, the treatise is also called *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

2. Introduction & Avadharika to Chapter I: (04-03-2006)

Vedhaantha Saasthraas or the *Upanishads* are the *pramaana granthaa-s* (main sources) of *aathma jnaanam*. For the seeker, they directly produce 'knowledge', similar to the sense organs, the 'eyes', which produce 'knowledge' of the objects perceived. The 'eyes' are *pramaanam* for *anaathma vishayaa* and *Vedhaantha Saasthraas* are *pramaanam* for *aathma vishayaa*. Both do not require further validation by any other *pramaanam*. They have self-validity. *Vedhaantha* is, therefore, referred to as *saasthra chakshu:* and in the *Brahma Soothraa-s*, as *prathyaksham*.

But, even though *Vedhaantha* is capable of giving the 'knowledge', the 'knowledge' does not take root in us, because of **our** *buddhi doshaa-s*. In other words, **we** do not accept the 'knowledge', because of deficiencies in intellect. This problem can be understood by considering the following: There is a common saying 'seeing is believing', meaning that 'seeing' is the ultimate validation. Despite this, a comment "I could not believe my own eyes" is very often heard i.e., even though the eyes have generated the knowledge, what is 'seen' is not taken as 'fact', because of certain obstacles in the mind. Likewise, even after obtaining *vitthi* knowledge "*aham Brahma asmi*", we are unable to accept this as 'knowledge', because of **our** intellectual problems.

It, therefore, becomes imperative to eliminate the intellectual problems. Great *aaachaaryaa-s* have authored secondary scriptures to help eliminate the *purusha buddhi doshaa:* - also called *purusha aparaadhaa:* - the obstacles in the intellect. Once the *doshaa-s* are eliminated, we will be willing to accept the *vitthi* "*aham Brahma asmi*" as 'knowledge'. Only then 'liberation' becomes a fact. As long as the *vitthi* is not looked upon as 'knowledge', 'liberation' is only an information. The seeker's effort is to convert the 'information' into a 'fact'.

This 'conversion of information into fact', through removal of *purusha buddhi doshaa-s*, is undeniably a struggle. The various *prakarana granthaa-s* made by great *aachaaryaa-s* help the seeker in this struggle.

In short, while the *Vedhaanthic Mahaa vaakyaa-s* give the 'knowledge', the *prakarana granthaa-s* remove the intellectual obstacles to the 'knowledge', and thus, make the function of the *mahaa vaakyaa-s* easy and effective.

The intellectual obstacles or doubts can be with regard to any particular aspect of the *mahaa vaakyaa-s*, the *jeevaa* or *Isvaraa* or the *aijyam*. A *prakarana granthaa* need not discuss the whole. It can specifically discuss a particular aspect; the available *prakarana granthaa-s* generally concentrate on one of the above aspects.

Naishkarmya Siddhi is a *prakarana granthaa*, attempting to remove the intellectual obstacle with regard to the *thvampadhaartha*; i.e., the focus in this *prakaranaa*, is on 'I', the word '*thvam*', in the *mahaa vaakyaa* '*thath thvam as!*'. Sureswaraacharya, presumably, feels that more seekers have problems with regard to '*thvam*' than with '*thatH*'.

In this aspect, Sureswaraacharya is influenced by his *guru*, Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, one of whose *prakarana granthaa*-s is the "*Upadesa Saahasri*", a forceful *prakaranaa*, partly in prose – *gadhyam* – and partly in verse – *padhyam*. The focus of *Upadesa Saahasri* is also '*thvampadhaartha viveka:*', especially Chapter XVIII, titled '*thathvamasii prakaranam*'. Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa* remarks in the *Upadesa Saahasri*, "*thvampadhaartha vivekaaya sanyaasa: sarva karamanaam*", indicating that, *sanyaasa aasramaa* should be resorted to for the reduction of the 'ego', which, naturally is stronger in other *aashramaa*-s, because of *vyavahaaraa*. He avers, that, for *mahaa vaakyaa*-s to be properly understood, the *ahamkaaraa* 'I' should be converted into *saakshi* 'I' - the *vyavahaaraa* 'I' into *paaramaarthika* 'I'. Sureswaraacharya inspired by *Upadesa Saahasri*, closely follows the same style in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, especially of the Chapter XVIII of *Upadesa Saahasri*. He has even borrowed or lifted many verses from the *Upadesa Saahasri*. *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is almost another version of *Upadesa Saahasri*.

Naishkarmya Siddhi is a *padhya grantha: I* a text primarily in verse form, consisting of 423 verses. A unique feature of this *prakaranaa*, is that the '*sambhandha ukthi:*', meaning 'linking of the verses', has been done by Sureswaraacharya himself. In majority of the other texts, this 'linking of verses' has not been done by the authors, but, by their commentators. Obviously, Sureswaraacharya considered the 'linking process' essential for progressive teaching. He uses prose form for the purpose of 'linking'. *Padhya roopa prakaranam* and *gadhya roopa sambhandha ukthi:*, together make this treatise.

The text is divided into four chapters, as follows:

- Chapter I, consisting of 100 verses, analyze *mokasha saadhanam*, i.e. as to what is the means of 'liberation', the ultimate goal of every human being. The roles of *karmaa* i.e. *saasthreeya karma* of the *karma kaandaa* of *Veda* and of *jnaana* i.e. *saasthreeya jnaana* of the *jnaana kaandaa* of *Veda* are discussed. "Which one has a direct role in the seeker attaining *mokshaa*" is discussed. Opinions of other philosophies, including '*jnaana karma samucchaya vaadha:*', a powerful philosophy of those days, are also considered. In short, 'roles of *karmaa* and *jnaanaa* as *moksha saadhanam*' is the subject of Chapter I.
- Chapter II, consisting of 119 verses, deals in '*thvampadhavichaara:*', the meaning of 'I'. Sureswaraacharya points out, that, if the word 'I' is not properly understood, the

mahaa vaakyam`aham brahma asmi` will appear absurd and even sacrilegious. Hence the importance of analysis of `thvampadhaa`. In other words, `aathma-anaathma-vivekaa` is the subject of Chapter II.

- In Chapter III, consisting of 126 verses, Sureswaraacharya discusses how the *mahaa vaakyaa*-s operate in the minds of listeners and how they generate 'knowledge'. He avers that study of *mahaa vaakyam* can and will directly give liberating knowledge. Once the *mahaavaakyaa*-s are understood, no other improvement will be needed. But, for this to happen, *buddhi doshaa*-s should not be there.

Sureswaraacharya also establishes in this chapter that '*sravanam` is the most important *Vedhaanthic* discipline – more important than *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*, since it generates the *jnaanam*, which is the direct cause for 'liberation', expressed as '*sravanasya moksha saadhana jnaana janakathvaath`.**

Another subject discussed in Chapter III, is the nature of ignorance – *ajaana svaroopam* - a technical subject, debated on, in many philosophical systems. Sureswaraacharya attempts to remove the 'ignorance of ignorance' and to give 'knowledge of ignorance'.

- Chapter IV consists of 78 verses, wherein, Sureswaraacharya first summarizes the contents of the first three chapters, the practice known as *upasamhaara:* or *samskshepa:* - consolidation. Later, he talks about *jeevan mukthi:*, the state of freedom or liberation of a *jnaani* even when he is alive exhausting his *praarabhdhaa`.*

So much about the background of the *prakaranaa, Naishkarmya Siddhi`.*

The Text begins with an introduction - *avadhaarikaa* - in prose form. (While the *gadhyaa* portions in the text, are generally *sambhandha yukthi:*, as explained earlier, this starting *gadhyaa baagha:* cannot obviously be termed so, since there is nothing prior to it, to be linked with later teachings.)

In this powerful, famous and charming *avadhaarika gadhya bhaagha:*, the *Aachaaryaa* lays emphasis on two points:

- (1) All human beings have one goal, consisting of two aspects. This goal is instinctive, not based on choice or even thinking. The first aspect of the goal is *dhu:kha nivrutthi* - the natural tendency to get rid of any pain – physical, emotional or intellectual. (Doubt and ignorance cause intellectual pain). *Dhu:kha nivrutthi:*, is , in fact, a natural goal for *all* living beings, not only humans. The *Aachaaryaa* , therefore, terms it *svabhaava*

pravrutthi: | The second aspect of the human goal is *sukha praapthi:*, the aspiration to attain all pleasures and entertainments.

(2) Total *dhu:kha nivritthi* is impossible without self-knowledge. All forms of sorrow – *adhyaathmika*, *aadhiboudhika* and *aadhidaivika* - are caused by self-ignorance (*aathma ajnaanam*) alone. If, therefore, *dhu:kham* has to be permanently got rid of, *ajnaanam* should be got rid of. *Ajnaanam* will go away, obviously, by acquisition of *jnaanam*. In short, *aathma jnaanena ajnaana nivrutthi:* and *ajnaana nivrutthiyaa sarva dhu:kha nivrutthi:* |

But, the human intellect does not accept this theory easily. The *Aachaaryaa* recognizes this problem; and, in this *avadhaarikaa*, shows that *dhu:kham* is not directly produced by ignorance, but is an indirect 7th generation product, as explained below:

- (1) Self-ignorance leads to *dvaitha dharsanam* – duality and multiplicity.
- (2) *Dvaitha dharsanam* results in *sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:* - i.e. the tendency to consider certain things / situations / people as favourable and certain others as unfavourable. *Sobanaa* means *ishta* and *asobanaa* means *anishta*.
- (3) The '*sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:*' creates *raagha dveshaa* – attachment and hatred.
- (4) *Raagha dveshaa*-s propel a person to *karmaani* – *vihitha* and *nishiddha karmaani*.
- (5) *Karmaa* generates *karma palaani* – in the form of *punyaa* and *paapaa*.
- (6) The *punya papa palaani* produce the body again (*punar janamaa*) and consequent *deha abhimaanaa*.
- (7) The *deha abhimaanaa* causes *dhu:kham* – both physical and mental.

It follows, therefore, that, to get rid of *dhu:kham*, one should get rid of *deha abhimaanaa*, therefore *punya papa palaani*, therefore *karmaa*, therefore *raagha dveshaa*, therefore *sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:*, therefore *dvaitha dharsanam* and therefore *aathma ajnaanam*. Elimination of *aathma ajnaanam* is achieved by acquisition of 'knowledge'. Sureswaraachaaryaa, in the *avadhaarikaa*, journeys through the seven stages, in this order, from effect to cause.

Without 'self-knowledge', all other remedies for pain are only temporary. The *Aachaaryaa*, therefore, concludes that *aathma jnaanam* is essential for everyone and declares that he is writing this *prakaranaa* for those who have recognized the cause of grief as *ajnaanam*.

Entering the Text:

Avadhaarika gadhyam (part):

आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तैः सर्वप्राणिभिः सर्वप्रकारस्यापि दुःखस्य स्वरसत एव जिहासितत्वात्तन्निवृत्त्यर्था
प्रवृत्तिरस्ति स्वरसत एव ।

As all creatures from *Brahmaa* down to the lowest species desire to avoid every kind of pain by the law of their nature, there is an equally natural effort on their part to effect its termination.

- सर्वप्राणिभिः - For all creatures,
- आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तैः - starting with the *chathurmuka Brahmaaji* up to a blade of grass, '*sthambha*' means 'blade of grass'.
- जिहासितत्वात् - because the desire to get rid of
- सर्वप्रकारस्य दुःखस्य अपिः - all types of grief
- स्वरसत एवः - is instinctive ,
- तन्निवृत्त्यर्था प्रवृत्तिः- the effort to effect the termination of the grief
- स्वरसत एव अस्तिः - is also natural.

3. Avadhaarika Gadhyam to Chapter I (11-03-2006)

Sureswaraacharya is introducing his treatise *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, in this *avadhaarikaa*, in prose form. He first established that all living beings instinctively try to get rid of all types of pain – physical, mental and intellectual (doubt and ignorance being the causes of intellectual pain). This desire for *dhu:kha nivrutthi* – elimination of pain – is universal and, therefore, one has to find out the cause for the pain and eliminate the cause. *Kaarana nivrutthiyaa kaarya nivrutthi*.

The *Aachaaryaa* explores and arrives at the cause of *dhu:kham* as *avidhyaa*. From *avidhyaa* alone, *dhu:kham* results, through seven stages:

- *avidhyaa* leads to *dvaitha dharsanam* |
- *dvaitha dharsanam* to *sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:* |
- *sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:* to *raaghadveshaa:* |
- *raaghadveshaa:* to *pravrutthi* and *nivrutthi* i.e. *karma* |
- *karma* to *karma palaani* (referred to by the *Aachaaryaa* as *dharmadharmau*) |
- *karma palaani* to *deha* and *deha abhimaanam* |
- *deha abhimaanam* to *dhu:kham* |

Dhu:kham is an inevitable result of *deha abhimaanam*, since the body is subject to old age, ill health and death (*jaraa*, *vyaadhi* and *maranam*). *Dhu:kham* is, thus, the 7th generation product of *avidhyaa*. To eliminate *dhu:kham* totally, therefore, the root cause, *avidhyaa* or *ajnaanam* has to be eliminated. If any intermediate remedy is resorted to, elimination of grief, if at all, will be only temporary.

Removal of self-ignorance, can, of course, be achieved only by *aathma jnaanam*. *Aathma jnaanaath eva ajnaana nivrutthi:* - *ajnaana nivrutthiyaa eva dhu:kha nivrutthi*.

Sloka 12 – Dvitheeya valli – Dvitheeya adhyaaya: of *Katopanishad*, declares “there is lasting happiness for the discriminative ones, who see the Self dwelling in the body; not for others” – तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीराः तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥१२॥ **tamātmastham yē:'nupaśyanti dhirāḥ tēṣāṃ sukham śāśvatam nētarēṣām** ॥

The conclusion of Sureswaraacharya also, in this *avadhaarikaa*, is that, *aathma jnaanam* is a “must” for every human being and therefore, *aathma vidhyaa* or *paraa vidhyaa*, is also a “must”. “Hence” says the *Aachaaryaa* “this work, the treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, is undertaken by me, to set forth the epitome of the essence of the entire *Vedaantha*.”

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

दुःखस्य च देहोपादानैकहेतुत्वात् देहस्य च पूर्वोपचितधर्माधर्ममूलत्वात् अनुच्छित्तिः । :

But, pain originates solely through the fact of embodiment and as embodiment is brought about by merit and demerit accumulated in the past, pain does not cease.

“What is the direct cause of pain” is explained in this sentence.

- दुःखस्य चः - For the pain (grief)
- देह उपादान एक हेतुत्वात् - the only cause is association with a body;

'Upaadhaanam' means 'association' / 'sambhandha:'. Ahamkaara, mamakaara sambhandha: is deha upaadhaanam. The body is under the grip of jaraa, vyaadhi and maranam – old age, disease and death. The word deha is, itself, derived as 'thrividha thaapai: dahyathe ithi deha:' – 'that, which suffers from three types of inflictions'. The other word, sareeram, used to denote the body, is derived as 'seeryamaanam svabhaavam' – 'that, which gradually decays and disintegrates'. It follows, therefore, that, as long as there is association with the body, grief or pain is inevitable. There is another very obvious proof of this fact: when in deep sleep, the individual has no deha abhimaanaa and is, therefore, not aware of any grief or pain.

Deha sambhandha bhaave dhu:kha bhaava: and, therefore, deha sambhandham eva dhu:kha hethu: Then a doubt may arise: “Since deha sambhandham is the cause of grief and since the sambhandhaa ceases at death, does mokshaa automatically follow death?”

Sureswaraacharya clears this doubt by his next remark in the same sentence.

- देहस्य पूर्व उपचित धर्माधर्म मूलत्वात् - the cause for the body being the *punyams* and *paapams* of earlier lives, If one loses one's present body, one acquires a new body depending on one's fructified *sanchitha karmaa* – the *praarabhdha karmaa* of the next birth.
- अनुच्छित्तिः - the destruction of grief / pain does not result (on death).

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

तयोश्च विहितप्रतिषिद्धकर्ममूलत्वात् अनिवृत्तिः।

Merit and demerit, in their turn, arise from good and bad and therefore, do not cease.

One can never end the *punya papa palaani*, since they are continuously being produced by further and further performance of *karmaani*. In effect, one has two problems: (1) One has a huge bundle of *sanchitha karmaa*, only a portion of which is exhausted in any one life, by way of *praarabhdha karmaa*; and (2) even while the *praarabhdha karmaa* is being

exhausted, one is adding *aagaami karmaa* to the unexhausted bundle of *sanchitha karmaa*. *Karmapalan* will continue as long as *karmaa* continues. In this context, verse 2 of the *Upadesa Saaram* of Sri Ramana Maharishi, is very relevant: “*krutimahodadhau pathanakaaranam palam asaasvatham gathinirodhakam*” meaning “Action is the cause for one to fall in the vast ocean of further action. The result of action is limited and hence an obstruction to ‘knowledge’, which is the direct means of liberation”.

- **तयोचः** - For the *punya paapa palaani*
- **विहित प्रतिषिद्ध कर्म मूलत्वात्** - the prescribed good and prohibited bad actions (*karmaani*) being the cause,
- **अनिवृत्तिः** - there is continuation of grief.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| कर्मणश्च | रागद्वेषास्पदत्वाद्ग्राह्यद्वेषयोश्च | शोभनासोभनाध्यासनिबन्धनत्वादद्यासस्य |
| चाविचारितसिद्धद्वैतवस्तुनिमित्तत्वादद्वैतस्य | च | शुक्तिकारजतादिवत् सर्वस्यापि |
| स्वत्स्निह्याद्वितीयात्मान्वबोधमात्रोपादानत्वादव्यावृत्तिः। | | |

Those deeds themselves spring from desire and aversion; desire and aversion are due to the ascription of goodness and badness (to external objects and situations); such ascription is caused by the presentation of duality, which presentation occurs owing to the absence of due inquiry ; and, as all duality arises out of the Ignorance of the self-established and secondless *aathman*, even as silver presents itself owing to the non-observation of the shell in the shell-silver illusion, it (the grief) does not cease.

Cessation of *karma*, therefore, would seem to be the solution. But, this cessation is not possible, because of some power/force whipping up the humans into activity. What is that force?

- **कर्मणश्च रागद्वेष आस्पदत्वात्** - The actions themselves spring from desire and hatred.

In verse 37, Chapter III, of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, Lord Krishna, in answer to Arjuna's question in the earlier verse, viz. “What prompts this person to commit sin, even though unwilling, as though he is forcibly persuaded?”, answers, “It is anger; it is desire”. The Lord's answer is relevant here.

It would, therefore, appear that one should get rid of *raaghaa* and *dveshaa*. But, this will not be possible, as long as one categorizes the world into two (i) favourable (people and situations, in the presence of whom / which life is considered pleasurable) and (ii)

unfavourable (people and situations, in the presence of whom / which life is considered painful).

- **रागद्वेषयोच शोभना अशोभना अध्यास निबन्धनत्वात्** : - The 'desire' and 'hatred' result from the misconception of things as favourable and unfavourable. '*sobhanaad*' means 'favourable'; '*asobhanaad*' means 'unfavorable'; '*adhyasam*' means 'misconception/erroneous impression'; '*nibhandhanam*' means 'cause'.

The conviction "*aham poorna: asmI*" is wisdom. My *svabhaavam* is *poornam* and it cannot be increased or decreased by anything in creation. The notion that it can be increased or decreased is *adhyasaa*: | *Sobhanaa asobhanaa adhyasam* is the second generation product of *avidhya* and because of this *adhyasam*, one pursues efforts to acquire or to get rid of things and situations.

- **अध्यासस्य च** - For this two-fold (favourable or unfavourable) erroneous impression
- **द्वैत वस्तु निमित्तत्वात्** - *dvaita dharsanam* is the cause.

The *Aacharyaa* points out that as long as one has *dvaita dharsanam* (duality in perception) one is subject to viewing things as favourable and unfavourable. Lord Krishna declares in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Ch. IV.- verse 24)" *brahmaarpanam brahma havi: brahmaagnau brahmanaa hutham brahmaiva thena ganthavyam brahmakarmasamaadhinaa*" – "The ladle is *Brahman*; the offering is *Brahman*; it is offered into the fire of *Brahman*, by *Brahman*. *Brahman* alone is to be reached by him who sees *Brahman* in every action". Only in *advaitic* perception, one sees *Brahman* or *Isvara* in every object perceived by him. Only this *sarvathra Brahma dharsanam* or *sarvathra Isvara dharasanam* can help in not dividing the world into favourables and unfavourables.

- **अविचारित सिद्ध द्वैतस्य च** - The *dvaita dharsanam* is the result of non- enquiry,
- **शुक्तिका रजतादिवत्** - similar to the 'shell-silver' and 'rope-snake'.

The "unreal" will continue as long as one does not enquire about the "real". Vidhyarany Swami, elsewhere, comments "non-enquiry is nourishment for 'unreality'". Hence, the *Aacharyaa* avers that *dvaitam* is *avicharitha siddham*.

The 'snake-rope' example, though not explicit here, is implied by the use of '*aadhivath*'. The use of the 'shell-silver' and 'rope-snake' examples is common in *Vedhaantha*. The subtle difference in the examples, is, that, while the misconceived silver in the shell causes *raaghaa* and consequent *pravrutthi* (running after), the unreal snake in the rope causes *dveshaa* and consequent *nivrutthi* (running away). *Vedhaantha* holds that the whole world is like shell-

silver and rope-snake, causing *raaghaa* and *dveshaa* and consequent *pravrutthi* and *nivrutthi*. Proper enquiry will eliminate the misconceptions. "*Sarvam brahmamayam jagath'*" should become a firm conviction. Alternately, the whole Creation should be looked upon as '*Isvara Svaroopam'*', as Lord Krishna declares in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Cha. VII – verse 7), "*mattha: paratharam na anyath kinchith asth'*" – "There is nothing other than Me".

- सर्वस्य अपि - (Thus) for everyone,
- स्वतस्सिद्ध अद्वितीय आत्म अनवबोध मात्र उपादानत्वात् - ignorance of the self-evident, non-dual Self being the only cause,
- अव्यावृत्तिः -non-elimination of grief persists.

The *Aachaaryaa* uses two adjectives for the *aathmaa*: (1) '*adhvitheeya'*' meaning 'non-dual' and (2) '*svatha: siddha'*' meaning 'self-evident'/'self-established'.

Avadhaarika gadhyam(further):

अतः सर्व अनर्थ हेतुः आत्म अनवबोधः एव |

Therefore, the cause of all evil is non-apprehension of Self.

- अतः आत्म अनव बोधः एव - Therefore, 'self-ignorance' alone
- सर्व अनर्थ हेतु - is the cause of all problems.

The moral: One should dedicate oneself to self-knowledge, if one is intelligent.

4. Avadharika Gadyam to Chapter I cont'd (18-03-2006).

Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces his *Naishkarmya Siddhi* text, by pointing out that self-ignorance alone is the cause of all forms of human pain - *sarva dhu:khasya kaaranam aathma anvabodha eva* | The *Aachaaryaa* derives this conclusion in a few steps, as to how *dhu:kham*, though not the direct product of ignorance, is the 7th generation product; and, because of this fact, viz., that , grief is not the **direct** product of ignorance, we do not realize that "ignorance" **is** the cause of pain.

To eliminate grief, therefore, the root cause , "self- ignorance", has to be eliminated, since any intermediary solution will only be temporary.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

सुखस्य च अनागमपायिनः अपरतन्त्रस्य आत्मस्वभावात् तस्य अनवबोधः पिधानम् |

Non-arrival, non-departure and non-dependence on external objects are parts of the very nature of original *aanandham*. 'Self-ignorance' veils that *aanandham*.

Until now, Sureswaraachaaryaa talked about "ignorance" as the creator or cause of sorrow. The *vikshepa sakthi* of *avidhyaa* was being highlighted. In this sentence, the *Aachaaryaa* talks about the *aavarana sakthi* of *avidhyaa*, because of which *sakthi*, it veils the *aathma aanandha svaroopam*. In other words, till now, the *Aachaaryaa* was pointing out that "ignorance causes sorrow"; now, he says "the very same ignorance does another mischief ; it also conceals the *svaroopa aathma aanandha.*" |

According to *Vedhaantha*, there is only one source of *aanandhaa* - the *aathmaa*, the Infinite One. Everything else is finite – *alpam* – and cannot give happiness. The *Chaandoghya Upanishad* declares: "Yovai bhoomaa sukham na alpe sukham asthi" – "Infinite alone can give *aanandhaa*; the finite cannot". The fundamental law of *Vedhaantha* is "Yath alpam thath dhu:kham yath poornam thath sukham".

In our experience, the worldly objects also give pleasure. In contrast, *Vedhaantha* asserts "sense objects do not give even an iota of *aanandhaa*". How does one explain this contradiction between physical perception and scriptures? The explanation is given by *Vedhaantha* itself: "Some sense objects *do* have a power to make the mind quiet and relax it; i.e., *saantha vrutthi* results from some sense objects. In this quiet and relaxed mind, the *svaroopa aanandhaa* gets reflected and the individual temporarily enjoys this 'reflected' *aanandhaa* / *prathibhimba sukham*, which is mistaken by the individual as *aanandhaa* given by the sense object. But, the fact is that the sense object does not actually give the *aanandhaa*; it only appears to do so". In effect, *Vedhaantha* says: "sense objects are

cheating you, by making you misconstrue that *they* are giving you *aanandhaa*, whereas the *aanandhaa* actually is *your* own *aathma aanandha*.

Sureswaraacharya also points this out: "*ajnaanam* makes one lose sight of the original source of *aanandhaa* and to run after the fragile and temporary sense objects".

The *priya aanandhaa*, *modha aanandhaa* and *pramodha aanandhaa*, mentioned in the *Thaithreeya Upanishad* belong to the *aanandha maya kosaa* and are temporary and fragile *aanandhaa*-s borrowed only from 'Me'. The world, by itself, does not have an iota of *aanandhaa*.

A relevant and well-known verse runs: "*akaare kalu samsaare sukha: braanthir maneeshina: laalaa paana ivaam ghushte baalaanaam sthanya bhibhramaa*" – "for human beings, there is the mistaken notion that *sukham* is from *samsaaraa*, similar to a baby sucking its thumb and mistaking its own saliva as the mother's milk".

Reverting to the text:

- अनागमपायिनः - Non-arrival , non-departure
- अपरतन्त्रस्य - and non-dependence (on external sources)
- आत्मस्वभावात् - being the very nature
- सुखस्य च - of the **original** *aanandham* (*sukham*, in this context, should be interpreted as original *aanandham*),
- अनवबोधः - it is ignorance of the Self
- तस्य पिधानम् - which 'veils' that *aananda svaroopam*

The adjective '*anaagamapaayina:*' to '*sukhasya*' stresses the nature of the original *aanandhaa*. All experiential pleasures 'come and go' and are not real *aanandhaa*. Even *samaadhi janya aanandhaa* is not *aathma aanadhaa*, but only *aathma prathibhimbha aanandhaa*, since it comes with *samaadhi* and disappears when the practitioner comes out of the *samaadhi*. Also, *aathmaanandhaa* is not an experiential *aanandhaa*; it is the very nature of 'I', who is behind all the arriving and departing experiences. The happiness of 'I', the continuous *chaithanya thathvam* is *anaagamapaayina aanandha:* - non-arriving and non-departing *nithyaanandha:* /

The second adjective '*aparathanthrasya*' (to '*sukhasya*') highlights the fact that *aathma aanandhaa* is not dependent on external factors, unlike experiential pleasures, which are conditional pleasures, dependent on external factors. Experiential pleasures are

parathanthraa; *aathma aanandhaa* is *apara thanthraa*. It does not depend on time also. It is the knowledge of the *poornathvam* of the self.

The use of the word '*pidhaanam*' meaning 'cover / veil' is only figurative and not literal. A cloth can physically cover a body, if large enough. But, *aathmasvaroopam* being infinite, how can it be covered? Also, *aathmaa* is experienced by all, at all times. *Aathma* is said to be *svayam prakaasa*: and *nithya prakaasa*: / Then how does *avidhyaa* 'cover' *aathmaa*? The explanation: By the word '*pidhaanam*', 'physical' covering is not meant; but, when one is 'ignorant', it is 'as though' the *aathmasvaroopam* is covered. In other words, the 'non-availability' caused by 'ignorance' is figuratively termed '*pidhaanam* / concealment'.

Thus, the two powers of *avidhyaa*, the *vikshepa sakthi* and the *aavarana sakthi*, create the two main problems of the human being. "Facing *dhu:kham*, because of ignorance" is one main problem. "Missing the *svaroopaa aanandhaa* and therefore, running after *vishaya aanandhaa*" is his second main problem. The two problems together constitute *samsaaraa*. Hence, the pressing need to tackle '*avidhyaa*' - 'ignorance'.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further) :

अतस्तस्यात्यन्तोच्छन्नावशेषपुरुषार्थपरिसमाप्ति | :

Therefore, the attainment of the *summum bonum* lies in the total destruction of this ignorance.

- अतः - Therefore, (ignorance being the cause of both problems (i) missing the original *aanandhaa* and (ii) facing *dhu:kham*)
- अशेष पुरुषार्थ परिसमाप्ति: - all the four *purushaartha*-s are achieved
- तस्य अत्यन्त उच्छित्तौ - by 'total elimination' of that ignorance.

'*Thasya*' means '*anavabodhasya*', mentioned in the earlier sentence. '*Ucchedha*.' means 'eradication / elimination'. And, what is 'total elimination'? Explanation: *Ajnaanam* has three aspects (i) *aavaranam* – ignorance (ii) *samsaya*: - doubtful understanding (partial understanding can only create doubts) and (iii) *viparyaya*: - wrong understanding. Removing all these three aspects is 'total elimination'. The use of the word '*athyantha*' emphasizes this.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

अज्ञाननिवृत्तेश्च सम्यग्ज्ञानस्वरूपलाभमात्रहेतुत्वान्तदुपादानम् ।

The destruction of ignorance is accomplished only by the attainment of perfect knowledge and hence such knowledge must be sought.

How does one remove 'ignorance'? How many methods are there for removal of 'ignorance'? A common example, in answer to this query, is the counter-query 'how many materials are

there to remove darkness in a room?' and the answer 'only light'. Likewise, 'ignorance' can be removed only by 'jnaanam' – not by any of the other *Yogaa-s*, like *bakthi yogaa*, *upaasanaa yoga*, *raja yogaa*, *hata yogaa* etc. These are the many paths for purifying the mind; but, for removal of ignorance and therefore, for liberation, *jnaanam* is the only path.

अज्ञाननिवृत्तेः- For el i m i nat i on of i g n o r a n c e,

- सम्यग् ज्ञान स्वरूपलाभमात्र हेतुत्वात् - attainment of perfect knowledge being the only cause,
- तत् उपादानम् - that (knowledge) should be sought.

Even in *kali yugaa*, *jnaanam* is the only path for *mokshaa*. The oft-quoted '*kalau naama sangirthanam*' should be understood only as: 'in *kali yugaa*, *naama sangirthanam* is the simplest *saadhanaa* which can help achieve *chittha suddhi* (not *mokshaa*).'

After realizing that 'knowledge' and 'ignorance' are mutually inimical – *jnaana ajnaanayo: virodha:* - and, that, therefore, 'knowledge' will destroy 'ignorance', how does one proceed to acquire 'knowledge'? Two conditions have to be satisfied – (1) *samaana vishayathvam* and (2) *samaana aasrayathvam*.

The term '*Samaana vishayathvam*' means "subject matter of ignorance and subject matter of knowledge should be the same". As a simple example, "ignorance of the subject of Physics will be removed only by knowledge of Physics". Likewise, *aathma ajnaanam* will be removed only by *aathma jnaanam* – not even by *Isvara jnaanam*.

'*Samaana aasrayathvam*' means "locus of ignorance and locus of knowledge must be the same". Again, as a simple example, "Rama's knowledge of Physics will not remove Lakshmana's ignorance of Physics or *vice versa*". Since it is the seeker who suffers from *aathma ajnaanam*, he should seek and acquire *aathma jnaanam*. *Jnaanam* of his *guru* or of his father will not help.

And, *aathma jnaanam* can be gained only through a long term and consistent educational programme, covering the study of scriptures.

This is what is said by Sureswaraachaaryaa in the next part of this *avadhaarikaa*.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

अशेषानर्थहेत्वात्मानवबोधविषयस्य च अनागमिकप्रत्यक्षादि लौकिकप्रमाण अविषयत्वात् वेदान्तागमवाक्यादेव सम्यग् ज्ञानम् ।

As the object to which ignorance of Self constituting the cause of all evil pertains, namely Self or *aathmaa*, does not fall within the range of ordinary modes of knowledge like sensory

perception, perfect knowledge could be acquired only through the authority of statements in the scriptures of *Vedhaantha*.

This is a very terse statement by the *Aachaaryaa*. Any knowledge, whether spiritual or worldly, is generated in the mind, only by the operation or use of the appropriate or relevant tool of knowledge. Such a tool or instrument is termed *pramaanam*. 'Eye' is the *pramaanam* for knowledge of 'colour'. No other sense organ (ear, nose etc.) or method (like meditation etc.) can give knowledge of 'colour'. So also sound, smell or taste, which can be known only by the appropriate sense organ – ear, nose and tongue respectively. In essence, every type of knowledge requires the appropriate tool for acquiring that particular knowledge. Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts, in this statement, that, for *aathmajnaanam*, the only *pramaanam* is *aagama / veda vaakyam* – especially *mahaa vaakyam*.

Again, for acquiring of any knowledge, the appropriate *pramaanam* should not only be available, but, should also be operated or put into use. Mere presence or availability of the *pramaanam* is not sufficient. Likewise, *aathma jnaanam* also can be acquired or generated only by making use of the appropriate *pramaanam* – the *Vedhaantha saasthraa-s*.

अशेष अनर्थ हेतु आत्मानवबोध विषयस्य च - The object to which, 'self-ignorance', constituting the cause of all evil, pertains (namely *aathmaa*),

'*Aathma anavabodham*' (self-ignorance) is *asesha anartha hethu* (cause of all evil of *samsaaraa*). The 'object' of 'self-ignorance' is obviously the 'Self' or '*aathmaa*'.

- अनागमिक प्रत्यक्षादि लौकिकप्रमाण अविषयत्वात् - not being the subject of non-traditional and non-*Vedic* worldly *pramaanam-s* like physical observation etc.,

'*Anaagamika*' means 'non-traditional / non-*Vedic*'; '*prathyakshaadhi*' means 'physical observation etc.'; '*loukika*' - 'worldly'; '*avishaya*' means 'not a subject'.

Non-*Vedic* worldly *pramaanam-s* cannot give knowledge of the Self.

- सम्यग् ज्ञानम् - clear / perfect knowledge
- वेदान्त आगम वाक्यात् एव - can result only from *Vedhaantha*, *aagama vaakyaas* (especially *mahaa vaakyam*)

But, mere chanting of the *mahaa vaakyaas* will not help generate knowledge. *Sabhda aavrutthi* is not *jnaana janakam*. *Mahaavaakya aavrutthi* cannot produce *aathma jnaanam*. Chanting of *mahaa vaakyam* (like '*soham*' etc.) can give only *chittha suddhi*. *Mahaa vaakya*

vichaara: (thorough inquiry under the guidance of a *guru*) alone can produce the knowledge. The process may be long drawn; but, there is no other path to *jnaanam*.

Avadhaarika gadhyam (further):

अतोऽशेषवेदान्तसारसंग्रहप्रकरणमिदमारभ्यते । तत्र अभिलषित अर्थप्रचयाय प्रकरण अर्थ संसूत्रणाय च अयमाध्य :श्लोकः।

Therefore, this work, purporting to set for the epitome of the essence of the entire *Vedhaanthaa*, is undertaken. The first verse serves as a prayer for the fulfillment of the desire in the matter and to indicate in a nut-shell the theme of the work.

- अत :- Therefore (because only *Vedhaantha vichaaraa* will give knowledge)
- इदं प्रकरणं आरभ्यते - I am starting this Text,
- अशेष वेदान्त सार संग्रह - which is the essence of all *Vedhaanthic* scriptures.
- तत्र - Having made the decision,
- अभिलषित अर्थप्रचयाय - for the successful progress of the desired objective '*abhilashitha*' - desired; *artha* – objective; *prachayaaya* – successful progress / unobstructed growth.
- प्रकरण अर्थ संसूत्रणाय - of presenting the subject in a nutshell,
- अयं आध्यःश्लोकः - this first verse of prayer.

5. Chapter I, verses 1 and 2 (25-03-2006)

In the comprehensive introduction to his text, Sureswaraachaaryaa establishes two points:

- (1) *Aathma ajnaanam* alone is the cause of *samsaaraa / vividha dhu:kha praapthi:* the experienced misery and pain; and, since *aathma ajnaanam* alone is the cause of *samsaaraa*, *aathma jnaanam* alone can be the cause of *ajanaana nivrutthi:* and *mokshaa*, as it is *jnaanam* alone which can destroy *ajnaanam*.
- (2) Proceeding to the second point, he explains that *aathma jnaanam* can be acquired only through the study of *Veda antha baaghaa*. Any knowledge / information can be acquired only by the use of the appropriate instrument, technically called *pramaanam*. The usage of the *pramaanam* is termed *pramaana vyaapaara:* | An indisputable rule is: "*Pramaana vyaapaaram vinaa pramaa uthpaathi naiiva sambhavath'*", meaning "without the use of a *pramaanam*, *jnaanam* can never be acquired". But, the choice of the *pramaanam* does not rest with the seeker of the knowledge. On the other hand, it depends on the 'knowledge' that is sought. For example, for 'knowledge of colour', one has to depend on one's eyes alone ; for 'hearing', one has to depend on one's ears alone ; and so on. In the case of *aathma jnaanam*, i.e. when *aathmaa* is the *prameyam*, none of the usual *loukika pramaanaa-s*, viz., *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi* and *anupalabdhi*, will be found useful. These *pramaanaa-s* can be employed only for *anaathma vishayaa-s*. Even science cannot help *aathma prameyam*. Sureswaraachaarya points out this fact. By his emphatic statement "*vedhaantha aagama vaakyaath eva'*", he avers, that, the only *pramaanam* for *aathma jnaanam* is *aagamika sabdha:*, i.e. *vaidhika sabdha:* , that, too, not the *Veda poorva baaghaa*, but, the *Veda antha baaghaa* alone.

Later, the *Aachaaryaa* will rule out meditation also as a *saadhanaa* for acquiring *aathma jnaanam*. Only the study of *mahaa vaakyam* in a systematic manner, will result in *aathma jnaanam*, though such a study may be a long-drawn process. Swami Vidhyaaranayaa also says, in his *Panchadasee* : "*Paroksha cha aparoksha chethi veda vidhyaa vichaarathaa'*" meaning "whether *parokshaa* or *aparokshaa*, direct realization of *aathmaa* has to come through *veda vaakya vicharaa* only".

Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes his brief introduction and commences the text with a *mangala slokaa*, which he intends as a prayer for the fulfillment / accomplishment of his desired objective – *abhilashitha artha prachayaaya* - and for presenting the subject matter of his treatise briefly - *prakarana artha samsoothranaaya*.

Chapter I : Verse 1

खानिलाग्न्यब्धिरत्र्यन्तं स्रक्फणीवोद्गतं यतः ।

ध्वान्तच्छिदे नमस्तस्मै हरये बुद्धिसाक्षिणे ॥ १ ॥

I offer obeisance to that Hari, the Witness of the intellect, who annihilates darkness (of ignorance) and from whom arises the world consisting of ether, air, fire, water and earth, even as the illusory snake arises from the rope.

In this *sloka*, Sureswaraacharya offers *namaskaaram-s* to Lord Vishnu.

- हरये नमः - I offer prostrations to Lord Narayana,
'Hari:' means 'remover'; may be taken as remover of ignorance or as remover of *paapaani* or as remover of obstacles – *harathy ajnaanam ithi Hari: - harathy paapaani ithi Hari: - harathy vighnaani ithi Hari: |*

What type of *Har*? The *Aachaaryaa* uses different adjectives.

- ध्वान्तच्छिदे : - (who is) the destroyer of internal darkness (i.e. ignorance),
Guru removes the disciple's ignorance, with the help of *saasthraa-s*; but, the *saasthraa-s* have been given only by *Isvara*. It follows, therefore, that, it is *Isvara*, who removes ignorance through *saasthra pramaanam*. Hence, the *Aachaaryaa* refers to *Hari*, as "destroyer of darkness of ignorance".
- यत(जगत्) उद्गतं : - from whom has emerged the world,

In *Thaithreeya Upanishad*, *Bhrugu Valli* also, we find the usage of '*yatha:*', meaning 'from whom', in the first *manthraa*, as, '*yatho vaa boothaani jaayanthe*'.

- खा अनिल अग्नि अप् धरित्री अन्तं - which is of the nature of space, air, fire, water and earth,
kham – space ; *anila:* – air ; *agni:* - fire ; *ap* – water ; *dharithree* – earth ; *antham* - of the nature of.

The whole world is made up of *pancha bhoothaa-s* only, the five elements, their combinations and the products of the five elements. The very word '*prapancha:*', denoting the world, means "containing the five elements".

Though only *srishti (udhgatham)* is explicitly mentioned here, *sthithi* and *layam* also are to be understood as implied.

What type of creation (*udhgatham*)? Three different theories have been propounded by different philosophies, pertaining to creation.

- (1) "Bhagavaan created the universe" is the stand of some philosophies – *Nyaayaa*, *Vaisheshikaa* and *Dvaitaa*. This theory is termed *nimittha kaarana vaadha:* or *thatastha Isvara vaadha:* |
- (2) "Bhagavaan has become the universe" is the theory propounded by *Visishtadvaitam* and is termed *parinaama upaadhaana kaarana vaadha:* or *Brahma parinaama vaadha:* | The attitude "*sarvam vishnumayam*" results.
- (3) "Bhagavaan (or Brahman) 'appears' as the universe, without undergoing any change" is the stand of the *Advaitin*. This theory is termed *brahma vivartha vaadha:* |

The *Advaitin* firmly believes that there is a fallacy in the *nimittha kaarana vaadha:*, namely, that, *Bhagavaan* will become 'limited', based on this theory ; as for the *parinaama upaadhaana vaadha:*, according to the *Advaitin*, there is a fallacy in it also, viz., the notion that *Bhagavaan* is subject to change. Neither 'limitation' to the 'Infinite' nor 'change' to the 'nirvikaara:' is acceptable to the *Advaitin*.

Sureswaraacharya, being a strong advocate of *Advaitam*, refers to 'Creation' as equivalent to the well-known '*rajju-sarpa*', using a different phrase '*sraak pane*'. *Brahman* 'appears' as the world, just as a discarded garland lying on the ground in semi-darkness, falsely 'appears' as a snake.

- स्रक्फणीव - similar to a snake that 'appears' in a garland, '*sraak*' means 'garland' ; '*panir*' - 'फणिन्' - means 'snake'; '*iva*' means 'like'.
- "I offer obeisance to Vishnu, who 'appears' as this world" says the *Aacharya*, implying the *Advaitic* theory "*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa*".
- बुद्धि सक्षिणे - (and) Who is the Witness of the intellect.

'*Buddhi saakshine*' is another adjective to Hari. One does not have to 'travel' to see Lord Hari. He is available in one's own heart, as the very witness consciousness of one's mind. *Thaitheeya Upanishad* (*manthraa 1- Brahmavalli*) refers to *Brahman* or *Iswara* as "*nihitham guhaayaam parame vyomar*" – "residing in the supreme space within the cave of the heart". The *Aacharya*, by this adjective "*buddhi saakshine*" for Hari, implies that "*Paramaathmaa* Hari is none other than the *jeevaathmaa*"; and, by extension, implies "*jeevo brahmaiva na apara:*" | The *Advaitic* theme of the treatise *Naishkarmya Siddhi* viz., "*brahma saathyam jagan mithyaa jeevo brahmaiva na apara:*" has thus been briefly indicated in this verse, in keeping with the *Aacharya's* statement '*prakarana artha samsoothranaaya*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 2:

स्वसंप्रदायस्य चोदितप्रमाणपूर्वकत्वज्ञापनाय विशिष्टगुणसंबन्धसंकीर्तनपूर्विका गुरोर्नमस्कारक्रिया ।

To intimate that his (the author's) tradition proceeds from sound authority, as required by the scriptures, obeisance to the preceptor is recorded through a tribute to his exalted excellence.

After *Isvara Namsakaaram*, Sureswaraachaaryaa does *Guru Namskaaram*, to show that the knowledge he proposes to present in the treatise, has come from a very legitimate, valid and genuine source, namely, *his Aachaaryaa*.

- ज्ञापनाय - To reveal (that)
- स्व संप्रदायस्य - my teaching,

Anything that is properly handed over or transferred is referred to, as '*Sampradhaaya*'. In this context, the use of the word means "the teaching has been handed over to me, by **my** *guru*, to whom it was handed over by **his** *guru* and so on. "Healthily transferred traditional teaching" is the meaning of '*sampradhaaya*' here.

- पूर्वकत्व - (is) backed by
- प्रमाण - valid sources
- चोदित - prescribed in the *saasthraa-s*,

"My teaching is backed by valid sources prescribed by *saasthraa-s*" is the essence.

What is that valid source prescribed by the *saasthraa-s*?

Saasthraa-s themselves prescribe that, though they **are** valid sources of knowledge, they should not be studied direct, but, only under the guidance of a *guru*.

In Verse 34 – Chapter IV – *Srimadh Bhagavadh Githaa*, Lord Krishna exhorts "*thadhviddhi pranipaathena sevayaa updekshyantii they jnaanam jnaanina: thathvadharsina:*" - " may you gain knowledge by prostration and service to wise sages, who will impart that knowledge to you".

Manthraa 12 - Section II – Chapter I of the *Mundaka Upanishad* also prescribes:

तद्विज्ञानार्थं स गुरुमेवाभिगच्छेत् समित्पाणिः श्रोत्रियं ब्रह्मनिष्ठम् ॥ १२ ॥

"*thadh vijnaartham sa gurum eva abhigaccheth samithpaani: srothriyam brahmanishtam*" –

"to attain knowledge, he (the seeker) must necessarily approach, with samith in hand, a teacher learned in scriptures and established in Brahman".

So, according to scriptures a *srothreeya, brahma nishta guru*, is the valid source for "knowledge".

- नमस्कार क्रिया - obeisance
- संकीर्तनपूर्विका - accompanied by flowing tributes
- विशिष्टगुणसंबन्ध गुरोः - is offered to my *guru*, who is endowed with great values.

To emphasize that the teachings which he proposes to give in this treatise, were received by him, from his *guru*, Sureswaraachaaryaa offers obeisance to his *guru*, in the verse that follows.

He also intends to glorify his *guru*, in the verse.

Chapter I: Verse 2 –

अलब्ध्वातिशयं यस्माद्व्यावृत्तास्तमबादयः।

गरीयसे नमस्तस्मै अविध्याग्रन्तिभेदिने ॥ २ ॥

I bow down in reverence to the great preceptor who cuts the knot of ignorance and whose greatness is unsurpassed.

- तस्मै नमः - I bow down to him (my *guru*)
- अविध्या ग्रन्ति भेदिने - who has cut the knot of ignorance,

Self - ignorance is considered a 'knot', because it joins two things together – the *sathya aathmaa* and the *mithyaa sareeram*. (The mixture is called *ahamkaara*:). Alternately, it may be said, that, the Consciousness of *aathmaa* and the mortality of the body have been brought together by *avidhyaa*. "Chith jada granthi:" is the name for *avidhyaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to his *guru*, *Adi Sankara*, as the one who has cut the knot of ignorance.

- गरीयसे - who is the greatest,

'*Ghareeyase*', meaning 'the greatest' is another adjective to the *guru*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa glorifies the greatness of his *guru*, in another poetic and eloquent manner, a detailed explanation of which is as follows. In Sanskrit grammar, degrees of comparison are expressed by the suffixes *thara* and *thama*. "*Guruthara*:" would mean "equal

to *guru*', while "*guruthama:*" would mean "superior to *guru*". There are other suffixes also, used for the same purpose. Such groups of suffixes, used for comparison, are referred to, by the *Aachaaryaa*, in this verse as "*thamabaadhaya:*" | He says "the *thamabaadhaya:* went to other *gurus* to find out an equal or superior to his *guru* - a '*thara guru*' or a '*thama guru*'. Not finding anyone superior or even equal, they returned to the *guru*, from whom they had started (namely, *Adi Sankara*) and rested in him".

- यस्मात् - since
- तमबादयः - the degrees of comparison
- अतिशयं अलब्ध्वा - not finding any one superior or equal (to my *guru*)
- व्यावृत्ताः - returned from the others (and rested in him).

6. Chapter I, Verse 3 to 5 (01-04-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is offering *namaskaaram-s* to Lord Hari, as well as his *guru*, so that he can successfully complete his text book, in the 1st *sloka* to Lord Hari and in the second *sloka* to his *guru*. In the second *sloka*, he also talks about the glory of his *guru*. He avers that no other *guru* is greater than his *guru*; that, all comparative and superlative suffixes travelled throughout the world to find out whether there is any *guru* equal to or greater than his *guru*, *Adi Sankara*; and unable to do so, they returned and rested on his *guru*. He, thus, conveys that his *guru* is matchless.

Thamap + aadhaya: = thamabhaadhaya: / Suffixes of comparison are called *athisayaana prathyayaa:*, because they talk about the degrees of superiority.

The word *guru* is derived as below: "*gukaara: thu anthakaaro vai rukaara: thath nivarthika: / anthakaara nivarthithvaath gurur ithi abhideeyathe*" – "the letter '*gu*' means 'darkness', the letter '*ru*' means 'eliminator'; being the eliminator of 'darkness' (of ignorance) *guru* is the word used (for the preceptor).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 3 & Verse 3- Chapter I;

नमस्कारनिमित्तस्वाशयाविष्करणार्थः ।

वेदान्तोदरसंगूढं संसारोत्सारि वस्तुगम् ।

ज्ञानं व्याकृतमप्यन्यैर्वक्ष्ये गुर्वनुशिक्षया ॥ ३ ॥

The motive behind this reverence is brought out .In obedience to my preceptor's commandment, I expound here the knowledge revelatory of Reality, which is contained in the heart of Vedhaanthaa and which knowledge puts an end to the life of transmigration, though it has been explained by others also.

After offering *namsakaaram-s*, Sureswaraachaaryaa presents his objective or the purpose behind his treatise.

- स्व आशया अविष्करणार्थः - (The following verse is intended) to bring out my objective (*avishkaranam* - expressing / bringing out)
- नमस्कारनिमित्त - for which objective, the *namaskaaram-s* were offered. The objective of the *Aachaaryaa* is expressed in the verse.
- गुरु अनुशिक्षया - Because of my *guru's* commandment / order / injunction,
- ज्ञानं वक्ष्ये - I shall impart the knowledge
- वेदान्त उदरसंगूढं - which is hidden in the words of *Vedhaanthaa*,

'*Udharam*' literally means 'stomach'; should be understood, in this context, as 'words' '*Samgoodam*' means 'hidden'.

The 'knowledge' proposed to be imparted is *Vedhaanthic* knowledge. But, the knowledge is not given by *Vedhaanthaa*, in an explicit manner. If it had been explicit, there would have been no confusion. The very fact that different philosophies like *dvaithaa*, *visishtaadvaitaa*, *advaitaa*, *dvaithadvaitaa* etc., have been expounded based on the same *Vedhaanthic* statements, shows that the meaning is 'hidden' and not explicit. Sureswaraacharya points out this fact, by the use of the word *samgoodam*.

What subject does this 'knowledge' deal with? The *Aachaaryaa* replies: "*vasthugam*". वस्तुगम् - which deals with the Absolute Reality,

The word '*vasthu*' means 'absolute reality' or "that object which always exists, exists non-dually and exists independently". It is derived as "*vasathi*, *sarvathra asthi swathanthrayaa asthi - ithi vasthu*". By using this word, Sureswaraacharya indicates that everything else other than this "independent, Absolute Reality" is *avasthu*, not existing independently and not existing all the time. *Avasthu-s* are *mithyaa*.

What is the benefit of this knowledge? It destroys/eliminates *samsaaraa*.

- संसार उत्सारि - and which is the destroyer of *samsaaraa*. '*samsaara uthsaarl*' is adjective to '*jnaanam*'. '*Uthsaarayathi ithi uthsaari*' / 'That which destroys/uproots is '*uthsaarl*'. The meaning of '*samsaaraa*' had already been dealt with, in the *avadhaarikaa*, with the chain of seven steps from *avidhyaa* to *dhu:kham*. This *chakram* is *samsaaraa*.
- व्याकृतं अपि - even though it (the knowledge) has been explained earlier by others (*poorva aachaaryaa-s*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 4:

किंविषयं प्रकरणमिति चेतदुपान्यासः।

The theme of the work is enunciated as follows.

In the previous verse, Sureswaraacharya generally said that he was venturing to deal with the 'Absolute Reality'. He did not elaborate as to what that 'Absolute Reality' is. That explanation is covered in the ensuing verse.

- किंविषयं प्रकरणं - "What is the subject matter of the treatise?"
- इति चेत् - If so asked,

- तद् उपान्यास- I shall now explain.

Chapter I: Verse 4:

यत्सिद्धाविदमः सिद्धिर्यदसिद्धौ न किञ्चन ।

प्रत्यग्धर्मैकनिष्ठस्य याथात्म्यं वक्ष्यते स्पष्टम् ॥ ४ ॥

Herein will be expounded clearly the essential nature of the Self, which is the sole inmost Reality and whose presence is presupposed by the presentation of the objective world and whose non-manifestation would mean the non-presentation of everything.

Vedhaantha saasthraa-s first introduce the Absolute Reality as *jagath kaaranam*, the ultimate substance out of which the whole universe has come; and, also define that ultimate substance as Pure Existence. "*Sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" – "O good looking one! In the beginning this was Existence alone, One only, without a second" declares the *Chaandhogya Upanishad* (VI.ii.1). Absolute Reality is Pure Existence itself – not a product, part or property of any substance. The Pure Existence, which exists independent of matter, pervades the matter, lends existence to matter and survives even after disintegration of matter. That Pure Existence is the Absolute Reality. On hearing this, the student is curious to know what that Pure Existence is. The *Upanishad* elaborates, talks about Creation and finally says "*Eithadhaatmyam idhagum sarvam thath sathyam sa aathmaa thath thvam as!*" – "Pure Existence is nothing but you, the Consciousness *Saakshi Thatthvam*" (VI.ix.4). Thus, 'I', the observer of everything, am the Pure Existence and, therefore, 'I' am the Absolute Reality. *Vedhaantha* starts in Absolute Reality and culminates in 'I', the *prathyak aathmaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the phrase '*prathyak dharmaa*' here, to mean 'innermost *aathmaa*'. '*Dharmaa*' generally means "values in life" prescribed in the scriptures, derived as '*dhaaranaath dharmaa*', meaning 'because it (*dharma*) sustains the Creation'. In the *Vedhaanthic* context, with the same derivation, the word is used to mean '*aathmaa*', since *aathmaa* is the substratum which sustains the whole Creation. In other words, 'relatively speaking' 'values' sustain 'Creation' and from the 'Absolute angle', the *aathmaa* sustains 'Creation'. To express in a different manner, *vyaavahaara dhrushtyaa*, *dharmaa* means 'values' and *paaramaarthika dhrushtyaa*, it means '*aathmaa*'.

- प्रत्यक् धर्म एक निष्ठस्य - For the ultimate culmination of *prathyak dharma*.

The ultimate culmination is *aathma aikyam*. When the study of *Vedhaantha* is done, the stages are (i) first, *paroksha Brahman* (i.e. *Brahman* as a faraway object, in *Vaikuntaa* or *Kailaasaa*) (ii) then, *prathyaksha Brahman* (as a close-by object) and (iii) ultimately, the *aparoksha Brahman* (as 'I', myself).

- स्पुटम् वक्ष्यते - will be clearly propounded by me
 - तस्य याथात्म्यं - the real nature / *svaroopam* of that (*aathmaa*/Self)
 - यद् सिद्धौ इदमःसिद्धिः - in whose existence alone, the existence of the whole world is proved
 - यद् असिद्धौ न किंचन - and in whose absence, nothing exists.
- '*yadh'* literally means 'who' or 'which' or 'what' and, in this context, indicates *aathmaa*/Self/'I', the Observer; '*idhama:*' means 'all this'(the entire universe).

The observed universe depends on the observer 'I'; 'I' lend existence to the Creation i.e. Creation borrows existence from 'me'. Hence, 'creation' is *mithyaa* and 'I' am *sathyam*. The world is *avasthu* and 'I' am the only *vasthu*.

Sureswaraacharyaa says that, his treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, will deal with 'I', the Absolute Reality.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 5:

विवक्षित प्रकरणार्थं प्ररोचनाय अनुक्तदुरुक्त अप्रामाण्यकारण शङ्काव्युदासेन स्वगुरोः प्रमाण्योपवर्णनम् ।

With a view to create interest in the subject-matter of the work, the authoritativeness of the preceptor is brought out (in the following verse) by a repudiation of the possibility of there being any defect or omission or commission invalidating the system.

In the previous verse, Sureswaraacharyaa said "the real nature of *aathmaa* will be **clearly** propounded by **me**". Would it mean that teachings by the earlier *Aachaaryas* were not clear? Sureswaraacharyaa hastens to correct any such doubt or misunderstanding.

Any teaching can have two types of deficiencies, because of which, it can become non-reliable – *apraamaanyam*. One deficiency is '*anukthathvam*' – omission or incompleteness. The other is '*dhurukthathvam*' – expressing the teaching in a wrong or confusing manner, giving scope for misunderstanding. These two deficiencies are said to be *apraamaanya kaaranaani* – causes for the unreliability of the teaching.

Sureswaraacharyaa says that his *guru's* teaching does not have the two deficiencies.

- विवक्षित प्रकरणार्थं प्ररोचनाय - To generate interest in the content of the *prakaranam* to be taught, '*vivikshitha*' - 'to be taught' ; '*prarochanaaya*' – 'to generate interest' / 'to inspire'.
- स्वगुरोः प्रामाण्य उपवर्णनम्: - the validity of my *guru* is established (in the verse).

If his *guru's* teaching is deficient, Sureswaraachaaryaa's teaching will also be deficient. Validity of the disciple's teaching is based on the validity of the *guru's* teaching. If, therefore, the glory and *praamaanyam* of the *guru* is established, the disciple's *praamaanyam* is established, since it is derived from the *guru*. And, only if Sureswaraachaaryaa's validity is established, his treatise can have validity.

- अनुक्त दुरुक्त अप्रामाण्य कारण शङ्का उदासेन - by elimination of any doubt of there being any deficiency of *anuktham* (omission) or *dhuruktham* (wrong teaching).
'*apraamaanyam*' - 'non-validity'; '*kaarana*' - cause; '*sankhad*' - doubt; '*udaasena*' - 'by eliminating'.

Chapter I: Verse 5:

गुरुक्तो वेदराद्धान्तस्तत्र नो वच्म्यशक्तिनः ।

सहस्रकिरणव्याप्ते खद्योतः किं प्रकाशयेत् ॥ ५ ॥

On the philosophy of the *Veda*, presented by my preceptor, I say nothing because of my incompetence. What can a glowworm do towards illumining what has already been flooded by the light of a thousand-rayed Sun?

In this verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa glorifies *Adi Sankara*, by comparing him to the summer sun in the mid-day and comparing himself to a glowworm. He says: "My *guru* is like the powerful midday sun, whose bright light is already illuminating everything. In comparison, I am like a glowworm. I have no illusions that I can throw better light than my *guru*, on *Vedhaanthee*."

- वेदराद्धान्तः- The final conclusion of *Veda* (which is '*brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa; jeevo brahma eva na apara:*')
- गुरु उक्तः has been taught by my *guru* (in his *baashyam-s* for *Brahma soothraa*, *Upanishads* and *Bhagavadh Githa* and in his *prakaranam-s*).
- तत्र - With regard to that
- नो वच्मि - I have nothing to say,
- अशक्तिनः- since I have no resources for that.
- सहस्रकिरणव्याप्ते (विषये)- (In the matter) illumined by the Sun,
- खद्योतः किं प्रकाशयेत् - what extra light can a glowworm throw?

"It cannot" is the implied message of the question.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 6:

गुरुणैव वेदार्थस्य परिसमापितत्वात्प्रकरणोक्तौ ख्यात्याध्यप्रामाण्यकारणशङ्केति चेत्युदासार्थमुपन्यासः ।

It may appear then, as the preceptor himself has completed the exposition of the import of the *Veda-s* , the work on hand proceeds from invalidating motives like love of fame. Such a supposition is ruled out in what follows:

Since Sureswaraachaaryaa himself had admitted that 'throwing further light' is not possible, he is concerned that people may suspect that he may have some other worldly motives, in writing this treatise.

'*Kyaathi:*' (name and fame), '*laabha:*' (material gain) and '*pooja*' (reverence from others) are the three common worldly motives or aspirations. If an exponent of *Vedhaanthaa* has such material motives, it will follow that he has no *poornathvam* and so cannot be a *jnaani*. In such a case, his *Vedhaanthic* teachings or treatises will not be worth studying, since they will have no *praamaanyam*.

In the previous verse, '*anukthathvam*' and '*dhurukthathvam*' were mentioned as *apraamaanya kaaranaani* - causes for non-validity. In this verse, desires for *kyaathi:*, *laabha:* and *pooja* are considered *apraamaanya kaaranaani*.

7. Chapter I, Verses 6 to 8 (08-04-2006)

In the first few verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa first offered *Isvara Namskaaraa* and *Guru Namskaaraa*, in the form of *Mangalaacharanam*, for removal of obstacles. Then he talked about the glory of his *Guru*, expressing his *gurubhakthi*. He pointed out that his guru's teaching is complete in itself and free of all deficiencies – *anukthathva dhoshaa* (deficiency of incompleteness) or *dhurukthathva dhoshaa* (deficiency of wrong teaching) etc. It would, therefore, appear that there was no reason at all for him to write this *Naishkarmya Siddhi* treatise.

The *Aachaaryaa* continue, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 6: "Then, what is the motive for my writing? People may attribute wrong motives to my venture – possibly three wrong motives (1) *kyaathi* – name and fame (2) *laabha:* - material return and (3) *pujaa* – honour / award / reward. But, if I have a desire for fame etc., it would follow that I have no *poornathvam*. That means *Vedhaantha* has not given me *poornathvam*. How can a work, authored by an *apoorna:*, give *poornathvam* to others? Therefore, if I have such a motive, I will become *apramaanam*. "*Kyaathyaadhi icchaa granthasya apraamaanya kaaranam bhavathi*" – "the desire for fame etc., would become the reason for the non-validity of my writing". If any of my readers has a doubt that I am after fame or material gain or honour, I would like to clear such a doubt, so that my readers will be assured of the validity of my treatise".

- गुरुणा एव वेदार्थस्य परिसमापितत्वात् - "As his *guru* has himself completely dealt with the import of the *Vedas*.
Vedhaartha: - import of the *Vedas*; *parisamaapthithvam* - complete exposition.
- प्रकरण उक्तौ - the writing of this *prakaranam* is done by Sureswaraachaaryaa,
- क्यात्यादि अप्रामाण्य कारण - because of desire for fame etc., which desire will be the cause of the non-validity of the teaching"
- इति आशंका चेत् - If such a doubt arises, *Aasankaa* – doubt / supposition.
- तद् उदासार्थं आह - to rule out such a doubt, I say the following:

Chapter I: Verse 6

न ख्यातिलाभपूजार्थं ग्रन्थोऽस्माभिरुदीर्यते ।

स्वबोधपरिशुद्ध्यर्थं ब्रह्मविन्निकषाशमसु ॥ ६ ॥

This work is not composed by me for the sake of fame, gain and reverential consideration ; it is for the purpose of purifying my own understanding by the judgment of those who know *Brahman*.

- ग्रन्थः - This book
- उदीर्यते - is written
- अस्माभिः - by me
- न ख्याति लाभ पूजार्थ - not for the sake of fame, material gain or honour.

The *Aachaaryaa* had already mentioned one reason for his writing this treatise, in verse 3, as his *guru's* commandment – '*guruanusiksha*' | Now, after clearing a possible doubt about his being after fame or gain or honour, he gives his other intention in authoring the treatise.

- स्वबोध परिशुद्ध्यर्थ- (I venture into this treatise) to purify my own understanding.
- to clear my understanding of all misconceptions,
- ब्रह्मवित् निकष अश्मासु - on the touchstone of those who know *Brahman*.

The *Aachaaryaa* reasons: "How do I know that my understanding is clear? If I do not express myself, other persons (including *mahaathmaa-s*) will not be able to know whether I have proper 'understanding'. But, if I write my treatise, others will know my level of learning and by their responses and reactions will indicate to me, whether I have proper 'understanding' or not. I am, therefore, writing this book to test me knowledge using the wise people as 'touchstone'".

A 'touchstone' is used to test the purity of gold; the *Brahmavith-s* are compared to the touchstone by the *Aachaaryaa*.

Mahakavi Kalidasa also, in the introduction to one of his works, says: "I will not be satisfied by my knowledge of *Sanskrit*, until scholars appreciate my work; because, even if one learns under the best of teachers, self-confidence will not come, without appreciation by other scholars".

The implied statement of *Sureswaraachaaryaa* "I am not trying to improve others; I am writing this book, only to improve myself" reveals his humility.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 7 :

अनर्थ अनर्थहेतु पुरुषार्थ तद् हेतु प्रकरणार्थ संग्रहजापनाय उपन्यास :।

What follows aims at stating the burden of the work, concerning evil, the cause of evil, the goal of human life and the means to attain it.

In this verse and the next, Sureswaraachaaryaa presents the subject matter of the treatise. He mentions four topics in this *sambhandha gadhyam*.

- उपन्यासः - The following verse is presented
- प्रकरणार्थ संग्रह जापनाय - for revealing the essence of this *prakaranam*, (which are)
- अनर्थ - the human problem of *samsaaraa*. Problems may vary from person to person and from time to time. *Vedhaantha* considers all the different problems as only symptoms of the main human problem, *samsaaraa*.
- अनर्थहेतु - the cause of that human problem,
- पुरुषार्थ - the prime goal of human being (meaning *mokshaa*)
- तद् हेतु - and the means of attaining that goal. "*anartha anarthahethu purushaartha thathhethu prakaranasangraha jnaanpanaayaa*" is a compound word.

Chapter I: Verse 7:

ऐकात्म्याप्रतिपत्तिर्या स्वात्मानुभवसंश्रया ।

साऽविध्या संसृतेर्बीजं तन्नाशो मुक्तिरात्मनः॥ ७॥

Nescience, which consists of non-apprehensions of the unity of the Self and which is a matter of our direct experience, is the ultimate seed of *samsaaraa*. Annihilation of it, is the emancipation of the Self.

Of the four topics indicated in the *sambhandha gadhyam*, three are mentioned in this verse.

- या ऐकात्म्य अप्रतिपत्तिः- Which ignorance of the *poorna aathmathvam* (the completeness of one's Self)
'*eka aathmaa*' means '*poorna aathmaa*/'Self, free of desires'.
- स्वात्म अनुभव संश्रया - located in one's *saakshi chaithanyam*
'*samsrayaa*' means 'located' ; '*svaathma anubhava*' means 'one's *saakshi chaithanyam*'.
The witness of existence of one's ignorance is one's *saakshi chaithanyam*. All mental problems are revealed by *saakshi chaithanyam*, while all external conditions are revealed by *chidhaabhaasaa*. So, the *Aachaaryaa* describes 'ignorance of *poorna aathmathvam*' as 'located' in *saakshi chaithanyam*.
- सा अविध्या समसृतेः बीजं - that ignorance is the cause of *samsruthi*: /

'*Samsruthi*:' means 'constant movement from one place to another or from one condition to another'. The 'movement' is because of one's dissatisfaction with one's existing state

of affairs. There is a constant endeavor on the part of human beings to improve their condition at the physical (*baudhika*), mental (*aathmika*) and surrounding (*daivika*) levels. This 'constant struggle caused by dissatisfaction of one's present position' is *samsaaraa*, referred to, by the *Aachaaryaa*, as '*anartham*', in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to this verse.

What causes this *samsruthi*: or *samsaaraa* or *anartham*? The above statement of the *Aachaaryaa* answers: "*Avidhyaa* is the cause of *samsruthi*."

What is *Avidhyaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* had explained "*Avidhyaa* is 'ignorance' of '*poornathvam*' of oneself".

'*Bheejam*' literally means 'seed' and is to be interpreted as 'cause' here.

With this, the *Aachaaryaa* has covered two topics, viz., (i) *samsruthi* is *samsaaraa* and (2) the 'self-ignorance', revealed by *saakshi*, is the cause of that *samsaaraa*.

The 3rd topic, *mokshaa* or *mukthi*:, follows in the same verse.

- आत्मनःतन्नासःमुक्तिः - One's liberation results from the destruction of *samsaaraa*

In other words, 'freedom from constant struggle to be different' is *mokshaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 8 :

पुरुषार्थ हेतोःअवशिष्टत्वात् तदभिव्याहारः ॥

Of the four factors, the means of the end of life remains to be specified and hence the following:

Sureswaraachaaryaa himself says: "Of the four topics, three have been mentioned (in verse 7). The 4th, 'means to *mokshaa*' remains and is covered in the following verse".

- पुरुषार्थ हेतोः- The 'means of *mokshaa*',
- अवशिष्टत्वात् - having been left out,
- तद् अभिव्याहारः - is to be specified now.

'*abhivyaaharanam*' means 'uttering/' 'speaking'. *Bhoo*:, *Bhuva*:, and *Suva*:, are called *vyahurthi manthraas*, since they were uttered by *Brahmaji*.

Chapter I: Verse 8 –

वेदावसान वाक्योत्थ सम्यग्ज्ञान अशुशुक्षणि : ।

दन्दहीत्यात्मनो मोहं न कर्म अप्रतिकूलत :॥ ८ ॥

The perfect knowledge that arises from the words of the closing portion of the *Veda-s*, is the fire that burns away the ignorance concerning the Self and not any action, because action is not opposed to ignorance.

In this verse, the *Aachaaryaa* says that '*moksha kaaranam* is *samyak jnaanam*' - 'means to liberation is right knowledge'.

The use of the adjective 'right' is significant. The word *jnaanam* is used in Sanskrit, both for wrong and right cognitions. Misconception also can be referred to, as *jnaanam*, as in the case of the popular *rajjusarpaa* example, where the misconception as snake is termed *sarpajnaanam*.

Extending this (not relevant to the verse, but an interesting fact) subject, even 'wrong' knowledge can be of two types:

- (1) 'inadvertent' wrong perception and
- (2) 'deliberate' wrong perception.

The rope-snake is an example of inadvertent wrong perception. What is 'deliberate' wrong perception? Every *upaasanaa* is an example. In the *sraadhaa* ceremony, a priest is invited and the *yajamaanaa* 'invokes' his forefather on him 'deliberately', fully conscious that the forefather is deceased and the priest is **not** his forefather. In *Devathaa aaradhanaa-s*, the *Ishta Devathaa* is invoked on a *prathimaa* or a *prathikaa* – *Vishnu* on a *saaligraamaa* and *Siva* on a *lingaa*, being examples of the use of *prathikaa-s*. This 'deliberate' perception of an *Ishta Devathaa* on a *prathimaa* or *prathikaa*, is also *jnaanam* - but, not *samyak jnaanam*. *Adi Sankaraachaaryaa*, therefore, mentions, in one of his works "*Pujaa, Upasanaa* etc. cannot give *mokshaa*, since they are not based on *samyak jnaanam*. The conviction "*aham brahma asmi*" is *samyak jnaanam* and will, therefore, give *mokshaa*".

Reverting to the text,

- सम्यग् ज्ञान अशुशुक्षणि : - The fire of right knowledge
- 'अशुशुक्षणि is a rare word used for 'fire'.
- वेद अवसान वाक्य उत्थ - arising from the words of the closing portions of the *Veda-s*.
'*avasaana*' – final portions; '*vaakya* – statement; '*uttha*' - born out of / arising from.
- आत्मनमोहं दन्दहीति: - totally destroys self-ignorance.

'*Moham*', in this context means '*avidhya*'. One's **own** knowledge only can destroy one's **own** ignorance – hence the qualification '*aathmana:*' |

Arising from this, another interesting topic (though again not relevant to the text). In advanced *Vedhaanthic granthaa-s*, a question is raised and discussed : "You say that **my** knowledge destroys **my** ignorance and **your** knowledge destroys your ignorance. Then, tell me, is 'ignorance' one or many?". "*Avidhya ekathva vaadha: avidhya nanaathva vaadha:*" is an interesting debate in advanced *Vedhaanthic* scriptures.

- कर्म न (मोहम् दन्दहीति) - '*Karma*' cannot destroy self-ignorance,
- अप्रतिकूलत : - since it is not opposed (to ignorance).

How does one acquire *samyak jnaanam*? *Upanishad Vaakyaani – Vedhaantha sabda pramaanam* – is the only source. This is made very clear by Sureswaraacharya, in this verse.

But, how to acquire the 'knowledge' from *Vedhaantha*? The only way is 'analysis'/ '*vicharaad*', of the *thadh padhaartham*, *thvam padhaartham* and *asipadhaartham*, in the form of *sravanam*, *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*. "A systematic, consistent study of the *Vedhaanthic* scriptures for a length of time, under the guidance of a live, competent preceptor" is the only way to acquire "self-knowledge".

9. Chapter I, Verses 9 to 12 (15-04-2006)

In the first six verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa presents a general introduction, offers *mangalaacharanam* and also indicates the purpose of writing his book, viz., "refining his own understanding". He does not claim that he is educating others. He says: "My *guru*, Sri Adi Sankaraachaaryaa, has already done this. *My* purpose is to refine my own understanding, on the touchstone of wise people".

In verses 7 and 8, the *Aachaaryaa* is giving in a nutshell, the topics he is planning to deal with in *Naishkarmya Siddhi* - the *vishaya saara*: |

He says: "I shall cover four topics, (1) *samsaaraa* – bondage (2) *samsaara hethu* – cause for bondage (3) *moksha*:- liberation and (4) *moksha hethu* – cause for liberation.

The first three topics have been defined in verse 7. *Samsaaraa* is nothing but travel between *lokaa-s* or from one body to another, in search of *poornathvam*. *Samsaara hethu* or *samsaara kaaranam* is *ajnaanam*, viz., ignorance of the fact that *poornathvam* cannot be and need not be **attained**, but, is only a matter to be **claimed**, because, *poornathvam* happens to be one's own nature. "*Mokshaa* is freedom from struggle for *poornathvam*" is the definition for *mokshaa*.

Moksha kaaranam - "means for liberation" is being covered in verse 8. Since *poornathvam* is one's own nature, but, one had disowned *poornathvam* because of one's self-ignorance, the solution is, naturally, "owning the *poornathvam* through self-knowledge"; in other words, *aathma jnaanam* alone is *moksha kaaranam*. Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the word *samyak jnaanam* – "right or perfect knowledge".

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* stresses upon by his statement: "*samyak jnaana asusukshani: aathmana: moham dhandhaheethi na karma*" – "The fire of perfect knowledge burns away ignorance of the Self; action does not".

In the *saasthraa-s*, 'ignorance' is often compared to darkness and 'knowledge' to fire. Verse 11 of *Kaivalya Upanishad* runs:

आत्मानमरणिं कृत्वा प्रणवं चोत्तरारणिम् ।

ज्ञाननिर्मथनाभ्यासात्पापं दहति पण्डितः ॥ ११ ॥

ātmānamaraṇim kṛtvā praṇavam cōttarāraṇim |

jñānanirmathanābhyāsātpāpam dahati paṇḍitaḥ || 11||

“Using the mind as the lower *arani* and *Vedic* teachings as the upper *arani*, and by the practice of churning, which is in the form of enquiry, the wise man burns down bondage”. In the *Bhagavadh Githa* also (verse 37 – Chap. IV), Lord Krishna states:

यथैधांसि समिद्धोऽग्निर्भस्मसात्कुरुतेऽर्जुन |
 ज्ञानाग्निः सर्वकर्माणि भस्मसात्कुरुते तथा ||४ -३७||
 yathaidhāṁsi samiddhō:'gnirbhasmasātkurutē:'rjuna |
 jñānāgniḥ sarvakarmāṇi bhasmasātkurutē tathā ||4- 37||

– “Oh Arjuna! The fire of knowledge reduces all *karmaa*-s to ashes, just as a well-kindled fire reduces the fuel to ashes”.

The comparison of *jnaanam* to fire, is based on two angles or perspectives:

(1) Fire is capable of illumining/lighting up things hidden by darkness. ‘Knowledge’ illumines *aathmathathvam*, hidden by ignorance, similar to fire illumining an object hidden by darkness. This is a constructive quality of fire.

(2) Fire is also capable of destroying / burning away. ‘Knowledge’ destroys *samsaaraa*, *adhyaasaa*, *ahamkaaraa*, *karmaa* etc.

The verse under discussion – verse 8 – compares “knowledge” to fire, from the angle of the second perspective, “destroying”. It destroys ignorance and *samsaaraa* totally – *sarva naasanam karothi*. The *Aachaaryaa*, therefore, uses the pre-fix *dhan* to *dhaheethi*. *Dhan* indicates that the destruction is total - *athisyena (dahathi)*.

The use of this emphasis – *dhan* – is significant. *Praayaschittha karmaa*-s also destroy *paapam*. “Knowledge” is also *paapa naasa kaaranam*. But, the difference is that *praayaschittha karmaa*-s can destroy *paapam* only temporarily, while “knowledge” causes the destruction so decisively , that *samsaaraa*, *karma* etc. will never come back again.

But, how does one generate *jnaana agni*: - i.e. “kindle” this fire of “knowledge”? The adjective to *samyak jnaanam*, “*Veda avasaana vaakya uttha*”- “arising from the words of the closing portions of *Vedas*”, used by the *Aachaaryaa*, gives the answer: “Diligent *vedhaantha vichaaraa* will culminate in *jnaanam*”.

To compare with the *Kaivalya Upanishad* statement again: The lower *arani* is the mind, the upper *arani* is the *Vedic* teachings, the churning process is the *sravana*, *manana*, *nidhidhyaasanaani* and the spark of fire is *jnaanam*. But, the lower *arani* – the mind - should be stable for the fire of knowledge to be kindled.

The word '*asusukshani*', used for 'fire' is also significant. The root '*sush*' means 'to dry'. The use of the word '*soshanam*' in the *Guru Sthothram*, as "*soshanam bhava sindho: cha*" may be recollected. "That which totally dries up everything" is the literal meaning of '*asusukshani*.' | *Jnaanam* is '*Samsaara soshaka agni*:' – 'the fire that dries up or destroys *samsaara*.'

Having completed the brief mention of the four topics - *samsaara*, *samsaara hethu*, *mokshaa* and *moksha hethu* - the *Aachaaryaa* introduces another topic in verse 8.

In *Vedhaanthic* discussions, for any text to be termed *Siddhi*, the text should not only reveal the *Vedhaanthic* teachings, but, should also negate counterviews. The author of the text should challenge other philosophies, invite their proponents for debate and refute their theories. This is termed "*poorva paksha kandanam*" – "refutation of differing views" and is a necessary part of a *siddhi granthaa*. This is the fifth topic of this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, and is introduced in this verse.

Among the numerous counterviews, Sureswaraachaaryaa takes the *karmavaadhi* / *poorvameemaamsakaa* as the main challenger. The *karmavaadhi* argues "Only *karmaa* is required for attainment of *mokshaa*. There is nothing like *jnaanam*". In other words "*karmanaa moksha*:" is the theory of the *poorvameemaamsakaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa intends to challenge this philosophy and indicates his intention in this verse, by tersely stating "*karmaa aathmana: moham na dhandahaethi aprathikoolatha*:" – "*Karmaa* does not destroy ignorance, since it is not inimical to ignorance".

An example to *jnaanam*, is 'light', which, being inimical to darkness can **alone** eliminate darkness; nothing else can. *Karmaa* and ignorance can co-exist; every human being is 'proof' of this – steeped in action and successfully self-ignorant also.

Any amount of *karmaa* cannot destroy *ajnaanam*. But, *karmaa* is **not** useless. It **is** useful and, in fact, **necessary** in many respects; but, it cannot destroy self-ignorance and therefore, cannot give *mokshaa*. *Karmanaa moksha: naiva bhavathi* | The popular 4-path theory, that, there are four routes to *mokshaa*, viz., *karmaa*, *bhakthi*, *yoga* (*raja* / *kundalini yoga*) and *jnaana*, is a **misconceived** theory. Only *jnaana* can give *mokshaa*. ***Jnaana maathrena moksha:*** / Sureswaraachaaryaa intends to establish this view with the support of *sruthi* and *yukthi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 9 and 10:

प्रतिजातार्थसंशुद्ध्यर्थं पूर्वपक्षोक्तिः । तत्र ज्ञानमप्युपगम्य तावदुपन्यासः ।

Now with a view to establish firmly the position thus stated, *prima facie* views are brought forward. Among them, the one that admits knowledge is stated in what follows:

In the previous two verses, Sureswaraacharya had introduced five topics, the 5th topic being *poorva paksha kandanam*, negation of counterviews. The *Aachaaryaa* takes up this topic first; the entire first chapter focuses upon the condemnation of the *poorvapakshaa*. The aim is to first avoid obstruction in the travel to *jnaanaa* and, therefore, to establish '*karmana na moksha*.'. The well-known *manthraa*, found both in the *Kaivalya Upanishad* and *Mahaanaarayana Upanishad* runs:

न कर्मणा न प्रजया धनेन त्यागेनैके अमृतत्वमानशुः ।

na karmaṇā na prajāyā dhanēna tyāgēnaikē amṛtatvamānaśuḥ |

"It is through renunciation, that a few seekers have attained immortality, not through ritual, nor through progeny, nor through wealth". Sureswaraacharya uses about 100 verses to establish this theory.

With the purpose to negate the *poorva meemaamsakaa* theory, he first introduces it.

- प्रतिज्ञातार्थसंशुद्ध्यर्थ - For cleansing / de-contaminating our view of "*jnaanena eva moksha*." (of the contaminating *poorva pakshaa* views)
- पूर्व पक्ष उक्तिः - the presentation of *poorva pakshaa* is done.

Even among the *poorva meemaamsakaas*, there are two views:

- (1) One view accepts *aathma jnaanam*; but, considers it useless, since, according to this view, *karmaa* itself can give *mokshaa*.
- (2) According to the second view, there is nothing as *aathma jnaanam* in the entire *Veda saasthraas*.

The first view, where *aathma jnaanam* is accepted, is taken up first:

- तत्र - Among the *poorva meemaamsaa* theories,
- ज्ञानं अभ्युगम्य तावत् - the view accepting *jnaanam* as a teaching of *Vedhaanthaa* (but, holding that *karmaa* **alone** is sufficient for *mokshaa*)
- उपन्यासः - is stated (in what follows).

Different *poorva meemaamsaka matham-s* are presented from verse 9 to verse 22. Among them, from verse 9 to 13, what is known as *eka desee matham*, is first presented.

Chapter I: Verse 9 –

मुक्ते :क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वाज्ज्ञानं तत्र करोति किम् ।

कथं चेच्छृणु तत्सर्वं प्रणिधाय मनो यथा ॥ ९ ॥

As release is effected by actions, what is there for knowledge to accomplish? How is that? Listen with an attentive mind.

It should be carefully noted, that, this address is by the *poorva meemaamsakaa*.

- मुक्तिसिद्धत्वात्: - Since attainment of *mokshaa* is achieved
- क्रियाभिः - by actions (*vaidhika karmaa-s*),
- तत्र - with regard to *mokshaa*,
- ज्ञानं किम् करोति - what can *aathma jnaanam* do?
- कथं चेत् - If you question how *karmaa*, by itself, gives liberation,
- तत्सर्वं शृणु - listen to all the explanations
- मनप्रणिधायः - with full mental concentration,
- यथा - exactly as they are made / without distortions.

Chapter I: Verse 10:

अकुर्वतः क्रियाः काम्या निषिद्धास्त्यजतस्तथा ।

नित्यनैमित्तिकं कर्म विधिवच्चानुतिष्ठितः ॥ १० ॥

One who abstains from actions proceeding from desires for earthly or heavenly happiness, discards actions prohibited in the scriptures and performs properly the actions unconditionally enjoined for daily and occasional observance. (continued in the next verse)

The *ekadesi poorva meemaamsakaa* argues: "*Karmaa* is the cause of *samsaaraa*. Travel from *sareeraa* to *sareeraa* is fuelled by *paapa*, *punya karmaani*. If, at the time of death, the seeker brings his *karmaa* account to 'zero', he can accomplish *mokshaa*. *Karma abhaavaath* results *samsaara abhaava*: and therefore, *moksha bhaava*: / The *Vedhaanthin* also says this. But, we, *poorva meemaamsakaa-s*, are presenting a different method, viz., "*karmaa management*", by adherence to which, at the time of death, the *karmaa* account will be 'zero' ". He says:

- काम्याः क्रियाः अकुर्वतः - For one who gives up all desire-based *vaidhika karmaani* (i.e. *kaamyaa karmaani*),

- तथा - similarly
- निषिद्धा :क्रिया :त्यजतः - abstains from all prohibited actions,
- नित्यनैमित्तिकं कर्म विधिवत् च अनुतिष्ठतः - and, who performs, as prescribed, all the regular compulsory and the occasional compulsory rituals, 'nithya' does not mean only 'daily', but, includes those prescribed to be done periodically – i.e. daily, monthly, yearly etc., and therefore, translated as 'regular'; 'naimitthikam' means 'occasional', for, example, 'grahana tharpanam'. 'vidhivath' means 'as prescribed'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 11:

किं अतः भवति ।

What consequences result from these?

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* himself raises the question "what is the consequence of these three exercises, viz., (1) giving up *kaamyaa karmaani* (2) abstention from *nishiddha karmaani* and (3) unfailing pursuit of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*?"

Chapter I: Verse 11

काम्यकर्मफलं तस्माद्देवादीमं न ढौकते ।

निषिद्धस्य निरस्तत्वान्नारकीं नैत्यधोजनिम् ॥ ११ ॥

...(continued from previous verse) does not attain states like heavenly existence, which are the fruits of the actions from desires and does not descend to low births or hell, which are the results of prohibited actions, as he has discarded them.

Kaamyaa karmaa-s produce *punyam*, which takes the performer to higher *lokaa-s*. So, if one does not perform *kaamyaa karmaani*, *punyam* will not accrue – the cause of higher *lokaa-s* is avoided. *Urdhva loka gamana kaarana punya naasa: bhavathy*

- तस्मात् - because of giving up of *kaamyaa karmaani*,
- काम्य कर्म फलं - the result of the *kaamyaa karmaani*, viz., *punyam*
- देवादि - (and) higher *lokaa-s* like *Devalokaa* etc.,
- न ढौकते - does not reach
- इमं - this person (the non-performer of *kaamyaa karmaani*).
- न एति - (The abstainer from prohibited actions) does not attain
- नारकीं - *lokaa-s* like *naraka lokaa*
- अधोजनिम् - (and) inferior births

- निषिद्धस्य निरस्तत्वात् - because of abstention from prohibited actions.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 12:

देहारम्भकयोश्च धर्माधर्मयोर्ज्ञानिना सह कर्मिणः समानौ चोध्यपरिहारौ ।

As for good and bad actions responsible for present embodiment the objection as well as the answer are common to both advocates of knowledge and action.

The *poorva meemaamsaa* himself foresees another question. "We can avoid *punyam* and *paapam* by abstaining from *kaamyas* and *nishiddha karmaani* respectively. But, what about the *punya-paapam*, already accrued and which have caused this birth – *praarabdhaa*?". The *poorva meemaamsaka* answers: "Our solution to the *praarabdha karma naasanam* is the same as that of the *Vedhaanthin*".

- धर्म अधर्मयोः - As for the good and bad actions
- देह आरम्भकयोः - which are responsible for the birth of this body
- चोध्यपरिहारौ समानौ - the objection as well as the answer are the same
- ज्ञानिना सह कर्मिणः - for both the *Vedhaanthin* and *poorvameemaamsaka*.

9. Chapter I, Verses 12 and 13 (03-06-2006)

Chapter I: Verse 12 –

वर्तमानमिदं याभ्यां शरीरं सुखदुःखदम्।

आरब्धं पुण्यपापाभ्यां भोगादेव तयोः क्षयः ॥ १२ ॥

Those merits and demerits that have caused the present body, which give pleasure and pains to individual, are to be liquidated through the experience of their effects.

In the first six verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa introduced his text book and thereafter in verses 7 and 8, he gave *Vedhaantha Saara*: - pointing out, that,

- (1) *Ajnaanam* is the cause of *samsaaraa*
- (2) *Ajnaananivritthi* is the solution for *mokshaa*
- (3) *Jnaanam* can be attained only through *Vedhaantha vichaaraa* and
- (4) *Jnaanam* gives the *moksha purushaartha*.

A text discussing any one of these four topics will be called a *Vedhaantha grantha*: | If, apart from these topics, the text includes negation of any other philosophy, the text will be called a *Vedhaantha Siddhi Grantha*: |

Since Sureswaraachaaryaa intends this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, to be a *Siddhi grantha*., he includes, in the treatise, his arguments against one group of *poorva pakshin-s*, the *poorva meemaamsakaa-s*. In verse 8, he indicates his intention to refute *poorva meemaamsaa*, asserting “*karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*”, by his explicit statement “*karmaa aathmana: moham na dahath*”| But, it is not as if *karmaa* does not give anything. It can give *chittha suddhi*, but, not *mokshaa*. This is where the *Vedhaanthin* differs from the *poorva meemaamsakaa*.

Poorva meemaamsaka poorva paksha niraasa: (refutation of *poorva meemaamsaa* philosophy) is the 5th topic of the treatise, apart from the four topics of *Vedhaantha Saara*: The *Aachaaryaa* takes up this topic of ‘rejecting *poorva meemaamsaa*’ first, in Chapter I. *Vedhaanthic* subject matter is covered in later chapters. In the *Brahma Sootra Bhaashyaa* also, refutation of *poorva paksha* philosophies, is done first, by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, followed later, by establishment of *Vedhaantha*. The same methodology is adopted by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this text.

Sureswaraachaaryaa starts with first presenting the philosophy of *poorva meemaamsaa* / the tenets of *karmavaadhin-s*, in verses 9 to 22.

There are three sub-divisions even among the *karmavaadhin-s*.

Verses 9 to 13 cover the first group, who claim "*Karmaa*, by itself, gives *mokshaa*. The subject of *Jnaanam*, though discussed in the *saasthraa-s*, is not at all required. It can be ignored". This group can be called *jnaana abhyupethya karma vaadhina:*

Verses 14 to 19 cover the second group of *poorvameemaamsakaa-s*, who also hold "*karma* alone gives *mokshaa*", but, also maintain "there is no *aathma jnaanam* taught in the *Veda-s*, independent of *karmaa*". This group is referred to, as *jnaana anabhyupedhya karma vaadhina:*

Verses 20 to 22 cover the third group called *samucchaya karma vaadhina:*, who accept *aathmajnaanam*, but contend "*jnaanam* should be combined with *karmaa* to attain *mokshaa*".

After elaborating the tenets of these groups, Sureswaraachaaryaa condemns them, one by one.

The first group of *karmavaadhin-s* claims that by ingeniously editing the *kaarmic* way of life, one's *karma* balance can be brought to "nil", at the time of death. Since the cause of *punar janmaa* (*punyam* and *paapam*) is eliminated, re-birth is avoided. "*Karma abhaavaath punar janma abhaava:* and therefore, *moksha:*" is their stand.

The fallacy in this view, is, that, this group takes into consideration only two types of *karmaa*, (1) *aagaami*, which are earned during the course of the present *janmaa* and (2) *praarabhdhaa*, which, according to the *Vedhaanthin* is the cause for this birth, but, which is interpreted by the first group of *karmavaadhin-s* as "**all** past *karmaa-s*".

The *Vedhaanthin-s* believe in three types of *karmaa-s*:

- (1) *aagaami*- which are earned during the course of the present *janmaa*
- (2) *praarabhdha* - that part of the past *karmaa*, which had fructified to cause this *janmaa* and is exhausted during this *janmaa* and
- (3) *sanchitha* – that portion of the past *karmaa*, which is yet to fructify, but, has to be exhausted in further *janmaa-s*.

The first group of *karmavaadhin-s* do not talk of *sanchitha karma* at all. The non-consideration of the *sanchitha karmaa* is a major mistake committed by this group of *karma vaadhin-s*, who say "by avoiding *aagaami karmaa* and exhausting *praarabhdha karmaa* in this birth, the seeker can attain *mokshaa*". *Adi Sankara* discusses this failure, in detail, in his *bhaashyam* to the *Bhagavadh Githa*.

According to this group of *karmavaadhin-s*, the *aagaami karmaa* is avoided, by three exercises:

- (1) avoidance of all *kaamyaa karmaa-s* that produce *punya palan*, expressed in Sanskrit as "*kaamyaa karma thyaagena aagaami punya abhaava.*";
- (2) avoidance of all *nishiddha karmaa-s* that cause *paapa palan*, expressed in Sanskrit as "*nishiddha karma thyaagena aagaami paapa abhaava.*";
- (3) diligent performance of *nithya, naimittika karmaa-s*, because of which, *prathyavaaya paapam* is avoided, (*Saasthraa-s* warn that non-performance of the prescribed *nithya, naimittika karmaani*, produce a type of *paapam*, named by the *saasthraa-s*, as *prathyavaaya paapam*) in Sanskrit "*Nithya naimittika karma anushtaanena prathyavaaya paapa abhaava.*".

Thus, the three exercises, put together into action, avoid *aagaami karma*, according to the first group of *karmavaadhin-s*.

Having discussed *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaani* in verses 9 to 11, the *karmavaadhin* digresses marginally and talks of *praarabhdhaa*, in verse 12. As indicated, according to the first group of *karmavaadhin-s*, *praarabhdhaa* includes *sanchithaa* also. How to avoid *praarabhdhaa*? The *poorvameemaamsakaa* answers: "With regard to *praarabhdhaa* (which, for him, includes *sanchithaa*) what the *Vedhaanthin* says, is acceptable to us also". The *Vedhaanthin* says "*praarabhdhaa* (but, *sanchithaa* is not included by him) cannot be destroyed by *jnaanam*; it will be destroyed only by experiencing the *karmapalan*"|

- याभ्यां पुण्यपापाभ्यां - Because of which merits and demerits
- इदं वर्तमानं शरीरं - this present body (*sthoola sareeram*)
- सुखदुःखदम् - that gives pleasure and pain (adjective to *sareeram*)
- आरब्धं - is born
- तयोःक्षयः - their (of the merits and demerits) destruction
- भोगात् एव - (results) only by experience (of their effects).

An interesting question regarding the *Vedhaanthin's* theory about destruction of *praarabhdha karmaa*, is worth noting, in this context: According to the *Vedhaanthin*, the *jnaani* also has to exhaust *praarabhdhaa*, only by *anubhavaa*; he may have to experience *dhu:khaa palan* also. Then, how is he called *jeevan muktha*; since *mukthi* is "freedom from grief?" The answer : *moksha sukham* and *praarabhdha dhu:kham* **can** co-exist in a *jeevan muktha*; since he sees the *moksha sukham* as *paaramaarthika sathyam* and *praarabhdha dhu:kham* as only *vyaavahaarika sathyam* or *mithyaa* and also considers the *praarabhdha dhu:kham* insignificant, in comparison to *moksha aanandhaa*. This is similar to the sun (comparable to

moksha aanandhaa) overpowering the stars (comparable to *praarabhdha dhu:kham*) and making them invisible.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 13:

काम्यप्रतिषिद्धकर्मपलत्वात्संसारस्य तन्निरासेने एव अशेषानर्थनिरासस्य सिद्धत्वात् किं नित्यानुष्ठानेन इति चेत्तन्न । तदकारणादप्यनर्थप्रसक्तेः ।

If it be asked as to why the obligatory actions should be performed, as the transmigratory existence is due to the performance of actions through desire and prohibited actions and all evil ceases through the renunciation of those two types of action, we reply that evil can accrue from their (i.e. obligatory actions) non-performance also.

As indicated already, the *poorvapakshaa* tenets are being elaborated by Sureswaraachaaryaa here. Verse 11 talked of the effects of *kaamyaa karma thyaagha:* and *nishiddha karma niraasa:*. The third requirement for avoidance of *aagaami karmaa*, namely, *nithya naimitthika karma anushtaanam*, is being taken up.

Even according to the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaa* will not give any result, including *mokshaa*. Then why does one have to perform them? The answer, is, that, while performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani* will not give any *punyam*, the non-performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani* will produce *prathyavaaya paapam*.

On this aspect, *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaani* are in contrast to *nithya-naimitthika karmaani*. Performance of *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaani* gives results and non-performance does not give any.

- काम्य प्रतिषिद्ध कर्मपलत्वात् संसारस्य - "Since *samsaaraa* is the result of *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaa-s*,
- तद् निरासेन एव - and merely by renouncing them (*kaamyaa* and *nishiddhakarmaani*)
- अशेष अनर्थ निरासस्य सिद्धत्वात् - avoidance of *punyam* and *paapam* (and, therefore, of *samsaaraa*) is achieved, *asesha anartha* – both *punyam* and *paapam*; *niraasa:* - avoidance; *siddhi* – achievement.
- किं नित्य अनुष्ठानेन - what is to be achieved by performance of *nithya karmaani*?"
- इति चेत् - if such a doubt is raised,

This is again a question raised by the *poorvameemaamsakaa* himself, with the intention to clarify his views. He himself replies:

- तद् न - it is not so / the doubt is not well founded,

- अनर्थ प्रसक्तेः - since *paapam* (*prathyavaaya paapam*) results
- तद् अकरणात् अपि - because of non-performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*.

Chapter I: Verse 13

नित्यानुष्ठानतश्चैनं प्रत्यवायो न संस्पृशेत् ।

अनादृत्यमात्मविज्ञानमतः कर्माणि संश्रयेत् ॥ १३ ॥

By the performance of obligatory actions, the retribution due to their non-performance is averted. Therefore ignoring comprehension of the Self, let one resort to actions.

It should be remembered that this verse is also part of the *poorvameemaamsakaas*'s enunciation of his views, wherein, he emphasizes the importance of the third exercise, namely, *nithya naimitthika karma anushtaanam*.

- नित्य अनुष्ठानतचः - By performance of *nithya, naimitthika karmaani*
- एनं प्रत्यवाय न संस्पृशेत्ः - *prathyavaaya paapam* will not touch him (the performer).
- अतः - Therefore,
- आत्मविज्ञानम् अनादृत्य - ignoring *aathma jnaanam*
- कर्माणि संश्रयेत् - the *nithya, naimitthika karmaani* should be done.

With this verse, the presentation of the arguments of the first group of *poorvameemaamsakaas*-s, is complete.

10. Chapter I, Verses 14 and 15 (10-06-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa has decided to convert the 1st chapter into a *poorvapaksha matha niraasa pradhaanaa* chapter – dedicated to the negation of *poorva pakshaa*. *Vedhaantha siddhanthaa* will follow in the next three chapters.

There are very many *poorvapakshin-s* to *Advaithaa* philosophy, i.e. people with faith in philosophies other than *Advaithaa*. Among them, Sureswaraachaaryaa takes three groups, in this treatise:

- (1) *karmavaadhin-s*, who claim “*Karmaa*, by itself, gives *mokshaa*. The subject of *Jnaanam*, though discussed in the *saasthraa-s*, is not at all required. It can be ignored”. This group can be called *jnaana abhyupethya karma vaadhina: /*
- (2) a second group of *karmavaadhin-s*, who also hold “*karma* alone gives *mokshaa*”, but, also maintain “there is no *aathma jnaanam* taught in the *Veda-s*, independent of *karmaa*”. This group is referred to, as *jnaana anabhyupedhya karma vaadhina: /*
- (3) the third group called *samucchaya karma vaadhina: or Vedhaantha eka desi-s*, who accept *aathmajnaanam*, but contend “*jnaanam* alone cannot give liberation, it has to go only with *karma*; *jnaanam* should be combined with *karmaa* for attainment of *mokshaa*”.

The philosophies of the *poorvapakshin-s* are presented elaborately, from verse 9 to verse 22.

From verse 9 to verse 13, is presented the theory of the 1st group of *poorvameemaamsakaa-s*: “One can get liberation without *jnaanam*, which can be totally ignored. By managing and following *karmaa-s* appropriately, one can attain *mokshaa*. The ‘management of *karmaa-s*’, according to this first group of *poorvameemaamsakaa-s*, consists in (1) renunciation of *kaamyaa karmaa-s*, resulting in avoidance of *aagaami punyam* (2) abstinence from *nishiddha karmaa-s*, resulting in avoidance of *aagaami paapam* and (3) strict and diligent observance *nithya, naimitthika karmaa-s*, resulting in avoidance of *prathyavaaya paapam*. As for *praarabhdhaa*, it is exhausted in this *janmaa*, by experiencing the *palan*. Thus, avoiding *aagaami* and *praarabhdhaa*, one avoids *punarjanmaa* and, therefore, attains *mokshaa*.

Since this *poorvameemaamsakaa* does not recognize *sanchitha karma* and **all** past accumulated *karmaa-s* are *praarabhdhaa* for him, by leading a life as indicated above, the seeker gets rid of **all** *karmaa-s* at the time of death, resulting in liberation.

This group of *poorvapakshin-s* are termed *jnaanam abhyupedhya vaadhina:* | “*Karmanaa eva moksha:*; ignore *jnaanam*, though, we agree, that, *jnaanam* is mentioned in the *saasthraa-s*”, is their stand. This viewpoint is refuted by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in later portions, in the same chapter, between verses 23 to 53.

The philosophy of the 2nd type of *poorvapakshin-s*, is now presented in verses 14 to 19.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 14 :

अभ्युपेत्यैवमुच्यते । न तु यथावस्थितात्मवस्तुविषयं ज्ञानमस्ति । तत्प्रतिपादकप्रमाणाभावात् ।

This has been said admitting knowledge. But, in reality, there is no such thing as knowledge about the real nature of the Self. There is no authority teaching the knowledge of the Self.

The arguments in the previous verses, 9 to 13, were presented by people who have accepted *jnaanam* as a subject of scriptures. From this verse 14, the views of the 2nd type of *karmavaadhin-s* are presented. They hold “there is no subject as *jnaanam* in scriptures and therefore, *kevala karmaa* will do for *mokshaa*”.

- एवं अभ्युपेत्य उच्यते - This has been said admitting knowledge;
- तु - but,
- यथावस्थित - in reality,
- आत्म वस्तु विषयं ज्ञानं - the subject of knowledge about / on the Self
- न अस्ति - is not there at all,
- तद् प्रतिपादक प्रमाण अभावात् - since there is no *pramaana vaakyam* in the *Vedaa-s* on *aathma jnaanam*.

Chapter I: Verse 14 –

यावत्यश्वेह विध्यन्ते श्रुतयस्स्मृतिभिस्सह ।

विदढत्युरुयत्नेन कर्मातो भूरिसाधनम् ॥ १४ ॥

Whatever *sruthi-s* are there, along with the *smruthi-s*, all of them enjoin with great effort, ‘action’. Hence, it (action) is productive of much, including liberation.

- यावत्यविध्यन्तेः च श्रुतयः - Whatever statements the *sruthi-s* make / all the *sruthi vaakyaa-s*,
- स्मृतिभिसहः - along with the *smruthi-s* / and, all the *smruthi vaakyaa-s* also,
- इह - in this context (of arriving at *moksha saadhanam*)
- विदधति कर्मा - teach *karmaa*
- उरुयत्नेन - with lots of effort;

- अतः - therefore,
- कर्मा - *vaidhika nithya karmaa* **alone**
- भूरिसाधनम् - is the instrument for achieving *mokshaa*.
'*Bhoori*' means 'big one'; in this context, means '*mokshaa*'.

The portions very often quoted by the *karmavaadhin-s*, in support of their view, are:

(1) Verse 2 of *Isaavaasya Upanishad*, which runs

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतः समाः ।

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ २ ॥

kurvannēvēha karmāṇi jijīviṣēcchataḥ samāḥ ।

ēvaṁ tvayi nānyathētō:'sti na karma lipyatē narē || 2||

- "Live a hundred years, in this world, performing all the *vaidhika karmaa-s*; this is the only way, by which, the results of the *karmaa-s* will not bind you".

(2) Verse 5 – Chapter XVIII, of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, which says

यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् ।

यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ॥ १८ - ५ ॥

yajñādānatapaḥkarma na tyājyaṁ kāryamēva tat ।

yajñō dānaṁ tapaścaiva pāvanāni maṇiṣiṇām ||18- 5||

"activity in the form of *yagnyaa*, charity and austerity should not be given up. It has to be performed necessarily. *Yagnyaa*, charity and austerity are the purifiers of the discriminate".

On the other hand, the *Brahma Soothraa-s* point out that "*Brahman* is the main purport of all *Vedhaanthic* texts" - "*Thath thu samanvayaath*" (*Soothraa* 4 – Section 1 – Chapter 1) and that "knowledge of *Brahman* is not subordinate to sacrificial acts" (in *soothraa-s* 1 to 17 – Section 4 – Chapter III – *Purushaartha adhikaaraa*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 15 :

स्यात्प्रमाणासंभवो भवदपराधादिति चेत्तन्न । यतः ।

It may be contended that the absence of evidence for knowledge is due to our fault. We deny the contention for the following reason.

The *poorvameemaamsakaaa* continues. He foresees a statement from the *Vedhaanthin* and pre-emptly the possible statement.

- प्रमाण असंभवः - " The 'absence of evidence' (for knowledge)
- स्यात् - happens to you,
- भवद् अपराधात् - because of your fault (of not studying scriptures properly)"
- इति चेत् - If this be your (the *Vedhaanthir's*) contention,
- तद् न - it is not so,
- यतः - because of the following reason.

Chapter I: Verse 15 :

यत्नतो वीक्षमाणोऽपि विधिं ज्ञानस्य न क्वचित् ।

श्रुतौ स्मृतौ वा पश्यामि विश्वासो नान्यतोऽस्ति न ॥ १५ ॥

Neither in *sruthi* nor in *smruthi*, do I see anywhere, injunction with reference to knowledge, in spite of looking for it a great deal. We have no faith in any other authority.

The *Vedhaanthin* can quote any number of *Vedhaanthic* statements, in support of his views on the importance of *aathma jnaanam* – (1) *Aithreya* (2) *Thaithreya* and (3) *Maithreya Upanishads*, being only a few of them. But, the *poorvameemamsakaa* is either really ignorant or is wantonly in denial, of the existence of such passages.

The *poorvameemaamsakaa's* argument is: "Even though *aathma jnaanam* is presented in the *Vedaa-s*, it is not the 'teaching' of the *Vedaa-s*. The *Vedaa-s* are primarily meant to give the followers the methods to achieve *purushaartha-s* and only those statements given by the *Vedaa-s*, which will be of *prayojanam* (utility) for achieving the *purushaartha-s*, can be called the 'teaching' of the *Vedaa-s*. Whenever 'knowledge-giving statements' are found, they should be treated only as 'statements of fact'. For example, the statement 'there is a City, by name Chennai' is a 'statement of a fact', giving you knowledge of the existence of Chennai. But the 'knowledge' alone cannot give you any benefit; it should be followed by 'action'.

Another example is the statement 'there is water available in this container'. This mere knowledge of 'availability' of water will not satiate your thirst. You have to follow up with the action of 'procuring and drinking' of the water. A *siddha vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* (a statement revealing the fact) and *siddha vasthu jnaanam* (the knowledge of the fact), by themselves, do not give any benefit at all. They have to be followed by appropriate actions. In the above example '*jala jnaanam*' (knowledge of availability of water) is *dushprayojanam*

(useless) by itself; *jala paanam* (drinking of water) alone is *saprayojanam* (accompanied by benefit)."

In effect the *poorvameemaamsakaa* contends "*jnaanam* is necessary for *karmaa*; but, by itself, it cannot help. As such, it is only a part of *karmaa*". The *poorva meemaamsaa* justifies his contention, by arguing further: "When you are told of the 'availability' of water, the indirect suggestion is 'go and drink it'. Likewise, the *siddha bodhaka vaakyaa-s* in the scriptures also, ultimately, reveal only *karmaa*, in an indirect manner. In the example, though the statement is 'there is water available', the *thaathparyam* / message is 'drink the water'. *Aathma jnaana*, similarly, is a mere tool, for delivering the ultimate instruction to the seeker to follow *karmaa*."

In other words, "*jnaanaa* is not the ultimate or final teaching of the *Vedaa-s*; it is suggested only as an intermediate step. *Karmaa* is the final teaching" is the stand of the *poorva meemaamsakaa*. And, in his support, he often quotes a *Chaandoghya Upanishad* statement "*Karmaa*, done with *Vidhyaa*, will give more benefit".

Reverting to the text,

- यत्नतअपि :वीक्षमाणः - Even though I analyze thoroughly,
- जानस्य विधिं न पश्यामि - I do not find *jnaanaa* as the final teaching. '*vidhi*', in this context, means 'final teaching' or 'injunction'. According to the *karmavaadin*, a *siddha bodhaka vaakyaa* is not final ; only the *karma bodhaka vaakyaa* is final.
- क्वचित् - anywhere
- श्रुतौ स्मृतौ वा (वा)- either in the *Vedaa-s* or in the *smruthi-s*.
- न :- For us,
- अन्यतन अस्ति :विश्वासः - there is no faith in any other authority.

The *poorvameemaamsakaa* is also an *aasthikaa*, i.e. one who considers *Vedaa-s* as *pramaanam*, like the *Vedhaanthin*.

11. Chapter I, Verses 16 to 18 (17-06-2006)

From verse 9 to verse 22, Sureswaraachaaryaa is elaborately presenting a *poorvapakshaa* (a view counter to the *Vedhaanthir's*) which claims that *jnaanam* alone can never liberate. This particular *poorvapakshaa* itself can be divided into three groups.

Of these, the philosophy of the first group, the '*jnaana abhyupethya karma vaadhina:*' was covered between verses 9 to 13. This group claims: "Even though teachings on *jnaanaa* are found in the scriptures, *jnaanaa* is not required for *mokshaa*. By managing *vaidhika karmaa*-s properly, *aagaami karma palan* can be totally avoided, while *Praarabhdhaa* can be totally exhausted by experiencing the *praarabhdha karma palan*. The resulting 'nil' *karma* balance will lead to attainment of liberation".

The viewpoints of the second group, *jnaanam anabhuyupethya karma vaadhina:*, is presented by the *Aachaaryaa* in verses 14 to 19. This group holds: "*Jnaanam* is never the true teaching of the *saasthraa*-s, since *jnaanam* is only 'understanding' of certain facts and the 'understanding' cannot be put to any use directly. It can be put to use only as *karmaa*, **which** alone can produce results. *Jnaanam* is only an *angaa* and *karmaa* is the *angi*."

Siddha bodhaka vaakyaaani are about *jnaanam* and *karma bodhaka vaakyaaani* are about *karmaa*. The second group argues that the *siddha bodhaka vaakyaaani* should be linked to *karma bodhaka vaakyaaani*. As in the example earlier cited, mere knowledge about availability of water will not quench thirst. Only the action, viz., 'drinking the water' will help quench thirst. The suggestion to drink water may be explicit or implied – nevertheless, only 'drinking' will help. "Likewise" the *poorvameemaamsakaa* argues "*Vedic siddha bodhaka vaakyaaani* are also not helpful, unless followed by *karma bodhaka vaakyaaani*. The ritual **has** to be performed. *Siddha bodhaka vaakyaaani* are *apraamaanam* and only *karma bodhaka vaakyaaani* are *pramaanam* and the final teaching of the *Vedaa*-s".

"Every knowledge is useful for enhancing the results of the corresponding action" is a *Vedic* statement, which, this group of *poorvameemaamsakaa*-s quote in support.

In essence, this group holds "Facts are revealed only for the sake of action" or, in other words, " 'knowledge' is meant only for 'practice'; by itself, it is of no use" and advises "therefore, perform action all the time, either physically (*karmaa*) or mentally (*upasanaa*)". Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 16 :

स्यात्प्रवृत्तिरन्तरेणापि विधिं लोकवदिति चेत्तन्न यत :।

It may be said that there can be undertakings without any injunctions to that effect, as in ordinary life. We deny that possibility for the following reason:

The *karmavaadhin* is arguing against another possible suggestion from the *Vedhaanthin*. This possible suggestion, as foreseen by the *karmavaadhin* is: "Even if the statement '*jnaana maathrena prayojanam asthi*' is not specific in the scriptures, why should we not go by worldly experiences, viz., examples of cases where knowledge directly produces benefit, without any action ?

"For instance, in the well known *rajju sarpaa* example, the 'rope knowledge' removes the misconception of the snake and the consequent fear, proving '*jnaana maathrena prayojanam asthi*'. Based on such *loukikaa* experiences, why should we not accept, that, *jnaanam can* give benefits? In the *rajju sarpaa* example, a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* gave 'knowledge' of the rope and served the purpose of 'removal of fear' without any 'action' being performed. Why cannot *aathma jnaanam* itself, in a similar manner, give liberation?"

The *poorvameemaamsakaa* counters this argument by saying "a *loukikaa* example will be valid only for *loukikaa* matters and not for *apourusheya vishayaa*-s. For instance, a destination on earth, can be reached by the use of a vehicle - a chariot or a cart. But, can *svargaa* be reached using the same vehicle? With regard to attainment of *svargaa*, only *Vedic* injunctions can be *pramaanam*. *Vedaa*-s declare that *jyothishyoma* (a kind of *yagnyaa*) can lead to *svargaa* and this statement may be accepted. Like *svargaa*, *mokshaa* is also *apourusheya* and *aloukikaa*. The example of the *loukika rajjusarpaa* cannot be relevant with regard to attainment of *aloukika mokshaa*. A *Vedic* statement, if there is any, that *aathma jnaanam* is **the** path to *mokshaa*, will be acceptable to me. But, I do not find such a clear-cut statement anywhere in the *Vedaas*".

विधिं अन्तरेण अपि - "Even without *Vedic* injunctions,

- प्रवृत्तिः - liberation
- लोकवत् - as in worldly life (as in the *rajju sarpaa* example)
- स्यात् - can take place".
- इति चेत् - If such a claim is made,
- तद् न - it is not so,
- यतः - because of the following reason (given in the following verse).

Chapter I: Verse 16 –

अन्तरेण विधिं मोहाद्यः कुर्यात्साम्परायिकम् ।

न तत्स्यादुपकाराय भस्मनीव हुतं हविः ॥ १६ ॥

He who undertakes anything through delusion, independent of scriptural injunctions, for securing spiritual objectives, gains no help thereby. His work is futile, like pouring oblations into ashes.

- यः - He, who
- साम्परायिकम् कूर्यात् - performs any ritual connected with life after death, 'saamparaayikam' means 'paraloka vishayam'. Heaven and other *lokaa-s*, pleasures in heaven and other *lokaa-s*, rituals connected with heaven and other *lokaa-s* etc. are all *saamparaayikam*.
- विधिं अन्तरेण - without support of *Vedaa-s* / without *Vedic* guidance,
- मोहात् - because of delusion,

What is the 'mohaad' or 'delusion' mentioned here? For *saamparaayika vishayaani*, scriptural guidance is essential. If one does not recognize or understand this fact, one is under *mohaad*. For instance, the *sraardhaa* ceremony, is *saamparaayikaa* and has to be performed only under *Vedic* guidance. *Brahmana bhojanam* is prescribed in the scriptures, as an essential part of the *sraardhaa* ceremony. 'Poor feeding' (*dharidhra bhojanam*) **cannot** replace *Brahmana Bhojanam*, though it will produce its own *punyam*. But, the *dosham* of non-performance of the *sraardha karmaa*, cannot be escaped from, if *Brahmana bhojanam* is not performed. An individual may think that by resorting to poor-feeding, instead of *Brahmana bhojanam*, he would have performed *sraardhaa*. This is wrong thinking and considered as 'mohaad'.

- तद् - such ritual
- उपकाराय न स्यात् - will be useless / futile,
- भस्मनि हुतं हविइवः - similar to oblations offered into ashes.

In the *Mundakopanishad*, in the *Dvithieya Kandaa* (section 2) of the *Prathama Mundakaa* (Chapter I), the teacher talks about various rituals prescribed in the *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* (the *Karma Kaandaa*), for attainment of material ends. *Manthraa* 2 specifies that "one should offer oblations in the fire **only** when the flames shoot up", while *manthraa-s* 4 and 5 refer to "tongues of fire, in which oblations are made" as "shining ones".

It is the *poorvameemaamsakaa's* stand, that, since (according to him) there is no specific *Vedic* injunction with regard to *aathma jnaanam*, the aspiration and effort to achieve liberation through *aathma jnaanam*, will be as futile as offering oblations, in *Vedic* rituals, into ashes, instead of into bright flames. This *poorva paksha* contention is answered by Sureswaraachaaryaa, later in the same chapter, in verse 90.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 17 :**अभ्युपगतप्रामाण्यवेदार्थविज्जैमिन्यनुशासनाच्च ।**

This follows also from the authority of *Jaimini*, who is acknowledged as a reliable guide and who has comprehended the import of the *Vedaa-s*.

The *poorvapakashin* continues: "This is not my own interpretation. This has been taught by *Jaimini Maharishi*, a thorough scholar of the *Vedaa-s*, who has written *soothraa-s* on the *Vedaa-s*. According to him (1) the entire *Vedaa-s* teach only *karmaa* and (2) no spiritual knowledge is useful by itself, but should be followed by *karmaa*".

- जैमिनि अनुशासनाः - The teachings of *Jaimini Maharishi*,
- अभ्युपगत प्रामाण्य वेदार्थ विद् - who is accepted as a reliable guide and a thorough scholar of the contents of the *Vedaa-s abhyugamatha* – accepted as ; *praamaanya* – as reliable guide; *Vedaartha* – the contents of *Vedaa-s*; *vith* - knower / scholar.
- च - also confirm this.

Chapter I: Verse 17 –:**"आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादानर्थक्यम् "इतोऽन्यथा ।****इति साटोपमाहोच्चैर्वेदविज्जैमिनिः स्वयम् ॥ १७ ॥**

Jaimini, who understands the *Vedaa-s*, has himself said loudly, as it were, and with gusto, that "as the scriptures signify actions to be done, statements that do not inculcate actions are of no significance and vale".

Sureswaraachaaryaa makes the *poorvameemaamsakaa* paraphrase the famous *Jaimini Soothraa* (*soothraa* 1 – section 2 – Chapter 1 of *Poorva Meemaamsa Soothraa-s* of *Jaimini*) – "*aamnaayasa kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*".

The term '*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath*', in the *soothraa*, means 'since *karmaa* is the **final** teaching of the *Vedaa-s*'; '*athadharthaanaam*' means 'whatever that teaches anything other than *karmaa*'; '*aanarthakyam*' means 'useless'.

The consolidated meaning of the *soothraa* is "Since *karmaa* is the final teaching of the *Vedaa-s*, whatever other than *karmaa* talked about by *sruthi* is useless". According to this *soothraa*, therefore, *siddhavasthujnaanam* (*aathma jnaanam*), not being a *karmaa*, is useless and so is the statement '*aham brahma asmi*'.

But, *Jaimini* does concede that knowledge may become useful under certain conditions – when it becomes an *angam* of *karmaa*, similar to the 'knowledge of availability of water in

the container' example, earlier discussed in detail. He is of the view that *Jnaanam* may be *angam* for *pravrutthi* (meaning 'going towards') or *nivrutthi* (meaning 'going away').

- “आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वात् - “Since *karmaa* is the final teaching of *Vedaa-s*
- इतः अन्यथा - anything other than *karmaa* (this includes *jnaanam*)
- आनर्थक्यम्” - is useless”
- इति वेदविद् जैमिनि स्वयम् आह - thus has declared, *Jaimini maharishi*, a scholar in the *Vedaa-s*,
- उच्चैः - loudly
- साटोपं - with gusto / vehemently. '*aatopam*' means 'gusto'.

While the *poorvameemaamsakaa* holds that 'understanding' is not enough for *mokshaa*, *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa's* / *Advaitin's* view is: "mere 'understanding' of *Vedhaanthee* is end of *samsaaraa* and therefore, *mokshaa*. There is no practice of *Vedhaanthee* involved".

If a student of *Vedhaanthee* makes the statement "I have understood *Vedhaanthee*; I only have to practice", it only shows that he has not 'understood' *Vedhaanthee* properly.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 18 – Chapter I:

मन्त्रवर्णाच्च|

The hymn also lays down the same thing.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* continues:

मन्त्र वर्णाचः - The *Veda pramaanaa-s* also support us.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* implies: "You may question *Jaimini*; but, the *Veda pramaanaa-s* also support us".

Chapter I: Verse 18:

"कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समा":।

इति मन्त्रोऽपि निःशेषं कर्मण्यायुरवासृजत् ॥ १८ ॥

Manthraa 2 of Isaavaasya Upanishad exhorts:

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतं समाः ।

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ २ ॥

kurvannēvēha karmāṇi jijīviṣēcchataꣳ samāḥ |

ēvaṁ tvayi nānyathētō:'sti na karma lipyatē narē || 2||

- Desire to live in this world for a hundred years, performing *karmaa*. There is no other way to avoid getting bound to *karmapalan*".

This *manthraa* is quoted by the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, in his support.

- "कर्माणि कुर्वन् - "Performing the *Vedic* rituals (*vaidhika nithya naimitthika karmaan*)
- इह एव - in this manushya janmaa itself,
- जिजीविषेत् - plan to live
- शतं समा: " - for a hundred years".
- इति - Thus
- मन्त्रपिअ: - a Vedic manthraa also says.
- निःशेषं आयुः - The entire life, without balance,
- कर्मण्ये अवासृजत् - should be dedicated to karmaa (*vaidhika karmaa*) only / should be spent on karmaa (*vaidhika karmaa*) only.

The *poorvapakshin* has given *sruthi pramaanam* here, against the *Vedhaanthir's* view of "aathma jnaanam alone can give liberation".

Hereafter, he uses grammar / language analysis, as support to his stand. "Any sentence is only *karma bhodhaka vaakyam*" will be his claim.

12. Chapter I, Verses 19 and 20 (01-07-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting the *poorva pakshaa* elaborately, from verse 4 to verse 22. The *poorva pakshaa* is sub-divided into three groups.

Verses 4 to 13, covered the arguments of that group of *karmavaadhin-s*, who hold "karma alone gives *mokshaa*; though *aathma jnaanam* is talked of, in scriptures, it is neither required for *mokshaa*, nor is it relevant". This group is termed *jnaana abhyupethya karma vaadhina*: |

The second group are "*jnaana anabhyupethya karma vaadhina*:", who also hold that *karma* alone gives *mokshaa*, but, along with that, the more extreme view that there is no teaching at all, as *aathma jnaanam*, in scriptures. The conviction of this group is "If at all *aathma jnaanam* is mentioned in the scriptures somewhere, it is not the main teaching and it cannot help attain liberation. Mere knowledge about a fact, **without** a corresponding follow-up action, cannot give results. It is only 'action' that gives the results and not 'knowledge'. A *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam*, even if found in *saasthraa-s*, cannot be considered *pramaana vaakyam*, the final teaching. *Kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani* alone are useful and therefore, to be considered as *pramaanam*, the final teachings". In support of their views, these *poorva pakshin-s* quote (vide verse 17) *Jaimini Maharish/s soothraa "aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadhaarthaanaam"* - "since *karma* is the final teaching of the *Vedaa-s*, whatever other than *karma* that *Vedaa-s* talk about, is useless". They also quote (vide verse 18) *manthraa 2 of the Isaavaasya Upanishad*, "kurvannēvēha karmāṇi jijīviṣēchataṣsamāḥ"—"Desire to live in this world for a hundred years, performing *karma s*", which *manthraa* explicitly stresses that *vaidhika karmaani* should be done for the entire span of one hundred years of one's life.

In the following verse 19, the *poorva pakshin* (as quoted by Sureswaraachaaryaa), provides the support of grammar and language to his view.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 19:

ज्ञानिनश्च वस्तुनि वाक्यप्रामाण्य अभ्युपगमात् वाक्यस्य च क्रियापदप्रधानत्वात् ततश्च अभिप्रेतज्ञानाभावः।

The desired knowledge can never arise, for the advocate of knowledge seeks it from scriptural statements; and, statements have, as their central element, the verbs (which signify actions):

The *Vedhaanthir/s* claim is "*aathma jnaanam* gives liberation, without requiring *karmaa*". When questioned by the *poorva pakshin*, as to how one acquires *jnaanam*, i.e., as to the *pramaanam* for *aathma jnaanam*, the *Vedhaanthin* replies "*aathmaa* can be known by only one *pramaana* – *Vedhaantha vaakyaani*. None of the other five *pramaanaa-s* -

prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapatthi and *anupalabdhi* - can give the knowledge of *aathmaa*. *Aathmaa* cannot be known even through *Veda karma kaanda vaakyaani* - **only *veda antha vaakyaani*** can give *aathma jnaanam*".

"*Vedhaanthic* statements reveal knowledge of *aathma* also; they do not reveal only *karmaa*" holds the *Vedhaanthin*.

The *poorva pakshin* counters this view: "Does a sentence reveal a fact? Or, does a sentence reveal an action? *Vaakyam vasthu bodhakam vaa karma bhodhakam vaa?* Does any sentence – leave alone a *Vedic* one – reveal an object or does it reveal an action?"

In reply, the *Vedhaanthin* says, that, a *vaakyam* can be *vasthu bodhakam* or *karma bhodhakam*; that, both types of statements are possible.

The *poorva pakshin* differs; he holds that no statement can reveal a *vasthu*; and, that, any statement - *vaidhikaa* or *loukikaa* – can reveal only a *kaaryam* or *karmaa*. He explains: "A sentence is a group of words; not just an arbitrary group of words, but, a group of words fulfilling certain conditions. The most important condition to be satisfied, is, that, the sentence should have a verb (*kriyaapadham*), without which, the sentence itself is not possible. A sentence without a verb, will be only a jumble of words, communicating nothing. Consider for example the sentence "The priest draws water from the well, with a bucket, for *abhishekam* in the temple". This sentence conveys a message by the crucial verb "draws". If this verb is removed, the sentence turns into a mere bunch of words conveying nothing. The verb is the link that connects all *naamapadham-s* (nouns) in the sentence and therefore, is the most important part of the sentence. Since the verb is the most important part of any sentence and since the verb reveals an action, it is to be concluded that *kriyaa* or *karmaa* is the central teaching of any sentence".

The *poorva pakshin* further argues: "Even the *naama padham-s* (nouns) in a sentence are not used with the purpose of revealing the substances they denote, since, even before using the use of the sentence, the listener knows the nouns and their meanings. The substances denoted are already known to the listener. If the listener does not know the substances, the speaker will not use the nouns".

The question, then, arises: "Then, what is the purpose of using the nouns in a sentence?"

The *poorva pakshin* replies: "In any sentence, the nouns are associated with 'prepositions' (*vibakthi*, in Sanskrit grammar). For instance, in the above sentence, 'from' (in the use 'from the well') and 'with' (in the use 'with the bucket') are prepositions. The prepositions are crucial, since they reveal the roles played by the nouns, with regard to the action indicated

by the most crucial verb. In the sentence taken for example, the preposition 'with' (in the use 'with the bucket') reveals the special role of the bucket as 'instrument' and the preposition 'from' (in the use 'from the well') reveals the role of the well as 'source'. 'Water' is the 'object' drawn. The role of any noun, in the 'action' revealed by the sentence, is called the *kaarakaa* status of the noun. 'Instrument' is the *kaarakaa* state of the bucket, 'source' is the *kaarakaa* state of the well and 'object' is the *kaarakaa* state of water".

The *poorva pakshin* continues: "It follows, therefore, that, from a sentence, no new substance (*vasthu*) can be learnt. A sentence reveals a *kriyaa* and also only the roles of the nouns in the *kriyaa*. If the crucial verb in the sentence is removed, the action will go, the nouns also will lose their *kaarakaa* states and the sentence stops revealing any message".

The *poorva pakshin* concludes : "Because of these four indisputable facts, namely, that, even in a complete sentence (1) the nouns have only *kaarakaa* states of the substances they denote (2) the verb reveals the *kriyaa* for which the *kaarakaa*-s are required (3) neither the nouns nor the verb reveal a substance and (4) the complete sentence also does not reveal a new substance or a *vasthu*, it follows, that, *aathmaa* also cannot be revealed by a *naamapadham* or a *kriyaapadham* or even by a complete sentence. A *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* is, therefore, not a *pramaanam* and nobody can acquire *jnaanam* from a *vaakyam*. When *jnaanaa* itself is not to be acquired from a *vaakyam*, where is the question of *mokshaa*?"

- ज्ञानिनः - For the *Vedhaanthin*,
- वाक्य प्रामाण्य अभ्युपगमात् - the *Vedic vaakyaa*-s are accepted as sources of knowledge
- वस्तुनि - for the *aathma vasthu*.
- वाक्यस्य च क्रियापद प्रधानत्वात् - (But) since it is the verb that is the crucial part of any sentence,
- अभिप्रेत ज्ञान अभावः - the desired knowledge will not arise,
- ततः - from the sentence.

'*abhipretā*' means 'desired / intended'.

"It is *Kriyaa* that plays the important role in any sentence ; hence, no sentence can be considered as *jnaana pradhaanam*" is the view of the *poorva pakshin*.

Chapter I: Verse 19:

विरह्य क्रियां नैव संहन्यन्ते पदान्यपि ।

न समस्त्यपदं वाक्यं यत्स्यात् ज्ञानविधायकम् ॥१९ ॥

The words do not come together in a sentence independent of an action signified by a verb. There can be no sentence, other than the words integrated by the focal point of action, which could enjoin knowledge.

- पधानि अपि न इव संहन्यन्ते क्रियां विरहय्य - Nouns alone cannot come together to form a sentence, without a verb. 'padhaanI' means 'nouns'; 'samhanyanthe' means 'join together'; 'virahayya' means 'without'.

The first line of the verse literally means "A sentence cannot be there without a verb"; it also implies "The nouns can come only as *kaarakaa-s* ; that too only when the verb is there".

- अपदं वाक्यं यत् स्यात् ज्ञानविधायकम् न समस्ति - There can be no sentence, other than the words integrated by the focal point of action, which could reveal 'knowledge'.

'apadham vaakyam' – a sentence without the integrating *kriyaa padham* ; *yath* – which ; *jnaana vidhaayakam* – revealing 'knowledge' ; *na samasthi* – does not exist; 'samasthi' is the same as 'asthi'; the prefix 'sam' is used to emphasize the non-existence. 'Na asthi' means 'not there'; 'na samasthi' means 'not at all there'.

"No sentence can reveal a substance. *Vedic* sentences also do not reveal *aathma jnaanam*, but, are meant only for action" is the conviction of the *poorva pakshin*.

Verses 14 to 19 covered the arguments of the second group of *karmavaadhin-s*, who contend that there is no such thing as *aathma jnaanam* at all. Sureswaraachaaryaa answers this group of *karmavaadhin-s*, later, in the same chapter, in verses 85 to 97.

From the next verse, the arguments of the third group of *karmavaadhin-s* are presented, by the *Aachaaryaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 20 :

ज्ञान अभ्युपगमे अपि न दोष :यत :।

There is no difficulty in this position, even if knowledge is admitted as a possibility, because.....

From verse 20 to 22, the arguments of the 3rd group, the "*jnaana karma samucchaya vaadhina:*" are presented. This group of *poorva pakshin-s*, as against the earlier group which contends "there is no *aathma jnaanam* at all", accepts *aathma jnaanam*, as a teaching of the scriptures; but, maintains: "*aathma jnaanam*, **by itself**, will not give any benefit at all. The mere knowledge (that, "I am *Brahman*") **alone** cannot liberate from *samsaaraa*. Our

grief and pain do not go away because of mere *jnaanam*. The *jnaanam* has to be combined with *karmaa*. Only the combination – *jnaana karma samucchaya* - will help liberation”.

The *samucchayavaadhi* group can be further divided into three sub-groups:

- *Jnaana pradhaana samucchaya vaadhi* - who considers *jnaanam* as *pradhaanam* (*ANGI*) and *karmaa* as support (*ANGAA*).
- *Karma pradhaana samucchaya vaadhi* - for whom *karmaa* is *pradhaanam* (*ANGI*) and *jnaanam*, the support (*ANGAA*).
- *Sama pradhaana samucchaya vaadhi* - who considers that both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* have equal importance.

In his *Thaithreeya Upanishad Bhaashyam*, while covering the first chapter, *Seekshaa Valli*, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, discusses in detail, as to which of the three, viz., (i) *karmaa alone* (ii) *jnaanam alone* or (iii) *jnaana-karma-samucchaya* – gives *mokshaa*. He finally establishes that *jnaanam only* and *by itself*, is *mokshaa saadhanam – jnaanath eva kaivalyam*.

Reverting to the text:

- ज्ञान अभ्युपगमे अपि - Even if *jnaanam* is accepted,
- न दोषः - there is no difficulty (to the *poorva pakshin-s* position),
- यतः - because of the following reason.

Chapter I: Verse 20 –

कर्मणोऽङ्गाङ्गिभावेन स्वप्रधानतयाऽथवा ।

संबन्धस्येह संसिद्देर्जनि सत्यप्यदोषता ॥ २० ॥

Admission of knowledge causes no difficulty, for it may stand in relation to action as means or end or as equally important.

- ज्ञाने सति अपि - Even if we accept *jnaanam*,
- अदोषता- there being no difficulty,
- अथवा - in any one of the three positions, namely,
- कर्मणअङ्ग भावेन संबन्धस्य : - (i) *karmaa* as *anghaa*, in association with *jnaanam* (*jnaanam* as 'main' and *karmaa* as 'supporting factor'),
- (भावेन संबन्धस्य) अङ्गि (:कर्मण) - or (ii) *karmaa* as *anghee*, in association with *jnaanam* (*karmaa* as 'main' and *jnaanam* as 'supporting factor')
- स्वप्रधानतया - or (iii) both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* having equal importance,
- इह - in the context of *mokshaa*,

-
- संसिद्धिः - the result (viz., *mokshaa*) is achievable.
 - (तस्मात् जानं अस्तु) - (This sentence is supplied to complete the message) 'Therefore, let *jnaanam* be there'.

The *jnaana karma samucchayaa vaadhi* says "Hence, (because there is no difficulty to our position) we are willing to accept *jnaanam*. But, we cannot accept, that, *aathma jnaanam*, by itself, is the means to liberation".

In his support, the *samucchayaa vaadhi* quotes from the *Chaandhogya Upanishad*: "*Yadeva vidhyayaa karothi sraddhayaa upanishadha thadeva veeryavatthithaa bhavathi*" meaning "when a *karmaa* is done, with the support of *jnaanam*, the *karmaa* gives the result of *mokshaa*. When the ritual is done without *jnaanam*, the result is *svarghaa*. *Karmaa* done with *aathma jnaanam* becomes more powerful and the more powerful *karmaa* gives *mokshaa*".

According to this *Upanishadic* quotation, *karmaa* is *anghee* and *vidhyaa (jnaanam)* is *anghaa*. "So" claims the *samuchchaya vaadhi* "Vedic support is there for our theory, *jnaana karma samucchayam*".

13. Chapter I, Verses 21 to 24 (08-07-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is elaborately presenting a few *poorva pakshaa-s*. All the *poorva pakshin-s*, whom he has taken for refuting, have got one idea in common – “mere knowledge cannot give liberation” – “*kevala jnaanaath mukthi: naiva sambhavath'*”.

The *Aachaaryaa* introduces three groups of the *poorva pakshin-s*, in this portion:

- (1) *Abhyupethya karma vaadhina: |*
- (2) *Anabhyupethya karma vaadhina: |*
- (3) *Samucchaya karma vaadhina: |*

The first group holds: “*Karmaa* alone gives liberation. Even though *jnaanaa* is mentioned in *saasthraa-s*, it is not required for liberation”. The second group holds: “There is no such thing called *jnaanaa*. Mere *karmaa* alone gives *mokshaa'*”. Thus both groups say “*kevala karmanaa moksha:'*”, *jnaanam asthu vaa na asthu vaa*.

In verse 20, the *Aachaaryaa* presents the 3rd group of *karma vaadhin-s*, the *samucchaya karma vaadhina:*, who claim “*karmana: sambhandhasya iha samsiddhi:'*” – “*karmaa* gives liberation, **in association** with *jnaanam*, in one form or another”. This group can be further divided into three sub-groups, based on the ‘form of association with *jnaanam'*:

- (1) *Jnaana pradhaana samucchaya vaadhina: -* for whom, *jnaanam* is *anghee* and *karmaa* is *angham* – i.e. *karmaa* supports *jnaanam* – *karmana: angha bhaavena sambhandhasya samsiddhi: |*
- (2) *Karma pradhaana samucchaya vaadhina: -* for whom, *karmaa* is *anghee* and *jnaanam* is *angham* – i.e. *jnaanam* supports *karmaa* – *karmana: anghee bhaavena sambhandhasya samsiddhi: |*
- (3) *Sama pradhaana samucchaya vaadhina: -* for whom, *jnaanam* and *karmaa* have equal importance, in the pursuit for liberation - *karma jnaana yogayo: samapradhaana sambhandhasya samsiddhi: |*

“*Karmana: jnaana sambhandhasya iha samsiddhi:'*” - “*karmaa* gives liberation, in association with *jnaanam*” can be taken as the common view of all the three.

Each sub-group cites *Veda Pramaanaa* in its support. The first sub-group quotes the last *manthraa*, in Section 1 – Chapter I, of *Chaandhogya Upanishad* – “*yadeva vidhyayaa karothi sraddhayaa upanishadaa thadeva veeryavaththaram bhavath'*” – “Only that *karmaa* which is done with knowledge, faith and meditation, that alone becomes more powerful”, which *manthraa*, according to this group of *poorva pakshin-s*, implies “*karmaa* is the main *saadhanaa*. It can produce greater result, if backed by *jnaanam*” – i.e. *karmaa* is *anghee*

and *jnaanam* is *angham*. In this *manthraa*, the *poorva pakshin* interprets 'vidhya' as 'aathmajnaanam', whereas, the *Advaitin-s*, in their annotations of this *manthraa*, interpret 'vidhya' as 'upaasana'.

The second sub-group gives a quotation from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iv.22) – "Thametham vedhaanuvachanena braahmanaa: vividhashanthi yagnyena, dhaanene, thapasaa, anaasaakena" – "The *Brahmanas* seek to know It (*Brahman*) through the study of *Vedaas*, sacrifices, charity and austerity consisting in a dispassionate enjoyment of sense objects", from which *manthraa*, they draw the implication "karmaa is the *angham* for *jnaanam* – i.e. *karmaa* supports knowledge".

The 3rd sub-group quotes, in its support, the 11th *manthraa* of the *Isaavaasya Upanishad* –

विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ ११ ॥

vidyām cāvidyām ca yastadvēdōbhayaṃ saha |

avidyayā mṛtyuṃ tīrtvā vidyayā:'mṛtamaśnutē || 11 ||

– "He, who knows the nature of both knowledge and action, transcends death by *karmaa* and enjoys everlasting bliss brought out by *aathmajnaanam*". The *poorva pakshin* interprets 'vidhya' in this *manthraa*, as 'aathmajnaanam' and 'avidhya' as 'karmaa'. The word 'saha' (in the *manthraa*) is taken by him, as indicating equal importance to both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* – *sama pradhaanam* or *sama samuchchayam*.

"Mere knowledge cannot give liberation. It should go with *karmaa*" is the stand of the *samuchchaya vaadhin*. He does not find any difficulty in accepting *jnaanam*, **if it goes with *karmaa***. This, he indicates, by the word 'adhoshatha:', in verse 20. (*Adhoshathaa*, in the place of *adhoshatha:*, may be a more appropriate usage, since it completes the sentence.)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 21 :

यस्मात् ज्ञानाभ्युपगमानभ्युपगमेऽपि न ज्ञानान्मुक्तिः ।

Liberation is never attained through knowledge, whether knowledge is admitted or not. Because of this reason, I would conclude the following:

This is the *poorva pakshin's* statement. The following verse 21 consolidates the three types of *karmavaadhin-s* and in this introductory *gadhyam*, the *Aachaaryaa* gives the *poorva pakshin's* view: "Whether *jnaanam* is in the *saasthraa-s* or not, I would like to emphasize that *jnaanam* cannot give liberation".

- ज्ञान अभ्युगम - Accepting the existence of *aathmajnaanam* in the scriptural teachings,
- ज्ञान अनभ्युगम अपि - or non-accepting the existence of *aathmajnaanam* in the scriptural teachings,
- ज्ञानात् मुक्ति(भवति) न : - liberation cannot result from *jnaanam*.
- यस्मात् - Because of this reason, I would conclude the following.

Chapter I: Verse 21 –

अतः सर्वाश्रमाणां हि वाङ् मनःकायकर्मभिः ।

स्वनुष्ठितैर्यथाशक्ति मुक्तिः स्यान्नान्यसाधनात् ॥ २१ ॥

Therefore, to conclude, actions well-performed through speech, mind and body, pertaining to the recognized stages of life, in accordance with one's powers, bring about release. There is no other means for it.

- अतः - Therefore,
- कर्मभिःस्यात् मुक्तिः - *mokshaa* results only from *karmaa*
- वाङ् मनकायः - done through speech, mind and body,
 "Chanting of *slokaa-s* and *manthraa-s*" are '*karmaa* through speech'. "Performance of varieties of meditation prescribed in the *saasthraa-s*, for instance, the different *upaasanaa-s* mentioned in the *Seekshaavalli* of *Thaithreeya Upanishad*" will come under '*karmaa* through mind'. "*Pujaa, namaskaaram*" etc., done using the *sthoolasareeram* are '*karmaa* through body'.
- सु अनुष्ठितैः - done properly as prescribed (adjective to '*karmabhi:*')
- यथा शक्ति - (and) according to one's capacity,

But, can all people do any or all *karmaa-s*, as they like? No. The *karmaa* undertaken by the performer, should be in keeping with his *aasramaa*. This is also stressed in the verse.

- सर्व आश्रमाणां - in keeping with the *aasramaa* (of the performer).
- हि - This is certain.

What about *jnaanam*? According to the *poorva pakshin*, if one believes in *jnaanam*, one is allowed to 'mix' it with *karmaa*. And, if one does not believe in *jnaanam*, it does not at all matter; mere *karmaa* will do. Only *karmaa* is essential for liberation; not *jnaanam*. This view is also stressed by the *poorva pakshin*, in the verse.

- न अन्य साधनात् :मुक्ति)स्यात्(- *Mokshaa* cannot result by any other means (including *jnaanam* is the implication).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 22:

असदर्थप्रलापोऽयमिति दूषणसंभावनाय आह ।

The author starts his criticism to show that this is the statement of a wrong position.

With verse 21, presentation of the arguments of the three types of *poorva pakshaa* is over. Sureswaraacharya starts presenting the views of the *Advaithin*. Detailed answers to the *poorva pakshaa* arguments are given later. The *Aachaaryaa* first presents his views ; he uses strong terms "these words are prattles".

- अयं - "These arguments (of the *poorva pakshin-s*)
- असत् अर्थ प्रलापः - (are) meaningless prattles "
- इति आह - Thus it is to be said (in the following verse)
- दूषण संभावनाय - with intention to counter the *poorvapakshaa* views. '*dhooshand*' – 'counter' ; '*sambhaavanaad*' – possibility / intention.

The *Aachaaryaa's* counters are '**strong**', not because of his hatred of the *karmavaadhin-s*; but, only to give confidence to the student of *Vedhaantha*.

Chapter I: Verse 22 –

इति हृष्टधियां वाच :स्वप्रज्ञाऽऽध्मातचेतसाम् ।

घुष्यन्ते यजशालासु धूमानद्दधियाम् किल ॥ २२ ॥

Such indeed is the speech made in places of sacrifice, by people, who are pleased with themselves, whose intellect is nourished by their own constructions and whose vision is enveloped in smoke.

- इति वाचकिल : - Such is the speech, indeed
- यजशालासु घुष्यन्ते - made in the places of sacrifice
- हृष्टधियां - by people who are satisfied with their own philosophy. The reference is to the *karmavaadhin-s*.
- स्वप्रज्ञात् आत्मातचेतसाम् - who are vain with their own views / who are puffed up with their own views 'They are not open to alternate views, a serious failure on their part', is the charge of the *Aachaaryaa*.
- धूम आनद् धियां - and whose 'vision' is blurred by smoke.

Literally, the eyes of the 'karmi-s' are blurred by smoke rising from the *homa*-s, in their *yagnyasaala*-s. "Their intellect is clouded" is the implied meaning. This is another failure on the part of the *karmavaadhin*-s.

'*Dhoomaa*' has also been interpreted by some commentators to mean '*dhooma maargam*' or '*krishna gathi*:', the path taken by the *karmi*-s to heaven, after death. If so interpreted, "obsession with *karmaa*" will be the implied meaning of "vision blurred by *dhooma maargam*".

"Thus obsessed with a misconceived notion of an eternal heaven, the *karmavaadhin*-s proclaim that *karmaa* is the path to liberation. But, because of their failures cited above, we are sure that they are wrong" avers Sureswaraachaaryaa.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 23:

दूषणोपक्रमावधिज्ञापनायाह ।

The scope of the criticism launched is indicated by the following.

The *samucchaya vaadhin*'s (the third group's) arguments are answered by the *Aachaaryaa*, later, in verses 54 to 79. In this verse, he starts his replies to the 1st group of *karmavaadhin*_s.

- दूषण उपक्रम अवधि ज्ञापनाय - To indicate the starting point of the refutation,
- आह - the following verse is presented.

'*Dhooshanam*' means 'refutation / objection'; '*upakrama*:' means 'beginning'; '*avadhi*' means 'period of time'; '*jnaapanam*' means 'indicating / announcing'.

Chapter I: Verse 23 –

अत्राभिदध्महे दोषान् क्रमशो न्यायबृंहितैः ।

वचोभिः पूर्वपक्षोक्तघातिभिर्नातिसंभ्रमात् ॥ २३ ॥

Now we will state the objections in an orderly manner in words supported by logic, which will destroy the *prima facie* views and that not in the spirit of sophistry.

- अत्र - From the following verse (verse no. 24),
- दोषान् अभिदध्महे - we shall point out the mistakes / loopholes.

'*Abhidaadhmahē*' means 'we shall say'. The plural use is to show that the *Aachaaryaa* has the backing of the entire *sampradhaaya guru paramparaa*. As the *Guruvandanam*

goes: "Yai: imey gurubhi: poorvam padhavaakya pramaanatha: / Vyaakyaathaa: sarva vedhaanthaa: thaan nithyam pranathosmi aham||".

- न्याय बृंहितैः वचोभिः - using arguments backed by *nyaayaa*/logic. The word 'br̥mhita' literally means 'grown / increased' and is to be interpreted here, as 'backed by / supported by / reinforced by'.
- पूर्वपक्ष उक्त घातिभिः - which (arguments) will destroy the statements of the *poorva pakshin-s*,
- क्रमशः - one by one / in an orderly manner / systematically,
- न अति संभ्रमात् - without any excitement / hatred / anger / disturbance.

The lesson to be drawn from the *Aachaaryaa's* use of the term '*na athi sambrahmaath:*' "Never debate with another person, with the idea that he **should** accept your views. Do not be concerned about your opponent getting convinced or not. Your intention should be only to share your views. Your conviction or your liberation does not depend upon others' approval". There should be a relaxed attitude, while debating. This is a practical suggestion even for worldly matters. Intellectual conviction cannot be forced on others.

This verse (no. 23) is the 'introduction' to the *siddhaanthaa* of the *Aachaaryaa* (or the *Advaithin*). The word '*avadhl*', in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 23, meaning 'starting point', indicates that the *poorva pakshaa* arguments are over and the *siddhaanthaa* presentation starts.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 24:

चतुर्विधस्यपि कर्मकार्यस्य मुक्तावसंभवान्न मुक्ते : कर्मकार्यत्वम् ।

Release cannot be the effect of action, for it cannot fall into any of the four categories that action can bring into existence.

Sureswaraachaaryaa starts with the refutation of the 1st group of *karmavaadhina:*, viz., *abhyupethya karmavaadhina:*. The '*abhyupethya karmavaadha niraasa:*' is done in verses 24 to 53.

Introducing this, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*karmaa cannot give mokshaa*", as against the view of the *karmavaadhin-s*, viz., "*karmanaa eva moksha: - karmaa alone gives mokshaa*", as expressed by the *karmavaadhin*, in verse 21 "*sarva aasramanaam kaaryakarmabhi: mukthi: syaath na anya saadhanaath*". Sureswaraachaaryaa firmly avers that *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*; when he uses the word '*karmaa*', he includes *upaasanaa* also, since *upaasanaa* is *chittha poradhaana karmaa*. Neither *kaaya pradhaana karmaa* nor *chittha pradhaana karmaa* can liberate. 'Meditation' also cannot give *mokshaa*.

Sureswaraachaarya can easily provide *sruthi pramaanam* for this statement of his, by quoting the well known *manthraa* in *Kaivalya Upanishad*, which is commonly chanted while receiving a *sannyasi* - "na karmanaa na prajayaa dhanena thyaagena eke amruthathvam aanasu."- "It is through renunciation that a few seekers have attained immortality, not through ritual, nor through progeny, nor through wealth". But, he has named his treatise a *Siddhi Granthaa*, which will necessitate the use of logic – *yukthi* – to establish his views. And, therefore, he stated (in verse 23) that he will use logic, to counter the *poorva pakshaa* views – '*nyaaya brumhithai*'. The *Aaachaaryaa* does not satisfy himself with giving *sruthi pramaanam* only.

In this introductory paragraph to verse 24, Sureswaraachaarya says "In scriptures, the results of all types of *karma* - (i) *kaayika*, *maanasa* and *vaachika karmaani* and (ii) *loukika* and *vaidhika karmaani* - have been given. All *karmapalan*-s, whether secular or *vaidhikaa*, fall under four categories, indicated by the common saying '*chaturvidham karmakaaryam*'. The *Aaachaaryaa* lists the four types of results later, in verse 53. They are:

- (1) *aapthi*: - 'reaching a place' – e.g. 'travel results in reaching a destination'
- (2) *uthpatthi*: - 'production' – e.g. 'farming produces grains, fruits etc.'
- (3) *vikhaara*: - 'modification / change (no production) – the form is changed.
- (4) *samskaara*: - 'purification' – neither production nor change, but, refinement.

In the *vaidhikaa* context:

- (1) When the result of a particular *vaidhika karmaa* is mentioned as 'going to *svargaad*', it comes under *aapthi*: /
- (2) When a particular *karmaa* is expected to produce *punyam*, it is *uthpatthi*: |
- (3) A particular *karmaa* or a particular *karmapalan* can be changed by change of *dravyam* or the instrument. The change of the oblation or even the ladle in a *homa karmaa* will give a different status to the *karmaa*. This is an example of *vikhaara*: /
- (4) *Prokshana karmaa* purifies – an example of *samskaara*:

Any *vaidhika karma* results in one or more of the *karma kaaryam*-s.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "*Mokshaa* is *ajnaana nivrutthi*;; and, on analysis, we can conclude that *mokshaa* does not come under any one of the four types of *karmapalan*'.

The same subject is discussed by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam* to *Soothraa* 1.1.4.

"*Mokshaa*, not being any one of the above four types of results, how can *karmaa* give *mokshaa*?" is the question of the *Aachaaryaa*-s.

14. Chapter I, Verses 24 to 27 (15-07-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa elaborately introduced three types of *poorva pakshin-s*, in verses 9 to 22, with the intention of refuting their theories later. Of these three types, the first group is being answered by the *Aachaaryaa* first, from verse 24.

"*Karmaa* alone gives *mokshaa*; even if there is a subject as *aathmajnaanam*, it does not play a role in attainment of liberation. *Karmaa eva moksha kaaranam*" is the view of the first group of *poorva pakshin-s*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa refutes this theory in verses 24 to 53, after first expressing his intention (to refute) in verse 23. His actual arguments against the *poorva pakshin* starts from verse 24.

The first argument of the *Aachaaryaa*: "All types of *karmapalan* can be broadly classified into four types, viz., *uthpatthi*:, *aapthi*:, *vikhaara*: and *samsuddhi*: (production, reaching, modification and purification respectively), whether the *karmaa* is *loukikaa* (worldly) or *vaidhikaa*. *Mokshaa*, being only *aathma ajnaana nivrutthi*: (removal of ignorance), it cannot come under any of the above four types of results. *Mokshaa*, therefore, or, for that matter, *any 'knowledge'*, cannot come under *karmapalan*".

"No ignorance, including self-ignorance, can be removed by *karmaa*. Therefore, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*" is the *Aachaaryaa's* answer.

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* of verse 24:

- मुक्तौ - In the field of mokshaa,
- चतुर्विधस्यापि - none of the four types of
- कर्मकार्यस्य - results of karmaa
- असंभवात् - can result; therefore,
- मुक्तेः न कर्मकार्यत्वम् - mukthi: cannot be the result of karmaa.

The four types of *karmapalan* are listed by the *Aachaaryaa*, later, in verse 53. *Karmaa*, in this context, includes *upaasanaa* also.

Chapter I: Verse 24 –

अज्ञानहानमात्रत्वान्मुक्तेः कर्म न साधनम् ।

कर्मापमार्ष्टिं नाज्ञानं तमसीवोत्थितं तमः ॥ २४ ॥

As release is nothing but the elimination of ignorance, action cannot be the means thereof. Just as the error engendered in darkness cannot put an end to darkness, action does not eradicate ignorance.

- मुक्तेः अज्ञान हान मात्रत्वात् - *Mukthi* being only removal of self- ignorance,
- कर्म न साधनम् - *karmaa* is not the 'means' for liberation.

'*Haanam*' means 'removal'; '*maathra*' means 'mere'; '*ajnaana haana maathrathvaath mukthi:*' means 'Liberation is attained by mere destruction of ignorance'.

Mukthi: is a matter of 'understanding'. By 'right understanding' one drops 'misconceptions'. The use of the word '*maathra*', meaning 'mere' or 'only', is very significant. The word 'mere' emphasizes, that, after 'understanding', the seeker has nothing to 'do' for liberation.

"I have understood that 'I' am *Brahman*; now, what should I do for liberation?" is an absurd question; it only shows that 'right understanding' has **not** taken place. 'Understanding' includes the understanding that there is nothing else to 'do' for understanding.

An aspirant may say: "I accept that *jnaanam* is **also** a means to *mokshaa*. But, why should I not choose to use *karmaa* for attaining *mokshaa*?" Pre-empting such a doubt, the *Aachaaryaa* categorically stated '*karma na saadhanam*' and follows up with the justification as to why *karma* cannot be a *saadhanam*:

- कर्म अज्ञानं न अपमार्ष्टि - *Karmaa* is not remover of ignorance,
- तमसि उत्थितं इव - similar to whatever is born of ignorance
- तमः न)अपमार्ष्टि(- cannot remove ignorance.

'*Apamaarshthi*' means 'remover', derived from the root '*maar*', meaning 'to destroy'.

Why cannot *karmaa* remove 'ignorance'? The *Aachaaryaa's* answer: "Because, *karmaa* itself is a product of ignorance". *Ajnaanam* is *kaaranam* (cause) and *karmaa* is *kaaryam* (effect). In the *avadhaarika gadhyam* of this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, the *Aachaaryaa* had already explained how, viz.,

- (1). Self-ignorance (*ajnaanam*) leads to *dvaita dharsanam* – duality and multiplicity;
- (2). *Dvaita dharsanam* results in *sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:* - i.e. the tendency to consider certain things / situations / people as favourable and certain others as unfavourable;

(3).The '*sobanaa-asobanaa adhyaasa:*' creates *raagha dveshaa* – attachment and hatred and

(4).*Raagha dveshaa*-s propel a person to *karmaani – vihitha* and *nishiddha karmaani*. These steps show that *karmaa* is a 4th generation product of *ajnaanam*.

Any *kaaryam* imbibes the qualities of *kaaranam*. For example, a golden ornament (*kaaryam*) has the qualities of the gold (*kaaranam*). *Karmaa* being the *kaaryam* of *ajnaanam*, the *svaroopam* of *karma* is *ajnaanam*.

In the well-known *rajju-sarpaa* example, only in the 'ignorance of snake'(*rajju ajnaanena*) the snake is 'created'. In other words, '*rajju ajnaanam*' is the *kaaranam* and '*sarpa dharsanam*' is *kaaryam*. *Sarpa dharsanam* being the product of 'rope ignorance', the nature of *sarpa dharsanam* is 'ignorance'. 'Ignorance' is the cause; 'error' or 'wrong perception' is the effect. And, the nature of every error or misconception is 'ignorance'. Erroneous perception cannot remove ignorance, since it is itself born of ignorance.

Aathma ajnaanam is comparable to *rajju ajnaanam*. *Karmaa* is comparable to *sarpa dharsanam*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*Karmaa* is not remover of *aathma ajnaanam*, similar to whatever is born of ignorance cannot remove ignorance".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 25:

कर्मकार्यत्वाभ्युपगमेऽपि दोष एव ।

Even if release is admitted as following from action, there are difficulties.

- अभ्युपगमे अपि – Even if it is accepted
- कर्म कार्यत्वं – that *mokshaa* can result from *karmaa*,
- दोष एव - there are problems.

In the following verse (verse 25) , Sureswaraachaarya asks the *poorva pakshin* : "I temporarily accept your theory that *mokshaa* is *karmapalan* ; then, tell me, what specific *karmaa* gives liberation?"

Chapter I: Verse 25 –

एकेन वा भवेन्मुक्तिर्यदि वा सर्वकर्मभिः ।

प्रत्येकं चेद्दृथान्यानि सर्वेभ्योऽप्येककर्मता ॥ २५ ॥

Is release the effect of one action or of all actions? If of one action, the other actions are useless; and, if, of all, they have all to be construed as constituting one action (which would

be contrary to the strict division of actions into various kinds accepted by the theorists of *karmaa*).

Sureswaraacharya asks: "What *karmaa* can give liberation?"

Karmaa, in these discussions, can mean only *viadhika karmaa*, prescribed in the scriptures, since *mokshaa* is *apourusheyam*.

The *Aacharya* gives two options: "Can we say that (1) every *vaidhika karmaa* can give liberation OR (2) all *karmaa-s*, put together, will give liberation?"

- एकेन मुक्ति : भवेत् वा - Does liberation result from one *karmaa*?
- यदि वा सर्वकर्मभिः - Or, does it result from all *karmaa-s* put together ?
- प्रत्येकं चेत् - If only one *karmaa* **singly**, independent of other *karmaa-s*, can give liberation
- अन्यानि वृथा - all other *karmaa-s* become redundant.

"Then, why should *Vedaa-s* prescribe so many *karmaa-s*? They need not" is implied.

- सर्वेभ्यः)चेत्(- If *mokshaa* results through all the *karmaa-s* put together,
- एक कर्मता - then, all the *karmaa-s* put together, will become **one** *karmaa*.

The problem with this view (i.e. all *karmaa-s* put together, will give *mokshaa*) is detailed below: "This view would mean that **all** *karmaa-s*, prescribed in the scriptures, will have to be done to attain *mokshaa*, since omission of any *karmaa* will make the exercise incomplete. But, no single person can do **all** *vaidhika karmaa-s*, since *vaidhika karmaa-s* are prescribed for different *varnaa-s* and different *aasramaa-s*, and scriptures strictly prohibit *para varna dharmaa* and *para aasrama dharmaa*. This would mean that *mokshaa* will not be possible, for any one".

This objection may be countered by the *poorva pakshin*, with the reply that "performance of **not all** the *karmaa-s*, but of all the *karmaa-s* prescribed for the particular *varnaa* and *aasramaa* of the *saadhakaa*, will give him *mokshaa*". But, this is also not acceptable because of the following reasoning: "The 'groups' of *karmaa-s* performed by people of different *varnaa-s* and *aasramaa-s*, will be different. Since, according to this view, all of them can attain *mokshaa*, through the different 'groups' of *karmaa-s* performed by them, it would mean that *mokshaa saadhanaa-s* can be different. But, if *saadhanaa-s* differ, *saadhyaa-s* also will be different. 'Saadhana bedhena saadhyaa bedha:' and 'yathaa karmaa thathaa palan' – both, in essence, meaning 'results are different for different actions' - are undisputed maxims. But because *mokshaa* is not of different types, but, is only one Uniform, Eternal and Infinite, this reply is not logical".

In this context of the statement, that, *mokshaa* is not of different types, verse 42 from the '*Sadh Dharsanam*' of Shri Ramana Maharishi, is relevant. The verse says: "*roopinyaroopinyubhayaathmika cha mukthisthriropethi vidho vadhanthi | idham thrayam yaa vivinakyahamdhee: thasyaa: pranaasa: paramaarthmaamukthi:*" - "Some people say that there are three types of *mokshaa* – *roopini mukthi:*, *aropini mukthi:* and *ubhayaathmika mukthi:* | *Mukthi:* being the destruction of the very *ahamkaaraa*, which indulges in this 'counting', how can there be three *mukthi-s*?"

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 26 :

सर्वप्रकारस्यापि कर्मण उत्पत्ति एव विशिष्टसाध्याभिसंबन्धान्न पारिशेष्यन्यायसिद्धिः।

All the diverse kinds of actions are associated with diverse effects by the initiating injunctions themselves and as such, there is no residual action to which the effectuation of release may be ascribed:

The *karmi* comes out with another suggestion: "I concede that *eka karmaa* and *sarva karmaa* are both ruled out. But, performing the specific *karmaa* leading to *mokshaa* will give liberation. The specific *moksha saadhana karmaa* has to be done".

The *Vedhaanthin* questions : "What is that specific *moksha saadhana karmaa*? The *Vedaa-s* do not talk about any specific *karmaa* for *mokshaa*. Various results for various *karmaa-s* have been indicated; but, all the results indicated, are other than *mokshaa*."

The *poorva pakshin* replies: "*Vedaa-s* have talked of some *karmaa-s*, without mentioning the *palan* of those *karmaa-s*. For whatever *karmaa*, a specific *palan* is not mentioned, the *palan* of that *karmaa* can be taken as *mokshaa*".

In reply, Sureswaraachaaryaa observes that there is no *karmaa* in the *Vedaa-s*, for which the *palan* is not mentioned.

- सर्वप्रकारस्य अपि कर्मणः - For all types of *karmaa-s*,

Karmaa-s are of five types – *nithya*, *naimitthika*, *kaamyaa*, *praayaschiththa* and *nishiddha*.

- उत्पत्तिः एव - even as and when they are introduced by the *Vedaa-s*,
- विशिष्ट साध्य अभिसंबन्धात् - since the specific goal is also prescribed, '*vishishtaa* – specific ; '*saadhyaan* – goal ; '*abhisambhandha:*' - association.
- न पारिशेष्य न्यायसिद्धिः - the 'law of exclusion' cannot be applied.

'*Paarisheshya nyaaya:*' is the technical word for the 'principle of exclusion'. Applying whatever is 'left out', after consideration and elimination of other factors, is '*Paarisheshya nyaaya:*'|

If the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s* had talked of at least a single *karma* without indicating its result, by '*Paarisheshya nyaaya:*', the claim can be made, that, the result of that particular *karma* is *mokshaa*. But, in the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, with **every** prescribed *karmaa*, the corresponding result has also been indicated. No *karmaa*, with results left out, has been mentioned. Nor has *mokshaa* been prescribed as a direct result of any *karmaa*. As such, there is no prescribed *vaidhika karmaa* that can be used for *mokshaa*, according to the *Aachaaryaa*. He elaborates this view further.

Chapter I: Verse 26 –

दुरितक्षपणार्थत्वान्न नित्यं स्याद्विमुक्तये ।

स्वर्गादिपलसंबन्धात्काम्यं कर्म तथैव न ॥ २६ ॥

The obligatory action cannot lead to release, for it is assigned to the function of removing sins. Similarly action prompted by desire is associated with ends like the conducting of the agent to heaven and cannot lead to release.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa explains how every *karmaa* is associated with some result or other and that there is no *karmaa* for which result is not prescribed.

- नित्यं दुरितक्षपणार्थत्वात् - Since *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s* result in the destruction of *praarabhdha paapam*,
- विमुक्तये न स्यात् - they (*nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s*) cannot lead to liberation.

'*nithyam*' means '*nithya karmaa-s*' and in this context, includes *naimitthika karmaa-s* also; '*dhuritha*' means '*praarabhdha paapam*'; '*kshapanam*' means 'destruction'.

According to *Vedhaanthin-s*, *nithya-naimitthika karma-s* will destroy *praarabhdha paapam* (not *sanchitha* or *aaghaami*). As is well-known, the *sankalpa* done before any *vaidhika karmaa* specifies the purpose as '*dhuritha kshayadwaraad*'.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa-s* or *karma kaandin-s* believe that performance of *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s* are for avoidance of *prathyavaaya paapam*.

Either way, *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s* have prescribed results, either *dhuritha kshapanam* or *prathyavaaya papa parihaaram*. It follows, therefore, that *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s* cannot be used for *mokshaa*.

- काम्यं कर्म - The *kaamya karmaa-s*,
- स्वर्गादि फल संबन्धात् - because they are associated with results like *svargaa* etc.,
- तथा एव न (विमुक्तये स्यात्) - similar to *nithya karmaa*, cannot give *mokshaa*.

Nishiddha and *praayaschittha karmaani* need not even be mentioned, since their results (*narakaa* and *parihaaraa* respectively) are known.

Thus, there is no result-less action that can be used for *mokshaa*, according to the *Aachaaryaa*.

Though the text, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* does not talk of any *vaidhika karmaa*, for which no result is mentioned, some commentators have referred to a few *karmaa-s*, for which no *palan* has been mentioned in the *Vedaa-s*.

An example is the *Viswajith Yaaghaa*, finding mention in the *Katopanishad* as performed by the father of Nachikethas.

In anticipation of the *poorva pakshin* quoting such *karmaa-s* as *moksha saadhananaa*, the commentators are ready with an answer: "In the *Poorvameemaamsa saasthraa*, in the chapter titled *Viswajith Adhikaranam*, the *poorva pakshin* himself had said, that, wherever results are not given in the *Vedaa-s*, *svarghaa* should be taken as the result. So, even according to the *poorva pakshin* himself, *mokshaa* cannot be the result of such *karmaa-s*, i.e. *karmaa-s* for which no result has been specified".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 27:

प्रमाणासंभवाच्च ।

Further, there is no scriptural testimony in support.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, in anticipation of the *poorva pakshin* 'inventing' or 'devising' a *karmaa* as *moksha saadhanam*, says: "Whenever *apourusheya vishayaa* is discussed, *saasthraa-s* can be the **only** *pramaanam*. For worldly matters, one can devise one's own methods. But, not in *apourusheya vishyaa-s*. And, *saasthraa-s* have not prescribed a *karmaa*, for achieving *mokshaa*. Hence, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*".

15. Chapter I, Verses 27 to 29 (22-07-2006)

Verse 27 – Chapter I:

साध्यसाधनभावोऽयं वचनात्पारलौकिकः।

नाश्रौषं मोक्षदं कर्म श्रुतेर्वक्त्रात्कथंचन ॥ २७ ॥

The means-and-end relation between action and their fruits of the nature of objectives beyond the present life, is to be ascertained through scriptures. From the mouth of sruthi, we have heard of no actions as leading to release.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the poorva pakshaa views, in these verses. Different poorva pakshin-s were introduced. Some claim that karmaa alone can give mokshaa and some others claim that "karmaa joined with jnaanaa" will give mokshaa.

Sureswaraachaaryaa desires to refute both these theories, namely:

- Kevala karma vaadham and
- Samucchaya karma vaadham.

The first group, who say, "*karmaa alone* gives *mokshaa*" is being refuted now. Even within this group, one sub-group concedes that *jnaanam* is a subject taught in the scriptures; but, holds, that, it is not required for *mokshaa*. The other sub-group does not even accept *jnaanam* as a subject of teaching by the *saasthraa-s*.

Various arguments are given by the *Aachaaryaa*, against this view "*karmanaa eva moksha:*"

In verse 24, the *Aachaaryaa* argued that *karma palan* can be only of four types – *uthpatthi:*, *aapthi:*, *vikhaara:* and *samskaara:* and since *mokshaa* cannot be considered to come under any one of these four, *mokshaa cannot* be *karmapalan*.

Thereafter, he raises the query as to whether there are any *karmaa-s* mentioned by the *saasthraa-s* specifically for *mokshaa*. *Saasthraa-s* always indicate the result of any prescribed *karmaa*; but, nowhere is *mokshaa* mentioned as *karmapalan*. A *kaamyaa karmaa* results in fulfillment of the desire, for which the *kaamyaa karmaa* is performed. *Nishiddha karmaa-s* result in *paapam* and lead to inferior worlds or inferior *punar-janmaa-s*. *Praayaschittha karmaa-s* remove the *paapam* accrued because of performance of wanton or accidental *nishiddha karmaa-s*. As for *nithya-naimitthika karmaani*, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* says that they are done for avoidance of *prathyavaaya paapam*, while the *Vedhaanthin* holds, that, they are meant for *dhuritha kshayam*. Thus, the five types of

karmaa-s have specified results; but, all the results are different from *mokshaa*. "Then how we can we attain *mokshaa*, resorting to *karma*?" is the *Aachaaryaa*'s query.

In this context, some commentators rake up another question: "There are certain rituals, like *Viswajith Yaaghaa*, for which *palan* is not mentioned by the *saasthraa*-s. Can it be concluded that these rituals give *mokshaa*?" and themselves answer "This is also not acceptable, since, the *karma kaandi* himself had discussed this and had said, that, wherever results are not mentioned by the *saasthraa*-s, one can assume that *svarghaa*, being the most desired object of the humans, is the result".

In support, the commentators quote *soothraa* 15 – Section 3 – Chapter 4, of *Jaimini Maharishi's Poorva Meemaamsa Soothraa*-s, which runs "*sa: svarga: syaath sarvaan prathi avisishtathvaath*" meaning "the unmentioned result shall be *svargaa*, because it is desired universally". (The word '*sa:*', in this portion of the *soothraa*, refers to the 'unmentioned result').

Sureswaraachaaryaa's stand is also that "there is no *karmaa* in the *saasthraa*-s, for which *mokshaa* is indicated as the result".

To this, the *poorva pakshin* may suggest "If there is no ritual in the *Vedaa*-s for attainment of *mokshaa*, why not we invent or devise a suitable *karmaa*?" Verse 27 pre-empts this possible suggestion, by saying: "Imagination or creativity cannot be a valid source (*pramaanam*) in matters concerning *aloukika* or *apourusheya* subjects like *mokshaa*. For worldly matters, you can devise your own methods. But, for *aloukika vishayaa*, *saasthraa*-s are the only *pramaanam*".

- अयं साध्य साधन भावः - This relationship between 'means' and 'end',
- पारलौकिकः - in subjects of *aloukika* nature
- वचनात्) एव निश्चितः - is to be ascertained only through scriptures.

The 'ends' of the 'means' are two-fold : (1) '*aloukika*' – 'relating to this world' and (2) '*aloukika*' or '*paaramaarthika*' – 'not relating to this world'. *Mokshaa* is an *aloukika* result and when one needs to know as to what will lead to *mokshaa*, one has to get the information only from the *saasthraa*-s.

The view that "*saasthraa*-s do not talk of any *karmaa* for *mokshapalan*" is stated in the second line of the verse.

- श्रुतेः वक्त्रात् - From the mouth of the vedaa-s,
- मोक्षदं कर्म न अश्रौषं - we have never heard of a *karma*, which will give *mokshaa*,
- कथंचन - in any manner (whether as *nithyaa* or *naimitthikaa* or *kaamyaa*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 28:

अभ्युपगतभ्युपगमाच्च श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिवत्भवतो निष्प्रयोजनः प्रलापः ।

Moreover, you are repeating what the advocate of knowledge also holds and hence your talk is superfluous. It is like the mother-in-law calling back the guest refused by the daughter-in-law, so that she may exercise the privilege of refusing.

Verses 24 to 27 refuted the *poorva pakshin's* statement given in verse no. 9, namely, "As release is effected by actions, what is there for knowledge to accomplish?" From verse 10 to verse 13, the *poorva pakshin* had given a list of suggestions, in support of his above statement, as to how, totally ignoring comprehension of the Self, by mere 'judicious management' of the *karma-s*, the seeker can attain *mokshaa*.

"Renunciation of *kaamyaa karma-s*, avoidance of *nishiddha karmaa-s* and diligent and unflinching performance of *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s* will lead to *mokshaa*" was his suggestion.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the *poorva pakshin* had not suggested anything new. *Vedhaanthin-s* also prescribe avoidance of *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaa-s* and unflinching performance of *nithya-naimitthika karmaa-s*. Hence, the *poorva pakshin's* giving this advice, is similar to the well-known example of the mother-in-law calling back the guest refused by the daughter-in-law, so that **she** could exercise **her** authority to refuse to entertain the guest.

- अभ्युपगत - Whatever is accepted by us (in relation to the pancha karmaani)
- अभ्युपगमाः च - is accepted by you and vice versa.
- भवतः प्रलापः निष्प्रयोजनः - Therefore, your statement (namely, talking to us, of the pancha karmaani) is akin to useless / superfluous blabber,
- श्वश्रूनिर्गच्छोक्तिवत् - similar to the statement 'go away' of the mother-in-law.

Chapter I: Verse 28 –

निषिद्धकामयोस्त्यागस्त्वयापीष्टो यथा मया ।

नित्यस्यापलवत्त्वाच्च न मोक्ष :कर्मसाधन :॥ २८ ॥

Like me you also desire the renunciation of prohibited and desire-prompted actions. Obligatory action is said to produce no result. Hence release is not effected by any action.

- निषिद्ध कामयो : त्यागः - "Giving up" of nishiddha and kaamyā karmaa-s
- त्वया अपीष्ट : - is desired by you,
- यथा मया - just as desired by me.
- नित्यस्य अपलवत्त्वात् च - As for nithya-naimitthika karmaani, since they also do not give *mokshaa* as a result,
- मोक्ष : कर्मसाधन :न - mokshaa cannot be the result of any karmaa.

By the first line of the verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out: "Since the *poorva pakshin* also advocates renunciation of *kaamyā* and *nishiddha karmaani*, the view, that, performance of *kaamyā* and *nishiddha karmaani* cannot give *mokshaa*, is obviously accepted by the *poorva pakshin* also."

As for *nithya-naimitthika karmaani*, they **should** be performed; but, not for *mokshaa*. They give results that are different from *mokshaa*. The *poorva meemaamsakaa* says that they are done for avoidance of *prathyavaaya paapam*, while the *Vedhaanthin* holds, that, they are meant for *dhuritha kshayam*. Thus, both admit that the result of *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* is not *mokshaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) of Verse 29:

एवं तावत् मुक्ते : क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात् "इति निरस्तोऽयं पक्षः ।

Thus the position that release is effected by actions (verse 9) stands refuted.

Sureswaraachaaryaa tells the *poorva pakshin*: "I have clearly refuted your view", referring to the *poorva pakshin*'s statement in verse 9, "*mukthe: kriyaabhi: siddhathvaath*" meaning "since liberation is achieved by actions (*karmaani*)".

Sambhandha gadhyam of Verse 29 (contd.):

अथाधुना सर्वकर्मप्रवृत्तिहेतुनिरूपणेन यथावस्तितात्मवस्तुविषयकेवलज्ञानमात्रादेव सकलसंसारानर्थनिवृत्तिरितीमं पक्षं द्रढयितुकाम आह ।

Now, with a view to strengthen the position, that all evils of transmigratory existence are subject to elimination only through the knowledge of the real

nature of the Self by an account of the cause of all actions, the author proceeds to say the following:

In verse 24, Sureswaraacharyaa had made a statement – “*karmapalan* is only of four types – production, reaching, modification or refinement; and, *mokshaa* does not fall under any of them”. By this one statement itself, **all** the systems imagining *mokshaa* as a “place to be reached” / “destination” are indirectly dismissed by the *Aachaaryaa*.

“*Mokshaa* is not *aapthi*.” is the *Aachaaryaa*’s statement.

“Then, what is *mokshaa*?” will be the question. Sureswaraacharyaa did not elaborate - but, briefly said “*ajanaa nivrutthi maathram* is *mokshaa*” – “mere removal of ignorance is liberation”. He has to, therefore, establish two points now: (1) *mokshaa* is only *ajanaa nivrutthi* and (2) *karmaa* cannot remove *ajnaanam*. Henceforth, this is what the *Aachaaryaa* does.

The second point, namely, ‘*karmaa* cannot remove ignorance’ is taken up first.

The reason for this view is that “*karmaa* is itself born out of ignorance. Ignorance being the cause of *karmaa*, the essential nature also of *karmaa* is ‘ignorance’, since cause and effect are of the same essential nature. Thus, being the ‘result’ of ignorance and of the ‘nature’ of ignorance, *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance”.

The *poorva pakshin* may ask: “Are you referring to *loukika karmaa* or *vaidhika karmaa*, when you say that *karmaa* cannot remove ignorance?”

The *Aachaaryaa* says, in reply to this possible question: “Neither *loukika karmaa* nor *vaidhika karmaa* can remove ignorance. *Vaidhika karmaa*, however holy, is also a product of ignorance and, therefore, cannot destroy ignorance and, therefore, cannot give *mokshaa*”.

An individual committed to *vaidhika karmaa* is a ‘religious’ person; but, not a ‘spiritual’ person. Only when ‘self-ignorance removal’ is attempted by him, he becomes ‘spiritual’.

- यथावस्थित आत्मवस्तु विषय केवल ज्ञानमात्रात् एव - “Merely by the knowledge of the ‘Self’, ‘as it is’,

‘*Yathaavasthitha*’ means ‘as it is’. This description is significant. “I am *apoorna*.” is, unfortunately, the universally held wrong belief. It is this misconception that causes the ‘search’ for a better future and the consequent ‘struggle’ for a better future, and, therefore, leads to ‘action’.

"I am *poorna*; here and now; there is no question of a better future; and, therefore, there is no question of any 'struggle' using either *vaidhika karmaa* or *loukika karmaa*" is the true and real *jnaanam*.

Swami Dayananda Saraswathi stresses: "'Trying to be different from what I am' is the struggle that binds. 'I do not have to be different from what I am now. I am perfectly OK, as I am' is the knowledge that will give *mokshaa*".

'*Yathaa avasthitha*' is an adjective to *aathmaa*, stressing this aspect; it can therefore, be interpreted as '*poorna*'. '*Yathaa avasthitha aathma vishaya*' can, therefore, be interpreted as '*poorna aathma vishaya*'.

An interesting question: "Will an *apoorna*, can be modified by worldly struggles, to be a *poorna*?" The answer is: "No, it cannot be. It will become only a different *apoorna*:", similar to an *ajnaani brahmachari* becoming an *ajnaani grihasthaa*.

Worldly struggles are undertaken for 'changing' the perceived '*apoornathvam*' and not for '*jnaanam*'. The worldly struggles convert the 'struggler' from one form of *apoornaa* to only another form of *apoornaa*. The true 'struggle' should be to convert the '*ajnaani I*' to the '*jnaani I*'. This is the aim of the *jnaana kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*.

- सकल सम्सार अनर्थ निवृत्ति) : भवति(- the elimination of the grief caused by *samsaraa* (results)".

'*anartha*' means 'grief' or 'problems'; '*nivrutthi*:' means 'elimination'.

Karmakaandaa converts the *karmi* from one type of *apoornaa* to another type of *apoornaa*. It is the *jnaanakaandaa*, which achieves conversion of the '*ajnaani I*' to the '*jnaani I*'.

- अथ अधुना - Now, at this time,
- इति इमं पक्षं द्रढयितुकामः - with a desire to reinforce this view of ours,
- सर्व कर्म प्रवृत्ति हेतु निरूपणेन - by establishing the cause for the pursuit of all *karmaa-s* – *loukika* and *vaidhika*,

'*sarva karmaa*' – all types of *karma*, both *loukika* and *vaidhika* ; '*pravrutthi*' – pursuit ; '*hethu*' – cause ; '*niroopanena*' – by establishing.

Later, Sureswaraachaaryaa is going to say that any action that is undertaken, is a stamp of reinforcement of self-ignorance.

"*Sarva karma pravrutthi hethu is ajnaanaa*" – "the cause for the pursuit of any action is self-ignorance" is what is going to be established by the *Aachaaryaa*. By establishing this, he can show that *jnaanam* is the only means to *mokshaa*.

आह - the following is mentioned.

A question arises: "Is not the pursuit of *jnaanam* also a form of *karmaa*, since all efforts are *karmaa*?" This question is followed by another: "If this is so, i.e. if 'pursuit of *jnaanam*' is also a *karmaa*, then will not *mokshaa* become a *karmapalan*?"

How does one resolve these questions or doubts?

This subject is discussed by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam – samanvaya soothraa* – 1.1.4. In the relevant portion, the question "Since 'meditation' is considered a 'mental action', is not 'knowledge' also a 'mental action'?" is raised. In replying this question, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* firmly establishes that "*Jnaanam* does **not** come under *karmaa*." The arguments furnished by him, in support, are not presented here, but, will be discussed in a later context. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* deals with the subject in one of his *prakaranam*-s also, named, '*Sarva Vedhaantha Siddhartha Saara Sangraha*'.

Reverting to the text:

Sarbanda Gadyamt o ver ser 29 (Cont 'd)

- इह चेदं परीक्ष्यते ।

Here, this has to be examined.

- इह च - Here,
- इदं परीक्ष्यते - we are examining our theories.

The idea is to make the theories firm in our minds; to make sure that the study is not just superficial, but, a thorough and deep study to help assimilation of the theories.

All our struggles in life are because of 'self-ignorance'. Both *loukika* and *vaidhika karma pravrutthi*-s are because of ignorance. The struggles, therefore, will never end without *jnaanam*. Looking to achieve a better future through *loukika* and *vaidhika karmaani*, is a

blunder. This *braanthi* – misconception – should be got rid of. Hence, the *Aachaaryaa* discusses these theories in detail.

He talks about various types of vaidhika karma pravrutthi – kaamyaa, nithya-naimitthika, praayaschittha and nishiddha karmaani.

He says: "Because of ignorance, people venture into *nishiddha karmaani*, even though they are prohibited by *saasthraa*-s. But, not only *nishiddha karmaani*; even the venture into *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* is also because of 'ignorance' only. **Any** action – **even right action** – is because of ignorance only".

16. Chapter I, Verse 29 (29-07-2006)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 29 (contd.) :

किं यथा प्रतिषिद्धेषु च कर्मसु स्वाभाविकस्वाशयोत्थ निमित्तवशादेवेदं

हितमिदमहितमिति विशेषान् परिकल्प्य मृगतृष्णिकोदकपिपासुरिव लौकिकप्रमाणप्रसिद्धान्येव साधनान्युपादाय हितप्राप्तयेऽहितनिरासाय च स्वयमेव प्रवर्तते निवर्तते च तथैवादृष्टार्थेषु काम्येषु नित्येषु च कर्मसु किंवा न्यदेव तत्र प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिनिमित्तमिति ।

There are well-known instinctive actions and bad actions. Men distinguish good and bad in the light of their natural empirical reason. Even as a deluded person goes to a mirage to quench his thirst, people endeavour, by themselves, to attain or avoid what they thus regard as good and bad, through the adoption of means regarded as conducive to the respective ends by common sense. In the matter of (i) actions supposed to lead to higher goods (ii) actions promoted by desire and (iii) the obligatory actions, is the situation the same ? Or is there any other source of motivation ?

Sureswaraachaaryaa is negating *karma vaadhaa*. He had given a few arguments against the *poorva pakshin* from verse 24 to verse 28. He wants to reinforce those arguments by a deeper enquiry, in which, he wants to establish, that:

- (1) **all** types of activities, worldly and religious (*lokika* and *saasthreeya*), are born of *ajnaanam* only;
- (2) since *karmaa* is, thus, born out of *ajnaanam*, it cannot destroy *ajnaanam* – on the other hand, it will only reinforce *ajnaanam* ;
- (3) *mokshaa* is *ajnaana nivrutthi*;
- (4) since *karmaa* cannot destroy *ajnaanam*, it cannot give *mokshaa*, either independently or in association with *jnaanam* and, finally
- (5) *jnaanam* **alone** (**mere** knowledge) is *moksha kaaranam*.

In the *sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 29*, the *Aachaaryaa* wants to emphasize this trend of his arguments.

He started the *sambhandha gadhyam* by saying “मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात्” इति निरस्तोऽयं पक्षः” Thus the *poorva pakshin*’s position (stated by the *poorva pakshin* in verse 9), that, ‘release is effected by actions’ stands refuted”.

Then he stated his intention: “अथाधुना सर्वकर्म प्रवृत्तिहेतु निरूपणेन यथा अवस्थित आत्मवस्तु विषय केवल ज्ञानमात्रात् एव सकल संसार अनर्थ निवृत्तिः इति इमं पक्षं द्रढयितुकाम आह।इह च इदं परीक्ष्यते।”

"Now, to reinforce the teaching that 'only through the clear knowledge of the real *pancha kosa vilakshana aathmaa*, all evils connected by *samsaaraa* can be eliminated', by establishing the cause of pursuit of all types of actions as 'ignorance', I proceed to say the following. In the following portion, the idea is to be examined".

In the first sentence above, the word '*jnaana*' is preceded by '*kevala*' and followed by '*maathra*'. '*Kevala*' and '*maathra*' are synonymous, both generally meaning 'only'. Then, why use of both words? In this context, '*kevala*' means '*samyak*' or 'clear', while '*maathra*' means 'mere' or 'only'.

When Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*Karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*; only *jnaanam* can", the questions "Is not *jnaanam* also a form of *karmaa*? Is there, at all, a difference between *karmaa* and *jnaanam*?" may arise.

The *Vedhaanthin* answers: "No, *jnaanam* is **not** a form of *karma*. As for differences between them, there are at least two".

The first difference : "The nature / process of action is always determined or governed by the subject, whereas, the nature / process of knowledge that is acquired, is **not** determined by the subject, but, by the object".

Karmaa is *karthru thanthram* and *jnaanaa* is *vasthu thanthram* or *vishaya thanthram*.

A simple example will make this clear – "reading a newspaper". The reader chooses the subject that he wants to read and turns to the relevant page. This is *karmaa*, based on the reader's decision and control. The 'turning action' is *karthru thanthram*.

After turning to the required page and starting the use of the *jnaanendriyaa*, his eyes, 'knowledge' is collected by the reader; but, the 'knowledge' is based **not** on the will of the reader, but, on the event reported.

The action (*karmaa*) done, using the *karmendriyaa* was the individual's choice. But, he cannot choose the 'knowledge' (*jnaanaa*) acquired through his *jnaanendriyaa*. It is the object (*vishayaa*) that determines the 'knowledge' (*jnaanam*).

The Swamiji's class may be cited as another example. What the student listens to (*jnaanam*) is not his choice; the *vishayaa* decides it. But, the manner, the language and the content of the notes made by the student (*karmaa*) are all subject to the student's will and choice.

A third example can also be cited. This is given by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in his *Brahma soothra Bhaashyam*, while dealing with *Samanvaya Adhyaayaa* : the difference between

- (1) merely looking at a stone and gathering the knowledge (*jnaanam*) that it is a stone, on which 'knowledge', there is no choice, and
- (2) invoking an *ishta devathaa* on the stone, for *Pujaa* or *Upaasanaa*, which is a *karmaa*, on which the individual has a choice.

The second difference between *jnaanam* and *karma* : *Jnaanam* cannot bring about a change in the field or object of 'knowledge'. In other words, no change to the 'object of perception', takes place, by any amount of perception. This is expressed as "*Jnaanam na kaarakam*". It is only '*prakaasakam*' or 'revealing'. *Jnaanam* reveals a thing "as it is".

Karmaa , on the other hand, is a *kaarakam* – it does bring about a change on the object or field it deals with, in one of the four ways (as discussed earlier) – (i) *uthpatthi:*, (ii) *aapthi:*, (iii) *vikhaara:* and (iv) *samsuddhi:*

It is to be noted, that, in the *Vedhaanthic* context also, *jnaanam* (*aathma jnaanam*) does not 'produce' *mokshaa*. It only 'reveals' the nature of *aathmaa*, 'as it is'. *Jnaanam* is not *kaayika karmaa* or *vaachika karmaa* nor even *maanasa karmaa*. "*Jnaanena vishaya adhisaya ajanaka akarthathvaath*" which means "since a change in the object is not brought about, by *jnaanam*", *jnaanam* is **not** *karmaa*.

Before proceeding further into the text of this *sambhandha gadhyam* (of verse 29), a gist of the *Aachaarya's* 'enquiry' / 'examination' (*pareekshyathe*), may be presented, as below:

Many actions are done by the individual, not because of *saasthraas'* injunctions (*saasthra chodhanaa*), but, because of the individual's desire and hatred (*raaghaa* and *dveshaa*). Both the *poorva pakshin* (the *karma vaadhin*) and the *Vedhaanthin* agree on this, namely, that, naturally born *raagha-dveshaa* is the force behind actions done without *saasthra chodhanaa*. *Raagha-dveshaa* is *pravrutthi hethu*.

Some of the actions thus undertaken may be even *nishiddhaa* (forbidden) by the *saasthraa-s*. When the 'doer' does not know *saasthraa-s* or value *saasthraa-s*, he indulges in these wrong actions, only because of his *raagha-dveshaa*. In the vision of the *saasthraa-s*, these wrong actions will produce *dhu:kham*. But, the 'doer' does not know that they are *dhu:kha kaaranam* and because of *ajnaanam* and *mithyaa jnaanam*, he performs the wrong actions. Where there is *dhu:kham*, as revealed by the *saasthraa-s*, he perceives *sukham*, because of *mithyaa jnaanam* and the *mithyaa jnaana* based *raagha-dveshaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an example to these misconceived ventures : "going after mirage water". *Mithyaa jnaanam*, namely, imagination of water where there is none, is the reason behind this fruitless action.

The Aachaaryaa first asks the *poorva pakshin*: "Is the performance of *nishiddha karmaa-s*, because of *raagha-dveshaa* based *mithyaa jnaanam* or because of *saasthra chodhanaa*?"

The *poorva-pakshin* answers: "Performance of *nishiddha karmaa-s* **is** because of *raagha-dveshaa*, which, in turn, is based on *mithyaa jnaanam*, the misconception that it will give benefits", i.e., he agrees that 'pursuit of *nishiddha karmaanl* is because of *raagha-dveshaa* and *mithyaa jnaanam*.

Thereafter, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "What about *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* and *kaamyaa karmaanl*? Are they **also** based on *raagha-dveshaa* or based on *saasthric injunctions*?" He calls on the *poorva pakshin* to enquire into this elaborately.

This 'enquiry' or 'examination' (as the *Aachaaryaa* calls it) and the answer to the question as to "whether the *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* and *kaamyaa-karmaani* are *mithyaa jnaanam* based or *saasthra-chodhanaa* based" are very important.

The *Aachaaryaa* starts with the *nishiddha karmaani*, since, with regard to them, the *poorva pakshin* has no difference of opinion with the *Vedhaanthin*.

Reverting to the text:

- स्वयं एव प्रवर्तते - (The individual) ventures by himself
- प्रतिषिद्धेषु कर्मसु - into prohibited actions,
- निमित्त वशात् एव - based purely on causal factors,
- स्वाभाविक - which factors are natural to oneself
- स्वाशय उत्थ - and which factors arise in one's own mind, namely,

'*svaabhaavika*' and '*svaasya uttha*' are adjectives to '*nimittha*'.

- इदं हितं इदं अहितं इति विशेषान् परिकल्प्य - the imagined notions 'this is good for me' and 'this is not good for me' etc.,

A prohibited action (for example, 'smoking') is believed to be good for the well-being of the 'doer', because of his *mithyaa jnaanam*.

- लौकिक प्रमाण प्रसिद्धानि एव साधनानि उपादाय - resorting to 'means' arrived at, through *loukika pramaanaa-s*,

'*prasiddhaanl* means 'arrived at'; '*upaadhaaya*' means 'resorting to'.

Saasthraa-s do not play any role in such activities. They are based only on the individual's *raagha-dveshaa* (likes and dislikes).

- **हितप्राप्तये अहितनिरासाय च** - to obtain (what he considers) *sukham* and to eliminate (what he considers) *dhu:kham*,
- **मृगतृष्णिक उदक पिपासुः इव** - similar to a thirsty traveler in the desert who looks to satiate his thirst from the mirage water.

The essence of this portion of the *sambhandha gadhyam* is: "The performer of prohibited actions, based on his instinctive likes and dislikes, considers something as good for him and something else as bad for him and resorting to purely worldly means available to him, without any reference to *saasthraa-s*, endeavours to attain what he regards as good and eliminate what he regards as bad, through the performance of the prohibited actions. This is very similar to a person running after the non-existent water of a mirage".

Up to this, the subject is *nishiddha karmaani*, where the *poorva pakshin* also agrees, that, performance of prohibited actions is based on *raagha dveshaa* and *mithyaa jnaanam* and not on *saasthra vidhi nishedham*. A corollary of this conclusion is, that, "since the *nishiddha karmaa-s* are nourished by 'ignorance', they cannot remove ignorance; on the other hand, they will reinforce ignorance". The *poorva pakshin* has no problems, in accepting this also, with regard to *nishiddha karmaa-s*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa proceeds to say that the same is true about *vaidhika karmaani* also; that, they are also born out of 'ignorance' only (*mithyaa jnaana janaka eva*).

- **अदृष्टार्थेषु काम्येषु** - With regard to *kaamya karmaa-s* (which produce *punyam* now and consequent *sukham* later),

Punyam resulting from the *kaamya karmaani* and the *sukham*, the fruit of the *punyam* acquired through the *kaamya karmaani*, are both invisible. Hence the use of the word '*adrishta*', to describe them.

- **नित्येषु कर्मसु च** - and also *nithya karmaani* (meant to avoid *prathyavaayapaanam*),
- **तत्र प्रवृत्ति निवृत्ति निमित्तं** - the causal factor for performance of or withdrawal from them ,
- **किं तथा एव वा अन्यदेव इति** - is the same as for *nishiddha karmaani* or different, (is to be enquired into).

The query "Are *kaamya karmaani* and *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* also born out of *mithyaa jnaanam*, **similar to *nishiddha karmaani* ?**" is conveyed by the term '*thathaa eva*'.

"Or, is there any causal factor, other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, for the performance of *nithya* and *kaamya karmaani*?" is the *Aachaaryaa's* query, by the term '*anyadeva*'. The *Aachaaryaa* has "*saasthric injunction*" in mind, when he asks for the causal factor.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 29 (contd.):

किंचातः।

But, what is the use of this enquiry?

- **अतः** - By this enquiry (namely, 'are *nithya – kaamyaa karmaani* based on *Vedic* injunctions or *mithyaa jnaanam*?)
- **किंच** - what is the *prayojanam*?

This question is from a passer-by, neither by the *poorva pakshin* nor by the *Vedhaanthin*.

"*Nishprayojana vichaara: na karthavya:*" – "Do not indulge in useless enquiry" is a *saasthric* rule.

'*Kimchaatha:*' is a commonly used term in *Saankara Bhaashyam-s* also.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 29 (contd.) :

यद्येवं श्रुणु |

I shall explain. Listen.

- **श्रुणु** - Listen to
- **यद्येवं-** what I have to say

Sureswaraachaaryaa considers this enquiry very crucial. Why? It is explained as below:

If *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* and *kaamyaa karmaani* are based on *Saasthric* injunctions, they are 'right' actions, from 'valid' sources, which actions will produce 'good' in the future. The *poorva meemaamsakaa* will be proved right, on this point, while the *Vedhaanthin* will be the loser.

If, on the other hand, these actions are also based on *ajnaanam* or *mithyaa jnaanam*, as Sureswaraachaaryaa firmly believes, even the *vaidhika karmaani* will not remove *ajnaanam* and *mokshaa* will not be attained. The *poorva meemaamsakaa* will be indulging only in futile actions, born out of ignorance, based on *mithyaa jnaanam*. The *Vedhaanthin's* views will stand vindicated.

Hence this enquiry is very important in the refutation of *karma vaadhaa*.

17. Chapter I, Verse 29 (05-08-2006)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 29 (contd.):

यदि तावध्यथावस्थितवस्तुसम्यग्ज्ञानं प्रमाणभूतं लौकिकमागमिकं वा प्रवृत्ति निवृत्ति निमित्तमिति निश्चीयते
निवृत्तिशास्त्रं च नाभ्युगम्यते तदा हताः कर्मत्यागिनो
भ्रान्तिविज्ञानमात्रावष्टम्भादलौकिकप्रमाणोपात्तकर्मानुष्ठानत्यागत्वाच्च।
अथ मृगतृष्णिकोदकपिपासुप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तवदयथावस्तुभ्रान्तिविज्ञानमेव सर्वप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं तदा वर्द्धमहे वयं
हताः स्थ यूयमिति ।

If the question is answered in the affirmative, the following consequence arises. If, on the one hand, the source of motivation is true knowledge of reality acquired through empirical modes of knowledge or the scriptural and if the scripture preaching renunciation of actions, is not accepted, then those who renounce actions stand condemned, for, depending on false authorities, they discard actions enjoined by the transcendent authority of the scriptures. If, on the other hand, it is conceded that all their actions are actuated by false understanding, as that of the man seeking to quench his thirst in the mirage, we triumph and you stand condemned.

After introducing, in verses 9 to 22, three types of *poorva pakshin-s*, who are all *karmavadhin-s* of one type or another, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* is negating them, one by one, in the portions from verse 23. The refutation of the first group is done in verses 23 to 53.

Initially, the *Aachaaryaa* gave general arguments. His first argument was that the result of any *karmaa* will fall under four types – *uthpatthi:*, *aapthi:*, *vikhaara:* and *samsuddhi:* / *Mokshaa*, being only *ajnaana nivrutthi:* or *jnaana praapthi:*, is something different from all of them and will not come under the *chathurvidha karmapalan*.

Subsequently, he pointed out, that, the scriptures, even while prescribing the various *karmaa-s*, have also clearly enunciated the results of each of the *karmaa-s*; and, that, all the results enunciated by them are different from *mokshaa*. There is no specific *karmaa* prescribed in the scriptures for *mokshaa*, nor any *karmapalan* mentioned as *mokshaa*.

Then, the *Aachaaryaa* enters into further analysis: What is the cause of any *karmaa*? "*Karmahethu: ka:?*" The *Aachaaryaa's* intention is to establish that *karmaa-s* are done because of *ajnaanam* or *mithyaa jnaanam*. And, having been born of misconception (*mithyaa jnaanam*), *karmaa-s* cannot destroy *ajnaanam*.

Does this analysis include both *loutika* and *vaidhika karmaa-s*? The general perception is, that, *loutika karmaa-s* are born out of ignorance, while *vaidhika karmaa-s*, since they are prescribed by the *Veda-s*, which are considered valid sources, should be born out of 'right'

knowledge. But, Sureswaraacharya's view is, that, even *vaidhika karmaani* are born out of *mithyaa jnaanam* only; and, therefore, they also will not destroy ignorance; but, will only nourish ignorance.

With the intention to establish his view, the *Aachaaryaa* enters into the enquiry "Is *Vaidhika karmaa* born out of right knowledge or misconception?"

He had already talked of *nishiddha karmmani* and had asserted that they are done only because of misconception. Obviously *Vedic* knowledge cannot be the cause of *nishiddha karmaani*, because *Vedaa-s* reject / prohibit them. Only one's own wrong understanding (*mithyaa jnaanam*) leads to *nishiddha karmaani*. *Svaabhaavika karmaa-s*, like bathing, taking food etc., are also not born out of *Vedic* knowledge or injunctions. With these examples, it can be concluded, without dispute, that, there **are** *karmaa-s*, which do not have *Vedic* backing.

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* comes to the crucial point: "*Vaidhika karmaa-s*, like *sandhyavandhanam*, should have some back-up knowledge. Is it right knowledge given by the *Vedaa-s* or *mithyaa jnaanam*?" The *Aachaaryaa* says, "this has to be enquired into" – "*anyath eva thathra pravrutthi nivrutthi nimittam ithi*" and starts the enquiry:

- यथावस्थित वस्तु सम्यग्ज्ञानं - "True knowledge of reality,
- प्रमाणभूतं - born out of valid sources,
- लौकिकं आगमिकं वा - either worldly (empirical) or *saasthric*,
- प्रवृत्ति निवृत्ति निमित्तं - is the cause of pursuit / withdrawal of *vaidhika karmaani*");
- इति यदि निश्चीयते - if we decide so (and)
- निवृत्ति शास्त्रं - the *jnaana kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s* (where *karmaa-s* are renounced)
- न अभ्युगमते - is also not accepted,
- तदा - in that situation,
- कर्मत्यागिनः - those who have given up *karmaa-s* (referring to *sanayaasin-s*)
- हताः - will be ruined,
- भ्रान्ति विज्ञान मात्र अवष्टम्भात् - because of the wrong conception that only 'knowledge' is needed as 'support' to achieve liberation,
- अलौकिक प्रमाण उपात्त कर्मानुष्ठान त्यागित्वात् च - and also because of renunciation of the *karmaa-s* enjoined by *Vedic* injunctions.

The essence: "If it is concluded that *vaidhika karmaani* are born out of right knowledge, the result is that those who consider *jnaanam* as the only means to *mokshaa* and, therefore, have renounced the *vaidhika karmaa-s*, are ruined".

On the other hand, if the conclusion is, that, *vaidhika karmaa*-s are also born out of misconception, as Sureswaraachaaryaa believes, what is the result?

- अथ - If, on the other hand,
- मृगतृष्णिकोदक पिपासुप्रवृत्ति निमित्तवत् - "Similar to the man seeking to quench his thirst in the mirage,
- अयथावस्तुभ्रान्तिविज्ञानमेव - only misconception / false understanding
- सर्व प्रवृत्ति निमित्तं - is the cause of all actions";
- (इति यदि निश्चीयते - if we decide so,
- तदा वयं वद्मामहे - then, we (the *Vedhaanthin*-s) are on the right path.
- हताःस्थ यूयम् - You (*karmi*-s) stand condemned / are ruined.

This is re-assurance to the *Vedhaanthic* student.

Chapter I: Verse 29 –

हितं संप्रेप्सतां मोहादहितं च जिहासताम् ।
उपायान्प्राप्तिहानार्थान् शास्त्रं भासयतेऽर्कवत् । 29 ॥

The scripture is like the sun. It sheds light on the means of attaining and of avoiding ends, which men seek through delusion.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives one of the cardinal principles of *Vedhaanthaa*, in a nutshell, in this verse. He elaborates on the subject later. This verse is, therefore, a very important, profound and valid verse.

The *Aachaaryaa* says, that the *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa* is **not** the cause of action. It **is** a *pramaanam*, but, which generates **only** knowledge and **not** action. The job of any *pramaanam* is only 'generation of knowledge' – not of action. Once the 'knowledge' is generated, the job of the *pramaanam* is complete.

A *loukikaa* example can be given for this: "The information from a newspaper on a possible 'goal' (*saadhyam*), through a 'means' (*saadhanam*). The newspaper, the *pramaanam* in this example, has generated *saadhya jnaanam*, *saadhana jnaanam* and *saadhya-saadhana-sambhandha jnaanam* (knowledge of a goal, knowledge of the means and knowledge of the relationship between the two). But, the newspaper is **not** responsible for any 'action' that follows the 'knowledge'.

This fact is succinctly expressed in Sanskrit as "Pramaanam bhodhakam eva bhavathi ; na kaarakam" or as "Pramaanam jnaana janakam eva bhavathi; naiva karma janakam".

This is only the first principle. Proceeding further, it is not only the *pramaanam* which is **not** *karma janakam*, but, even the *pramaana janaka jnaanam* is **not** *karma janakam*. In other words, not even the 'knowledge' generated by the *pramaanam* can be considered as responsible for the 'action' that follows the 'knowledge'. **Both** the *pramaanam* and the knowledge generated by the *pramaanam*, only throw light on the *karmaa*. They are **not** 'generators' of *karmaa*.

The question follows: "In that case, what is the generator of *karmaa*? (*Pravarthakam / karmajanakam kim? / What is the reason for karmapravrutthi?*)"

The answer is: *Kaama: eva sarva karma janakam*. (Desire **alone** is the cause of *karmaa*) .

In the manner as in the example of the newspaper, *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa* also is not responsible for *karmaa*. It gives only knowledge on the various *karmaa-s* – *maanasa*, *vaachika* and *kaayika karmaani*. The results of the *karmaa-s* (*saadhyam-s*) and the relationships (*sambhandhaa*) between the two, namely, *saadhyam-s* and *saadhanam-s*, are all given. But, all the five types of *karmaa-s* are carried out only because of *kaamaa* (desire) and nothing but *kaamaa*.

Then, the next question arises: "What generates desire?"

The detailed analysis will be as follows:

Different people have different desires. The very fact that they engage themselves in different *karmaa-s* proves this. "But" Sureswaraachaaryaa points out. "All *karmaa-s* are only superficially different. They can be reduced to two types – both types centered on 'I' – i.e., both types are self-centered".

The two types are:

- (1) *Sukha praapthi icchaa* – desire to acquire happiness and
- (2) *Dhu:kha nivrutthi icchaa* – desire to get rid of grief.

The desire to 'acquire' (*praapthi icchaa*) is termed *prepsaa* and the desire 'to get rid of' (*haana icchaa*) is termed *jahaasaa*.

Every human being is driven by one of these desires only. What is the fundamental reason for these two desires?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, each of this self-centered desire is based on two assumptions.

When I want *sukham*, my assumptions are

- (1) that, I do not have *sukham*, and
- (2) that, my 'action' will give me *shukham*.

Likewise, when I want to get rid of *dhu:kham*, my assumptions are

- (1) that, I have *dhu:kham*, and
- (2) that, my 'action' will remove my *dhu:kham*.

All desires are based the above four assumptions.

Having thus analyzed the cause for desire, Sureswaraachaaryaa further argues:

All the four assumptions are *mithyaa jnaanam* or error/misconception. This misconception is because of self-ignorance – the ignorance of the fact, that, "I need not get *aanandhaa* from outside; nor do I require to remove my grief using external factors".

It is this ignorance which leads to action/*kaaryaa* , both *vaidhika karmaani* and *loukika karmaani*.

Vedaa-s are **not** responsible for the *kaaryaa-s*. They only give information.

Because of the above fact, viz., that, 'it is only ignorance which leads to action', *vaidhika karmaa-s* also will not remove ignorance. They will only reinforce ignorance.

Reverting to the text (verse 29):

- शास्त्रं भासयते - *Veda poorva bhaaghaa* throws light on
- उपायान् - various *saadhanaa-s* (the means)
- प्राप्ति हान अर्थान् - for getting various goals (like *svarghaa*) and for avoiding various destinations (like *narakaa*),
- अर्कवत् - like the sun (which also only illumines; but, does not decide your actions).

"Which *saadhanaa* will give you which *saadhyaa* etc." is also given by the *Vedaa-s*.

18. Chapter I, Verse 29 and 30 (12-08-2006)

In this important portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to establish that even *vaidhika pravrutthi* – *Vedic* actions – are born out of ignorance only; that, *mithyaa jnaanam* is the cause of **all** actions - *loukikaa* or *vaidhikaa*. This view is in contrast to the *poorva meemaamsaka matham*, which claims “*Vedic* activities are born out of right knowledge only”. The *poorva meemaamsakaa* holds : “*Vedaa* is a valid source – *pramaanam*. *Vedic* knowledge is right knowledge. *Vedaa* persuades one into action. *Vaidhika karmaani*, are, therefore, born out of right *Vedic* knowledge. *Loukika karmaani* may be born out of wrong knowledge, misconception and error – but, not *vaidhika karmaani*. *Vedaa* alone is *pravarthakaa* for *vaidhika karmaani*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, on the other hand, firmly refutes these views. He holds that any *pramaanam* only gives knowledge (information), but, is not responsible for generating action. Neither the *pramaanam* nor the *pramaana janya jnaanam* can be considered responsible for action. (As earlier cited, the mere information that a newspaper gives, about the various programmes in the City, cannot be considered to be the cause for the reader to attend any particular programme. If the newspaper or the information from the newspaper were to be considered responsible, then *all* the readers should be attending *all* the programmes, which does not happen, nor is possible).

Then, what is responsible for ‘action’? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers: ‘Desire’. He says: “After getting the information, the individual ‘**desires**’ and acts”. Expressed in Sanskrit: “*Jaanaathi, icchathi, pravarthithi*”. According to the *Aachaaryaa*, the **direct** cause for action is only ‘**desire**’.

He says: “*Vedaa-s* never command a person to perform a ritual. It only gives information as to what are bad *karmaa-s*, what are good *karmaa-s*, what are the results of good and bad *karmaa-s* (*saadhana-saadhya-sambhandham*) etc.

“The *vaidhika karma jnaanam* is decided by the *Vedaa-s*; but, the *karma pravrutthi*, is **not** decided by the *Vedaa-s*. It is decided only by the ‘desire’ of the individual”.

Of course, there *are* some direct commandments in the *Vedaa-s* (not related to *karmaa* or *upaasanaa*), such as ‘*sathyam vadha*’ etc. But, even adherence to these direct commandments, depends only on the choice of the individual, based on his ‘desire’.

Reverting to the text (verse 29):

- शास्त्रं उपायान् भासयते - *Vedaa-s* reveal the various *saadhanaa-s*
- प्राप्ति हान अर्थान् - for attainment or removal of the various *saadhyaa-s*,

- **अर्कवत्** - similar to the sun.

The implication of the example, is, that, similar to the sun, which only illumines the roads and different routes, but, does not decide the route to be taken, *Vedaa*-s only provide information on the *saadhyaa*-s and the *saadhanaa*-s, but, do not force or command any action.

Why, then, does an individual venture into 'action'? The answer is in the first line of the verse:

- **मोहात्** - Because of misconception / delusion, which consists of
- **हितं संप्रेप्सतां** - the desire to attain sukham (sukha praapthi icchaa),
- **अहितं च जिहासताम्** - and the desire to remove dhu:kham (dhu:kha nivrutthi icchaa).

This gives rise to further queries: What generates desire? Does *Vedaa* or the *Veda janya jnaanam* generate desire?

Sureswaraachaaryaa answers: "*Vedaa* is only a *pramaanam*, and, therefore, does not generate desire, just as it does not generate action. Likewise, *pramaana janya jnaanam* also does not produce desire.

"It is only the conclusion of the individual, that, a particular action will produce *hitham* or *sukham* or the conclusion that a particular action will remove *ahitham* or *dhu:kham*. Only these 'self-analyzed' and 'self-arrived at' conclusions cause desire".

Are these conclusions 'right knowledge' or 'wrong knowledge'? The *Aachaaryaa* answers this also and declares that the conclusions are based on a fundamental blunder, namely, the wrong assumptions:

- (1) I do not have *sukham*
- (2) This particular action will give me *sukham*
- (3) I have got *dhu:kham*, and
- (4) This particular action will remove *dhu:kham*.

All four assumptions are wrong, since

- (1) *aathmaa* is *aanandha svaroopaa*:
- (2) therefore, nothing in the world need give *sukham*, nor, can anything give *sukham*
- (3) *aathmaa* is *dhu:kha rahitha*: and
- (4) therefore, nothing in the world need remove *dhu:kham*, nor, can anything remove *dhu:kham*".

“Hence” the *Aachaaryaa* concludes: “only ‘self-analyzed’ and ‘self-arrived at’ wrong conclusions are the causes for all actions”. In fact, this is a basic *siddhaanthaa* of the *Vedhaanthin*. *Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa* also establishes this in his *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam* – that, all actions, *loukikaa* or *saathreeyaa*, are because of erroneous self-conclusions.

Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys this, in this verse, by the significant word ‘*mohaath*’.

This does not mean that, the individual should totally ‘give up’ relationships or possessions. No. What are to be given up are the wrong expectations from them. It should be recognized that relationships or possessions cannot give lasting or permanent *aanandhaa*.

The *Aachaaryaa*’s firm conviction is: Any activity is born out of ignorance only.

Verse 17 – Chapter III, of the Bhagavadh Githa, is relevant here. It declares:

यस्त्वात्मरतिरेव स्यादात्मतृप्तश्च मानवः |

आत्मन्येव च सन्तुष्टस्तस्य कार्यं न विद्यते ||३- १७||

yastvātmaratirēva syādātmatrptaśca mānavaḥ |

ātmanyēva ca santuṣṭastasya kāryaṁ na vidyatē ||3- 17||

meaning “ However, suppose there is a man who loves the Self alone, who is happy with the Self alone and who is contented with the Self alone. There is nothing to be accomplished by him”.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to verse 30 :

एवं तावत् प्रत्यक्ष अनुमान आगम प्रमाणवष्टम्भात् आत्मनो निरतिशयसुखहित अव्यतिरेकसिद्धेः अहितस्य च षष्ठगोचरवत् स्वत एव अनभिसंबन्धाद् एवं स्वाभाव्य आत्म अनवबोधमात्रात् एव ‘हितं मे स्यात्’ , ‘अहितं मे मा भूत्’ इति मित्याज्ञानं तु ऊषरशुक्तिकानवबोत्थ मिथ्याज्ञानवत् प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमिति निर्धारितम् ।

Thus, it is determined, on the basis of perception, inference and scriptures, that, the Self is of the nature of intense bliss and ultimate good, while, evil, like what is non-existent, cannot in any way affect it, and, that, wrong understanding based on the non-comprehension of this nature of the Self, takes the forms ‘Let good befall me’, ‘Let not evil come to me’ and thus furnishes the motives for all action, even as the misconception of the shell leads to coveting it as silver.

In this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa is concluding that actions are born out of wrong self-knowledge. The conclusion is arrived at, with the help of *Veda pramaanam*.

- **हित (आत्म) अव्यतिरेकसिद्धः** - Because of the fact that *hitham* (well being) is non-different from *aathmaa*;

"*Sukham* is an object which has to come from outside" is a wrong belief. The fact is, that, *sukham* is '*aathma avyathirekham*' - 'not different from *aathmaad* / 'identical with *aathmaad*'.

- **निरतिशय सुख (अव्यतिरेकसिद्धेः)**- because of the fact, that, ungraded, absolute *sukham* is non-different from *aathmaa*;

Saasthraa-s declare that not only is *aathmaa* identical with *sukham* – but, the identical *sukham* is *nirathisaya sukham* – meaning "highest / ungraded / absolute". If *aathmaa* has graded *aanandhaa*, one may have to work for the higher and still higher grades, the effort being endless. But, *aathmasvaroopam* is that *aanandhaa*, which is beyond comparative and superlative degrees.

The corollary of this statement is, that, since *aanandhaa* is *aathmasvaroopam*, any effort to get *aanandhaa* from outside, is only because of *mithyaa jnaanam* – misconception.

"Removal of grief by external means" is another misconception, since, 'I' do not have grief. This message follows:

- **स्वतः एव अहितस्य अनभिसंबन्धात् च** - and, because of the inherent nature of non-association of *aathmaa* with *dhu:kham*,
- **षष्ठगोचरवत्** - similar to the 'object' of the sixth *pramaanam*;

"*Aathmaa* is *dhu:kha rahitha*:" or, in other words, "*Dhu:kham* is *abhaavam* in *aathmaa*" is the message that the *Aachaaryaa* wants to convey. For this, he uses the phrase "*shashtagocharavath*". The significance of the use is explained as follows:

Scriptures talk of six *pramaanam*-s (valid sources of knowledge). Of these, five are grouped as "*bhaava pramaanaanam*" - i.e. "sources that reveal existing things or objects" and are listed as (1) *prathyaksham* (2) *anumaanam* (3) *upamaanam* (4) *arthaapatthi* and (5) *sabdhaa*.

The sixth *pramaanam* is what is known as '*anupalabdhi*' meaning 'non-cognition', which *pramaanam* reveals the 'absence' of objects. For example, the non-cognition (or non-experience) of horns on a human being reveals the fact of 'non-existence' of horns for humans. Another example: "non-experience' of an elephant in the class room reveals the 'absence' of an elephant". In short, the object of *anupalabdhi pramaanam* is '*abhaava*.' – 'non-existent'.

Therefore, to convey the message "In *aathmaa*, '*dhu:kham*' is *abhaavam*", the *Aachaaryaa* uses the phrase '*shashtagocharavath*', meaning 'similar to the 'object' of the sixth *pramaanam*', which 'object' is non-existent or '*abhaava*:'.

Why should an individual, then, strive for *dhu:kha nivrutthi* or search for peace? Both struggles are because of *mithyaa jnaanam* only.

- **एवं स्वाभाव्य आत्म अनवबोधमात्रात् एव** - purely because of the non-comprehension of such nature of the Self, (as detailed above),

evam svaabhaavya – of such a nature; *aathma* – of the *aathmaa*; *anavabodham* – ignorance / non-comprehension ; *maathraath eva* – purely because of:

- **मिथ्याज्ञानं** - the misconception consisting of the aspirations,
- **“हितं मे स्यात्”** - 'let good befall me',
- **“अहितं मे मा भूत्” इति** - 'let not evil come to me' etc.,

The misconception (*mithyaa jnaanam*) is born out of ignorance (*anavabodham*); i.e. 'ignorance' leads to 'misconceptions', which, in turn lead to 'actions' (struggles in life). In *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam*, Sankaraacharya calls *mithyaa jnaanam* as *adhyaasa*: |

Sureswaraacharya compares this struggle to a person running after a mirage for the non-existent water or running towards a conch shell, for the non-existent silver.

- **ऊषर शुक्तिक अनवबोध मिथ्याज्ञानवत्** - similar to the misconceptions of running after a mirage (for water) or after a conch shell (coveting silver).

Oosharam – desert; *sukthikam* – conch shell; *anavabodha* - arising from ignorance.

In the examples, 'ignorance' results in 'misconceptions', which, in turn, results in 'actions', viz. 'looking for water' and 'looking for silver'.

- **प्रवृत्ति निमित्तं (भवति)** - becomes the cause of / motivator for activities.

The *Aachaaryaa* claims three *pramaanam*-s for this conclusion.

- **इति निर्धारितम्** - This conclusion is arrived at
- **प्रत्यक्ष अनुमान आगम प्रमाणवष्टम्भात्** - on the basis of 'valid sources', viz., perception, inference and scriptures.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 30 (contd.):
शास्त्रं च न पदार्थशक्त्याधानकृदिति ।

It is also determined, that the scripture does not confer any power on anything.

This is an important statement: “*Pramaanam* can never generate activity”.

According to the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, there are two types of statements : (1) *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* – a statement of fact and (2) *chodhanaa vaakyam* or *pravarthaka vaakyam* – a statement generating activity.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* holds that there *are* 'commandments' in the *Vedaa-s*, which he calls *vidhi vaakyaani* or *pravarthaka vaakyaani*. The *Vedhaanthin* strongly refutes this. According to him, no statement, even in the form of a commandment, can generate action, unless the listener is motivated by 'desire'. An example was already cited : the *Vedic* injunction '*sathyam vadha*'.

The *Aachaaryaa* emphasizes the view "a commandment does not generate action", by stating here "a commandment does not give power to do action". Only 'desire' gives the power to action.

- शास्त्रं - "Scripture
- न आधानकृत् - (is) not the creator (of)
- शक्ति - the activating power
- पदार्थ - (in) any object".
- इति (च निर्धारितम्) - This fact is also stated.

The *poorva meemaasakaa* says, that, whatever *vidhi vaakyam* is there in *karma kaandaa*, it is *pravarthaka vaakyam*. In contrast, the *Vedhaanthin* says that *vidhi vaakyaani* also are only *bodhaka vaakyaani* and not *pravarthaka vaakyaani*.

The *Vedhaanthin* is of the form view that even a commandment in the scriptures, only gives knowledge.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 30 (contd.):

अतेतस्यैवोत्तरत्र प्रपञ्च आरभ्यते ।

Therefore, the explanation of this principle follows:

19. Chapter I, Verses 30 to 32 (19-08-2006)

Sureswaraacharya pointed out that the *Veda Poorva Bhaagaa* i.e. the *Karma Kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, is also a *pramaanam*. The job of a *pramaanam* is only "giving rise to knowledge". It can never do anything else other than giving information. It cannot produce any desire in the minds of the people. "*Pramaanam jnaapakam eva bhavathi; kaarakam na bhavathi*" meaning "*Pramaanam* is only a 'revealer' and not a 'producer'".

A *pramaanam* cannot generate action also. *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* also cannot generate any action. It is **not** the generator of *vaidhika karmaani*, even though it contains many *vidhi vaakyaani* (injunctions on right actions to be performed) and *nishiddha vaakyaani* (injunctions on prohibited actions). But, even such commandments cannot generate desire or action, as shown below:

An example of *vidhi vaakyam* is the one that *Sandhyaavandhanam* is an essential daily ritual to be performed. However powerful this commandment may be, it does not result in all the listeners' performing the ritual, without fail. Likewise, in spite of the awareness of the *nishiddha vaakyam* – "*himsaa na kuryaath*", meaning "violence should be eschewed", people continue to do *himsaa*. Such commonly observed non-adherence to *vidhi vaakyam* or *nishiddha vaakyam*, shows that *vaakyam* obviously does not have the power to generate the 'desire' to implicitly obey the commandment. It follows, therefore, that *vaakyam* lacks the power to 'generate' action also.

Ishta saadhanaartha bhodhakam is *vidhi vaakyam*; anishta saadhanaartha vaakyam is *nishiddha vaakyam*. Both types of commandments are only *bodha janakaa* - not *kaama janakaa* nor *karma janakaa*.

Sureswaraacharya says, that, any *karmaa* - *loukikaa* or *vaidhikaa* – is generated only by 'desire', which, as was seen, is also **not** generated by the *Vedaa-s*, but, by self-ignorance only, viz., the ignorance of the fact " 'I' do not require any *karmaa* to acquire *sukham* or remove *dhu:kham*, since 'my' *svaroopam* itself is only *sukham*". 'Ignorance', therefore, is the indirect cause of *karmaa* also – *loukikaa* and *vaidhikaa*.

The corollary that the *Aacharya* derives from this, is: "Since *vaidhika karmaa* is also born out of ignorance, it can never remove ignorance; therefore, *karmaa* – even *vaidhika karmaa* – cannot give *mokshaa*."

Then, a question may arise : (though this is not discussed here by the *Aacharya*): "If *vaidhika karmaani* cannot destroy ignorance and cannot give *mokshaa* and if *mokshaa* is possible only by *Vedaantha Jnaana*, then why should *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* talk of countless

vaidhika karmaani, karma palaani etc.? Why should not *Vedaa* start straightaway with *jnaana kaandaa*? Why should it have a *karma kaandaa* at all, which, according to the *Vedhaanthin*, promotes and preserves self-ignorance?"

There are two explanations in clarification of this doubt.

The first will be as follows: "The human problem is self-ignorance ; only self-knowledge can remove the self-ignorance. *Karmaa* cannot solve the problem" is the essence and ultimate teaching of the *Vedaa*-s. But, humanity is not aware of this fact. Even among the few, who are aware of this, most are not easily convinced about it – at times, even a sincere *Vedhaanthic* student. The *jnaana kaandaa* does not appeal to such people. Till such time as the awareness of and conviction about this fact are achieved, humans, by inherent nature, are only in the field of *karmaa* – action in some form or other. So *Vedaa*-s deem it their duty to give information on *karmaa*, to guide the people on the path of right *karmaa*. In other words, *Vedaa*-s tell the seeker: "*Jnaanam* is the **only** means to *mokshaa*. But, since you are yet to be convinced of this, let me guide you on the path of right *karmaa*, till such time as you mature to get convinced on this". *Manthraa* 12 – Section 2 – Chapter I, of *Mundakopanishad* clearly expresses this route map. The *manthraa* runs: "*Pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath naasthi akrutha: kruthena | Thath vijnaartham sa gurum eva abhigaccheth samithpaani: srothreeyam brahmanishtam*", meaning "Having examined the worlds which are achieved through *karmaa*, a Brahmin (seeker) should come to dispassion. The unproduced (*mokshaa*) is not possible through *karmaa*. Therefore, to attain knowledge, he must necessarily approach with *samith* in hand, a teacher learned in scriptures and established in *Brahmar*".

The second explanation: "A seeker may be very clear that **only** *aathma jnaanam* can lead to *mokshaa* and may also have the keen desire for *aathma jnaanam*. But, he may not be mentally qualified to receive the *jnaanam*. We do find such instances in worldly education programmes also. A student might have completed schooling, the basic requirement to join a prestigious Institution of higher learning; he may have the keen desire also to join the Institution. But, the examiners in charge of admission might find him wanting in maturity and mental capacity, to receive the teachings at the Institute successfully. In this case, the desire to pursue the course is there – but, not the qualifications. Mere *kaamaa* (desire) is not sufficient; *adhikaaraa* (qualification) is also essential. With regard to *mokshaa* also, along with the desire for *jnaanam*, the *yogyathaa* should be there. Implicit following of the injunctions of the *Karma Kaandaa* of the *Vedaa*-s, gives the seeker, the *jnaana yogyathaa*. The elaborate *karmaa*-s prescribed by the *Karma Kaandaa* of the *Vedaa*-s are meant more for attainment of *jnaana yogyathaa*, than worldly gains".

Chapter I: Verse 30:

न परीप्सां जिहासां वा पुंसः शास्त्रं करोति हि ।
निजे एव तु ते यस्मात्पशुदावपि दर्शनात् ॥ ३० ॥

Desire or aversion is not put into men, by scriptures. They are natural, as they are found in animals also.

- पुंसः - For the humans,
- शास्त्रं - the scriptures,
- न करोति हि - surely, do not create
- परीप्सां - the desire to get sukham
- जिहासां वा - or the desire to get rid of dhu:kham.
- ते - They (pareepsaa and jihaasaa)
- निजे एव तु - - are inborn / natural
- यस्मात् दर्शनात् - as perceived
- पशुदावपि - even in animals.

Vedaa-s do not give any one, either the desire for *sukha praapthi* or the desire for *dhu:kha nivrutthi*. Acceptance and rejection by an individual, are, both, because of self-ignorance.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 31 and 32:

उक्तं तावदनवबुद्धवस्तुयाथात्म्य एव विधिप्रतिषेधशास्त्रेष्वधिक्रियत इति अथाधुना विषयस्वभावानुरोधेन प्रवृत्त्यसंभवं वक्तुकाम आह ।

It has been laid down that only he who has not understood the nature of Reality, is addressed by scriptural commandments and prohibitions. Now, with a view to show that action is impossible in the light of the nature of the object, the author proceeds:

In the following portion, Sureswaraacharya is entering a marginally different topic. Earlier, he had said that *karmaa* **cannot remove** self-ignorance and give *mokshaa*. In this portion, the *Aachaaryaa* will be stressing "*karmaa* is **not required** for *mokshaa*".

Before doing any *karmaa*, the relevant *karmajnaanam* should be obtained. The aspirant to any action 'learns' (*jaanaathl*), 'desires' (*icchathl*) and 'acts' (*yathathl*). But, when the aspirant comes to *Vedhaanthaa*, the very 'knowledge' removes 'desire'. '*Karmaa*' becomes irrelevant and redundant.

- तावत् - Till now,
- इति उक्तं - it was stated, that,
- "अनवबुद्ध वस्तु याथात्म्यः एव - "Only he, who has not understood the real nature of the Self (i.e. an ajnaani or self-ignorant person)

vasthu yaathaathmyam - real nature of the Self ; anava bhuddha - ignorant.

- **विधि प्रतिषेध शास्त्रेषु अधिक्रियते** - is addressed by scriptural commandments and prohibitions".

adhikriyathe - addressed.

A *jnaani* knows that he has no *dhu:kham* and, that, therefore, he need not try to get rid of the non-existent *dhu:kham*, through *Vedic karmaani*. In contrast, an *ajnaani*, who is not aware of the real nature of the Self (*sukha svaroopam*), deems it necessary to perform the *karmaa*-s prescribed by the scriptures, for both *sukha praapthi* and *dhu:kha nivrutthi*.

- **अथ अधुना** - Hereafter,
- **वक्तुकामः** - desirous of discussing (the topic of)
- **प्रवृत्ति असंभवं** - 'non-requirement of karmaa (with regard to mokshaa)',
- **विषय स्वभाव अनुरोधेन** - by studying the nature of the subject matter of human goals,
- **आह** - the following is stated.

Vishaya – (in this context) means '*purushaartha vishayam*' (subject matter of human goals); *svabhaava* – nature ; *anurodhena* – by studying.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is planning to classify the human goals into two groups and to establish that one of the two groups require *karmaa*, while, the other group requires *jnaanaa* – i.e., as (1) *karmaa*-requiring group of human goals and (2) *jnaanaa*-requiring group of human goals. The object of the study is to understand and pursue the route required for one's goal.

Mokshaa requires only a simple cognitive change. Intellectual knowledge is sufficient for *mokshaa*.

Chapter I : Verses 31 & 32

लिप्सतेऽज्जानतोऽलब्धं कण्ठे चामीकरं यथा ।

वर्जितं च स्वतो भ्रान्त्या छायायामात्मनो यथा ॥ ३१ ॥

भयान्मोहावनद्वात्मा रक्ष : परिजिहीर्षति ।

यच्चापरिहृतं वस्तु तथालब्धं च लिप्सते ॥ ३२ ॥

Forgetting that the gold necklace is there on the neck already, the wearer searches for it. Similarly, the man, mistaking in fright, his own shadow for a demon, runs to avoid the demon, which, in fact, is not there. There are, of course, cases in which one seeks to avoid what is really there to be avoided and wants to appropriate what is not really in his possession already.

Sureswaraachaaryaa talks of the four goals, in this verse. In certain cases, we have certain objects with us; but, are ignorant of the fact that the objects are already with us; and,

therefore, take efforts to attain the object. An example will be a key within the folds of a handkerchief in one's pocket; the owner of the key (and the kerchief), removes the kerchief (along with the key in its folds, of which, he is not aware), keeps it in his left hand and looks for the key in the pocket. Not finding it there, he becomes frantic and perspires, and, while wiping his face with the kerchief, 'discovers' the key. Because of his ignorance a *praapthavasthu* became an *aprapthavasthu*. The 'distance' was caused only by ignorance and what he already had in his possession became a 'goal' / *lakshyam*. He looked for an object seemingly *apraptham* – but, actually *praaptham*; in other words, he took efforts to attain the already attained / to accomplish the already accomplished. What is the 'means' he used or should use to attain the key already with him? Ans: It is merely the 'knowledge' that the key was in the folds of his kerchief. This is a typical case of what the *Aachaaryaa* lists as his goal no. 1 , viz., '*praapthasya praapthi:*' in his list of four goals .

The *Aachaaryaa* gives the example of a necklace around the neck, for this first goal '*praapthasya praapthi:*' |

- **अज्ञानतः** - (An individual), because of ignorance/ forgetfulness,
- **लिप्सते** - desires to attain
- **कण्ठे चामीकरं** - the necklace (already) on the neck,
- **अलब्धं (मत्वा)** - (considering it) as not attained.

Sureswaraachaaryaa moves on to the 2nd goal on his list – "a non-existing problem is desired to be removed" – '*nivruththasya nivrutthi:*' or '*pariharthasya parihaara:*', akin to looking for a remedy for a disease, which is not there.

The *Aaachaaryaa* gives an example for this second goal also. A person sees his shadow on the wall and upon seeing the moving shadow, superimposes a ghost on it – a non-existing ghost, which, he wants to get rid of. The 'getting rid of the ghost' is also achieved merely by the knowledge that 'there is no ghost'.

- **भ्रान्त्या** - (Another individual), because of delusion,
- **आत्मनः छायायां** - superimposing on his own shadow,
- **स्वतःवर्जितं रक्षः** - an actually non-existent ghost,
- **भयात् परिजिहीर्षति** - fearfully desires to drive (it) away,
- **मोह अनवद् आत्मा** - with a mind covered by the delusion.

Raksha: - ghost; parijiheersathi - (pariharthum icchathi) desires to drive away.

The next two goals are "acquiring something which one does not own" (goal no. 3) and "removal of an actually existing problem" (goal no. 4)

20. Chapter I, Verses 32 to 35 (26-08-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to establish that *karmaa* can never give liberation, either independently or in association with *jnaanam – swathanthrena vaa jnaana samucchithena vaa karmanaa moksha: kathaapi na praapyathe.*

But, while dwelling on this topic, the seeker has to be very careful. It is the *Vedhaanthir's* firm view, that, *Karmaa* does not give liberation; but, he never says, that *karmaa* is totally useless. *Karmaa* is extremely useful – every seeker should follow *karmaa* for *chittha suddhi*. In the context of liberation, *karmaa as moksha saadhanam* is criticized; but, *karmaa as suddhi saadhanam* is glorified. *Moksha saadhanathvena karmaa nindhyathe; suddhi saadhanathvena karmaa sthooyathe.* The seeker of *mokshaa* should understand this clearly and should take care not drop his *nithya-naimitthika karma anushtaanam.*

Sureswaraachaaryaa makes it very clear that *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*. He gave one reason earlier; the reason given was on the basis of studying the cause of *karmaa*. *Karma hethu vichaarena karmana: moksha asaadhanathvam nischitham.* He showed that *karmaa* is caused by *mithyaa jnaanam* or *ajnaanam*; and, being a product of ignorance, it cannot destroy ignorance and therefore, cannot give *mokshaa*. This is *karma hethu vichaara: |*

Now, the *Aacharyaa* wants to establish the same view, viz., "*karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*", by the study of *karma pala vichaara: - the study of the 'results' or 'benefits' of karmaa. Poorvam karma hethu vichaara: | Idhaaneem karma pala vichaara: |*

As a first step of this study, the *Aachaaryaa* analyses the varieties of possible results or goals that a human being chooses. All the possible goals, the *Aachaaryaa* says, will come under four categories (*chathur vidha palaani*), in two groups of two categories in each group. This categorization should not be confused with the categorization of the four *purushaartha-s – dharma, artha, kama and mokshaa*. It is also different from the categorization as *aapthi:, uthpatthi:, vikhaara: and samsuddhi: |*

The present categorization is as follows: (vide verses 31 and 32):

- (1) *Praaptha praapthi: -* Attainment of something which is already with me, but, missed by me / separated from me, due to ignorance. The example given by the *Aachaaryaa* is '*kantachaameekaram' – 'a thin maalaa around the neck'*. This is a popular argument, known as '*kantachaameekara nyaayaa' |*
- (2) *Parihrutha parihaara: -* Elimination of something, which is actually non-existent, but, thought to exist, again because of ignorance. The *Aachaaryaa* gives the example of a '*ghost seen in one's own shadow on the wall' – 'chaayaa pisaasa:.'*

- (3) *Apraaptha praapthi*:- Attaining something that is not already attained. An example will be *svargaa*, which one does not have, but, would like to attain.
- (4) *Aparihrutha parihaara*:- Removal of a problem very much with me – a problem which is real and not imaginary. An example is a disease in one's body.

The first line of verse 31, talks of the first category of goals – "*praapthaysa praapthi*:" - "*Lipsathe ajnaanatha: alabdham kante chaameekaram yathaa*" – "similar to desiring to attain the thin *maalaa*, already around the neck, because of ignorance /oversight.

The second line of verse 31 and the first line of verse 32, talk of the second category - "*parihruthasya parihaara*:" – "*aathmana: chaayaayaam svatha: varjitham raksha: parijiheersathi moha avanaddha aathmaa bhraanthayaa bhayaath yathaa*" – "similar to desiring to get rid of the non-existent ghost, wrongly perceived on one's own shadow, out of fear, with a mind covered by delusion".

The second line of verse 32, mentions the third and fourth categories of goals.

Alabdham lipsathe - Desires to get what has not been attained (*apraaptha praapthi*).

No example is given by the *Aachaaryaa*, for this category, since the "un-attained" are obvious.

Aparihrutham vasthu (parijiheersathi) - (Desires to be rid of) an object/a problem, which is real / not imaginary.

Before starting any *saadhanaa*, the seeker has to be clear as to:

- (1) under which category *mokshaa* will come, and
- (2) in which field *karmaa* will help.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 33:

तत्र एतेषु चतुर्षु विषयेषु प्राप्तये परिहाराय च विभज्य न्यायः प्रदर्श्यते ।

Among these four cases, in the matter of attaining and avoiding, the principle is exhibited through analysis.

A seeker has to have clarity, first, with regard to *saadhyam* (his goal) and then, with regard to the appropriate *saadhanaa* (the means to achieve the goal).

- तत्र - In this context,
- एतेषु चतुर्षु विषयेषु - among these four types of goals,
- न्यायः - the principles / rules

- प्राप्तये - of the two types of praapthi:
- परिहाराय च - and also of the two types of removal,
- प्रदर्शयते - are presented
- विभज्य - distinctly.

Claiming 'knowledge' and disclaiming 'moksha' is because of ignorance. The statement "I have understood *Vedhaanthaa*; but, I am not a *muktha*:" is absurd; it results from the fact, that, though the teaching has been received, the content of the teaching has not been dwelt upon. The *Aachaaryaa*, therefore, says "*pradharshyathe*" – "shall analyze properly" (the 'means' of attaining these four types of goals).

Chapter I: Verse 33 –

प्राप्तव्यपरिहार्येषु जात्वोपायाञ्छुतेः पृतक् ।
कृत्वाथ प्राप्नुयात्प्राप्यं तथानिष्टं जहात्यपि ॥ ३३ ॥

In relation to what is to be got and what is to be got rid of in reality, one should find out from the *sruthi*, the appropriate means in a clear manner and get what is to be got and get rid of what is to be got rid of, using the appropriate means.

The *Aachaaryaa* first takes up analysis of the means to attain the third and fourth types of goals – '*apraapthasya praapthi*:' (like *svargaa* etc.) and '*aparihruthasya parihaara*:' (like disease etc.). To achieve these goals, one needs to first acquire the *karma jnaanam* (knowledge about the 'means') and then venture into the actual *karmaa* (performance of the appropriate action). For *praapthi*., one should have the information, as to what action is to be performed to attain what is desired to be attained. For *parihaara*.: also, one should have the knowledge, as to what action is required for elimination or removal of the problem. The knowledge is to be followed by performance of the appropriate *karmaa*, which, is also essential for both goals.

- प्राप्तव्य परिहार्येषु - For attaining the really un-attained and for elimination of the really existing problem,
- श्रुतेः उपायान् जात्वा - learning the appropriate rituals to be performed from the Vedaa-s,
- पृतक् - distinctly / thoroughly,
- अथ कृत्वा - and, performing the prescribed rituals, after thus learning about them,
- प्राप्यं प्राप्नुयात् - what has not been attained will be obtained ;
- तथा अनिष्टं अपि जहाति - in the same manner, problems also are eliminated.

One requires the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, for these two goals. *Jnaana Kaandaa* will not help.

As for the first two types of goals, viz., '*Praaptha praapthi*:' and '*Parihrutha parihaara*:', the 'means' are different and are explained in the following verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 34:**अथ अवशिष्टयोः स्वभावत एव ।****Now, on the remaining two cases, which are natural:**

***Sukham* or happiness comes under *praaptha vishayam* i.e., we already have it, since the source for *sukham* is only *aathmaa*; the world cannot give us peace and joy. Likewise, 'removal of sorrow' is also a *praaptha vishaya*; because sorrow does not really exist; it is only an 'assumption' ; sorrows is a non-existent thing – a *parihrutham*.**

Chapter I: Verse 34 –**परिहृतावाप्तयोर्बोधात् हानप्राप्ती न कर्मणा ।****मोहमात्रान्तरायवात्क्रियया ते न सिध्यतः ॥ ३४ ॥**

Through enlightenment, he must get rid of the two illusions, viz., (i) 'what is accomplished already, is unaccomplished' and (ii) 'what is really non-existent, is to be rid of'. This two-fold achievement is only through enlightenment and not through any action. So, these ends cannot be gained by any exertion, by way of action.

- हानप्राप्ती - The removal and attainment
- (स्वभावात्) परिहृत अवाप्तयोः - of the (naturally) absent problems and of the (naturally) present attainments ,
- बोधात् (संभवन्ति) - (result) through knowledge.
- न कर्मणा (संभवन्ति) - (They) do not result through action.

Parihrutham can be taken as *dhu:kham*, which is already absent in *aathmaa*; *avaapthi*: may be taken to mean *poornathvam* or *sukham*, which is the nature of *aathmaa*. Since 'absence of *dhu:kham*' and 'presence of *sukham*' are already 'my' nature, what is needed to get rid of the seemingly existent *dhu:kham* and attain the seemingly absent *sukham*, is the mere knowledge, that, 'they are my nature'. No action is needed.

- मोह मात्र अन्तरायत्वात् - Since the distance between me and these two is caused only by wrong notions,

antharaaya: - gap / distance / separating factor ; moham - wrong notion.

What is the jnaanam that will remove the 'distance'? Ans: The awareness "I am sukha svarooपा: | dhu:kha rahitha: |"

- क्रियया ते न सिध्यत : - they (the removal and attainment) are not achieved by any type of karmaa (including paaraayanam, japam and dhyaanam).

Saasthravichaaraa should continue till one understands that *mokshaa* is one's nature and that one does not require anything else for *mokshaa*. The 'understanding' includes the understanding that nothing else except 'understanding', is required for *mokshaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 35 :

कस्मात्पुनरात्मवस्तुयाथात्म्यावबोधमात्रादेवाभिलषितनिरतिशयसुखावाप्तिनिश्चेष दुःखनिवृत्ती भवतो न कर्मणेति । उच्यते ।

What is the ground for holding that the attainment of infinite bliss and the complete cessation of misery is brought about only by the knowledge of the real nature of the Self and not by action? The reply follows:

Sureswaraacharya had given two arguments to establish that *karmaa* cannot give *moksha*. The first argument was based on '*karma hethu vichaara:*', viz., that, the cause of *karmaa* being ignorance, *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance and therefore cannot give *mokshaa*. The second argument was based on '*karma pala vichaara:*' meaning 'analysis of the results of *karmaa*'.

In this verse, he gets back to the "*karma hethu vichaaraa*" topic. The *sambhandha gadhyam* is a presumed question, addressed to the *Aacharya*, by the student of *Vedhaanthaa*, followed by the *Aacharya*'s assurance that he will answer the question.

- कस्मात् - On what grounds,
- अभिलषित निरतिशय सुख अवाप्तिः - "The attainment of absolute sukham, desired by all (in other words, 'mokshaa')

abilashitha – desired by all; nirathisaya - absolute / without gradation. Both are adjectives to sukham. Other desires may differ from person to person. Sarva abhilashitha sukham (i.e. sukham desired by all) is mokshaa.

- निश्चेष दुःख निवृत्तिः - (and) freedom from all sorrows,

Nissesha – without any balance / complete / all.

- आत्मवस्तु याथात्म्य अवबोधमात्रात् एव - (result) only by the knowledge of the real nature of the Self.

aathma vasthu - Self / aathmaa ; yaathaathmyam - real nature ; avabodham - knowledge ; maathraath eva - only by.

- न कर्मणा - (and) not by action"
- इति भवतः - is this statement made by you ?

Both "attainment of *moksha sukham*" and "complete cessation of misery" are possible by *jnaanam* and **only** by *jnaanam*, asserts Sureswaraacharya. Even some *Advaitins* believe that there are four routes to *mokshaa*, namely, *karma yogaa*, *bhakthi yogaa*, *raja*

yogaa and *jnaana yogaa*. This is a wrong view. There is **only** one route – '*jnaanaa*'. Sureswaraachaaryaa stress this, based on facts.

- उच्यते - "I will tell you" (the *Aachaaryaa* assures).

Verse 35 – Chapter I :

कर्मज्ञानसमुत्थत्वान्नालं मोहाप्तये ।

सम्यग्ज्ञानं विरोध्यस्य तामिस्रस्यांशुमानिव ॥ ३५ ॥

Action itself arises from ignorance and hence it cannot remove the latter. Perfect knowledge is the antithesis of ignorance, even as the sun is in relation to darkness.

Certain goals can be reached by different routes; for example, a temple on the hilltop. Different pathways may be provided; different types of vehicles can be used. But, certain other goals can be reached only by one 'means'; for instance "removal of darkness", which can be achieved only by one means, viz., "bringing in a light". Likewise "*ajnaana nivrutthi*" is the **only** means for removal of self-ignorance.

"*Karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance, because it is born out of ignorance. So, it cannot give *mokshaa*" repeats Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this verse.

21. Chapter I, Verses 35 and 36 (02-09-2006)

In this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa is negating the *karmavaadhin-s*, establishing that *karmaa* cannot give liberation, either by itself or by joining *jnaanam*. The *Aachaaryaa* accepts *karmaa* as a means to *chittha suddhi*; there is no dispute on the fact that *karmaa* is very, very essential for preparing the mind. But, to the question "with regard to a person, who has already purified the mind, what is the role of *karmaa*?", Sureswaraachaaryaa replies, that, for such a person, *karmaa* has no role at all, since it cannot give liberation independently or in association with *jnaanam*.

He gave two reasons, as to why *karmaa* cannot give liberation:

Reason 1: *Karmaa* is born out of desire; desire is born out of ignorance ; so, *karmaa* is a product of ignorance; therefore, it cannot destroy ignorance and therefore, it cannot give *mokshaa*.

Reason 2: If an "analysis of the various results of *karmaa*" (*karma pala vichaaraa*;) is done, it can be concluded that, while *apraapthasya praapthi*: and *apariruthasya parihaara*: can be achieved by *karmaa*, the other two types of results – *praapthasya praapthi*: and *pariruthasya parihaara*: - can be achieved only by *jnaanam*. *Mokshaa* comes under '*praaptha*:' – 'the already attained' and, therefore, does not need action.

Thus, by the two methods of reasoning, 'karma hethu vichaara:' and 'karma pala vichaara:', the *Aachaaryaa* established: "karmanaa moksha: na sambhavathi" .

In verse 35, he comes back to hethu vichaara:, with the intention of meeting another poorva pakshaa argument. The repetition of hethu vichaara: is for the purpose of refuting that specific poorva pakshaa objection, which the *Aachaaryaa* intends presenting in the next verse (no. 36). Reverting to the current verse (no. 35):

- **कर्म अज्ञान समुत्थत्वात्** - Since *karmaa* is born out of ignorance,

As already analyzed, *karmaa* is born out of desire, which is born out of misconception, which, in turn, is born out of ignorance.

- **न अलं मोह अपनुत्तये** - (it) is not capable of removing ignorance.

Alam - capable; *moha* – *ajnaanam* (ignorance); *apanutthi*: - removal.

Karmaa cannot remove ignorance; without removal of ignorance, *mokshaa* is not possible. Hence, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*.

Then, what will give *mokshaa*? Answer follows:

- **सम्यग्ज्ञानं** - The correct / perfect / valid knowledge

Correct or perfect jnaanam is aathma jnaanam, born out of vedhaantha pramaanam; no other pramaanam can give aathma jnaanam.

- **अस्य विरोधि** - (is) the enemy (destroyer) of this (ignorance),

Knowledge alone is inimical to ignorance. The *Aachaaryaa* gives an example.

- **तामिस्रस्य अंशुमान् इव** - similar to sunlight (being the enemy) of darkness.

Only light is inimical to darkness; and, therefore, darkness can be removed only by light. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* gives the same example in Verse 3 of his *Aathma Bodham*, which runs:

अविरोधितया कर्म नाविद्यां विनिवर्तयेत् ।

विद्याविद्यां निहन्त्येव तेजस्तिमिरसङ्घवत् ॥ ३॥

avirōdhitayā karma nāvidyām vinivartayēt |

vidyāvīdyām nihantyeva **tējastimirasaṅghavat** || 3||

– “since *karmaa* is not inimical to ignorance, it does not remove or destroy ignorance. **Just as light destroys darkness**, only *jnaanam* can destroy *ajnaanam*”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa now introduces the new *poorva pakshaa*, unique to *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 36:

ननु आत्मज्ञानं अपि अविध्योपादानम् । न हि शास्त्रशिष्याचार्याधि अनुपदाय आत्मज्ञानं आत्मानं लभत इति ।

“But “it may be objected “surely the knowledge of the Self does not occur independent of diverse factors, like the scripture, teacher and disciple. Thus, even the knowledge of the Self is a product of ignorance”.

Up to this, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*, is the new *poorva pakshaa*. The *poorva pakshir's* objection is: “You say, that, *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance, because *karmaa* is born out of ignorance. Then, by the same reasoning, *jnaanam* also cannot destroy ignorance, since *jnaanam* is also born out of ignorance, though not directly, but indirectly. Just as *karmaa* has *ajnaanam* as its ultimate cause, *jnaanam* also has *ajnaanam* alone as its basic cause”. The *poorva pakshin* explains how: “Your (the *Vedhaanthir's*) arguments are that the ultimate truth is *advaitam* and, that, any form of duality is born out of *ajnaanam*. If, thus, *ajnaanam* is the cause of *any* form of *dvaitam*, *ajnaanam* must be the cause of *guru-*

sishya-saasthra dvaitham also. But, how is 'knowledge' born? It is born of *guru-saasthra-upadesa*. *Upadesa* is born of *guru-sishya-saasthra dvaitham* and *jnaanam* is born of *guru-saasthra-upadesa*. Without *guru-sishya-saasthra* distinction, *jnaanam* cannot be attained. So, it follows, ultimately, that *jnaanam* is also born of *ajnaanam*. How then, can you claim that *jnaanam* will destroy *ajnaanam*, which is the cause of the very rise of *jnaanam*? The logic that you applied to *karmaa*, will have to be applied to *jnaanam* also".

Expressed in Sanskrit, the *poorva pakshin's* objection to the *Vedhaanthin* is: "Yena kaaraanena karmaa ajnaanam na naasayathi ithi thvayaa uktham thena eva kaaranena jnaanam api ajnaanam naiva naasayathi | Thasmaath 'jnaanaath eva kaivalyam' ithi thava siddhaantha: dhushta:"

- ननु आत्मज्ञानं अपि अविध्योपादानम् - But, self-knowledge is also born of avidhya.

'*Upaadhaanam*' means '*kaaranam*'. Here, the usage is '*bahuvreehi samaasam*', similar to referring to King *Dasarathaa* as '*Ramaputhra*.' – 'one whose son is Rama'.

- आत्मज्ञानं आत्मानं न लभते हि - Surely, the knowledge of the Self is not attained by the seeker,

'*aathmaanam*', in this context, refers to the seeker and not to the *sacchidhaanandha aathmaa*.

- शास्त्र शिष्य आचार्याधि अनुपदाय - without resorting to (diverse factors like) the scriptures, disciple and teacher.

'*anupadhaaya*' means 'without resorting to'.

"*Aatma jnaanam* can be attained, only by resorting to plurality, in the form of teacher, scriptures and disciple. Plurality is *ajnaanam*, according to the *Advaithin*. It follows therefore, that *ajnaanam* is the root cause of *jnaanam*. Then, in what manner, is *jnaanam* better than *karmaa*? If *jnaanam* can give *mokshaa*, *karmaa* also can give *mokshaa*. Conversely, if, as you say, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*, because it is born out of *ajnaanam*, by the same reasoning *jnaanam* also cannot give *mokshaa*" is the argument of the *poorva pakshin*. The *Aachaaryaa* answers:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 (Contd.)

नैष दोषः । यतः आत्मज्ञानं हि स्वतस्सिद्धपरमार्थं आत्मवस्तुस्वरूपमात्रं
आश्रयादेवाविध्यातदुत्पन्नकारकग्रामप्रध्वंसि स्वात्मोत्पत्तावेव शास्त्राध्यपेक्षते नोत्पन्नमविध्यानिवृत्तौ ।

My conclusion is not wrong. The knowledge of the Self rests only on the essential nature of the Self, which is Self-established and the ultimate Reality. It is destructive, therefore, of ignorance and the operating factors emerging from it.

Moreover, while, Self-knowledge depends on factors like the scriptures etc., for coming into being, it does not depend on scriptures etc., after coming into being, for destroying ignorance.

The answer of the *Aachaaryaa* to the *poorva pakshir's* objection is very important and subtle. Sureswaraachaaryaa, first, accepts that 'rise of knowledge' requires plurality. Because knowledge is born out of *pramaanam*, *saasthraa-s* **are** required. *Guru-sishya* interaction and therefore *guru-sishya* distinction **are** required. With respect to *jnaana uthpatthi*, therefore, *dvaitham* is required, exactly as for *karma uthpatthi*. "*Uthpatthi vishaye jnaanam karmaa cha samaanam eva*" meaning "with regard to 'rise', both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* are the same". For *karma uthpatthi*, the plurality of *karthaa*, *karanam* and *karmaa* are required. For *jnaana uthpatthi*, the plurality of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* (or *jnaathaa*, *jnaanam* and *jnyeyam*) are required. Both types of plurality are born out of *ajnaanam*. Sureswaraachaaryaa agrees, that, *Ajnaanam* is the base for *jnaana uthpatthi*., as for *karma uthpatthi*:. *Karma uthpatthivathu jnaana uthpatthi: api ajnaanam aasrayeth*. Up to this point, both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* are the same.

The difference, thereafter, is, the fact, that, *jnaanam* destroys *ajnaanam* only because of its unique power, which unique power is **not** dependent on either *dvaitham* or *ajnaanam*, and, therefore, it can, by itself, destroy *ajnaanam*. What is that unique power?

For explaining this, an example is given by *another Aachaaryaa* (not Sureswaraachaaryaa): One requires different accessories to produce a flame, such as oil, oil holder, wick, match box etc. In other words, the flame is dependent on these materials for its 'rise'. But, the power of the flame to destroy darkness – the *andhakaara nivarthaka sakthi* of the flame – does not depend on these accessories, since the accessories themselves are not luminous. None of them has any 'light' in it. They are not responsible nor do they support the flame in destroying the darkness. It is only the inherent nature of the flame that destroys darkness. Likewise, *jnaana uthpatthi*: depends on plurality – *saasthraa-s*, *guru*, *sishyaa* etc. But, *jnaana palan* or *jnaana kaaryam* – "removal of darkness" – does not depend on plurality.

The destructive power of 'knowledge' is said to depend only on the 'validity' of the 'knowledge'. 'Validity' of the knowledge, in turn, depends on the content or 'object' of knowledge; in other words, any 'valid' knowledge is 'valid', only if the object of the knowledge is the fact / the truth. This statement can be better understood using the well-known analogy of the 'rope-snake'; the 'rope-knowledge' is valid, because the knowledge of the object, the 'rope' is true, whereas 'snake-knowledge' is not valid, since the 'snake' is false. Similarly, *Advaita jnaanam* is valid, because of the object of the *advaita jnaanam* is *Advaitam*, which is *sathyam*. The validity of the *advaita jnaanam* depends on the truth of *advaitam*. Therefore, the validity does not depend on *dvaitham*.

In short, 'rise of *jnaanam*' depends on *dvaitham*, while 'destructive power of *jnaanam*' depends on *advaitam*. *Advaita Jnaanam*, whose destructive power depends only on the *advaita thathvam*, is capable of destroying both *ajnaanam* and *dvaitham*. In contrast, with respect to *karmaa*, the 'rise of *karmaa*' is dependent on *dvaitham* and the *karmapalan* is also dependent on *dvaitham*; i.e. both *uthpatthi* and function of *karmaa* depend on *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam*.

Reverting to the text:

- न एव दोष : - My conclusion is not wrong,
- यत : - the reason being that
- आत्मज्ञानं प्रध्वंसि - self-knowledge is the destroyer
- अविद्यात् उत्पन्न कारक ग्रामं - of the group of plurality, born out of ignorance,

avidhyaath - from ignorance ; uthpanna – born; kaaraka graamam-group of plurality.

"*Aatma jnaanam* is destroyer of ignorance and ignorance-born plurality" is the essence of this statement. But, how?

- (आत्म ज्ञानं) स्वतस्सिद्ध परमार्थ आत्मवस्तुस्वरूपमात्र आश्रयादेव - because (self-knowledge) depends only on the essential nature of the Self, which is self-established and is the ultimate Reality.

Aathma vasthu svaroopam - real nature of *aathmaa*; *svatha: siddha* – independent / self established (adjective to *aathma vasthu*); *paramaatha* – ultimate Reality (another adjective to *aathma vasthu*); *maathra eva* - merely (not dependent on *saasthra- aachaaryaa-sishya* relationships); *aasrayaath* – because of dependence.

'Snake knowledge' is invalid since the snake is 'false'. 'Rope knowledge' is valid, since rope is the 'truth'. (This comparison is repeated, to make the following statement clear).

"*Vishayasya sathyathvam eva jnaasya yaathartham*" meaning "The truth of the 'object' of knowledge gives validity to knowledge ; conversely, the validity of knowledge depends on the truth of the 'object' of knowledge" is a fundamental principle of epistemology – science of language.

- आत्मज्ञानं) शास्त्राधि अपेक्षते - (Self-knowledge) depends on *saasthraa-s* etc., (i.e. on *dvaitham*),
- स्वात्म उत्पत्तौ एव - only for its 'rise'.
- उत्पन्नं - (The self-knowledge) which has thus risen (from duality),
- (शास्त्राधि) न (अपेक्षते) - does not depend on *saasthraa-s* etc.,
- अविद्या निवृत्तौ - in the matter of elimination of ignorance,

Jnaanam born of *ajnaanam* destroys *ajnaanam*. Verse 7, of the *Dasa Slokee* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* is relevant here. It declares "na saasthaa na saasthram na sishyo na sikshaa" , after attainment of knowledge.

Bhaagavadha Mahaa Puraanaa gives an example for this. In dense forests, during the hot summer, forest fires result due to friction between trees; the fires have the power to destroy the very tress of which they are born. So does *jnaanam* ; though born out of ignorance, it can and does destroy ignorance. On the other hand, *karmaa's* position, at all times, depends only on *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam*. So, it cannot destroy *ajnaanam*. This is what is stated in the next sentence of the *sambhandha gadhyam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 (Contd):

कर्म पुनः स्वात्मोत्पत्तौ उत्पन्नं च ।

But, the position is different, in the case of action. It depends on ignorance both for origination and the subsequent efficacy.

Sureswaraacharya wants to highlight the difference between *karmaa* and *jnaanam*. *Karmaa* is dependent on *dvaitham* both for its rise (implementation) and its *palan* (results), consisting of *sukha* / *dhu:kha* experiences.

- पुनः - On the other hand (in this context),
- कर्मा - *karmaa*,
- स्वात्म उत्पन्नौ - for its rise
- उत्पन्नं च - and also for its functioning (depends on *dvaitham*).

Karmaa's very survival depends upon *dvaitham* i.e. *ajnaanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 : (Contd.)

नहि क्रिया कारकनिस्स्पृहा कल्पकोटिव्यवहितफलदानायस्वात्मानं बिभर्ति साध्यमानमात्ररूपत्वात्तस्याः ।

Action cannot continue in being, to produce its results, in the remote future, without the sustaining help of other factors in the interval, for its very essence lies in being a product of the productive factors.

Sureswaraacharya continues to talk on the differences between *jnaanam* and *karmaa*.

Jnaanam, for destruction of *ajnaanam*, is not dependent on time also. "Removal of darkness" is simultaneous with "rise of flame"; similarly, *jnaanam* gives *advaita palan* instantaneously; even *jnaanavrutthi* is destroyed. *Jnaanam* does not require *dvaitham* for its continued existence; in fact, the continued existence of knowledge is not even required, since it has finished its work immediately on its arrival.

'Aham Brahma asmi jnaanam also gets falsified, *'kathaka renuvath'* as asserted by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in his *Aathma Bodham*.

A *jnaani* does not even claim "I am a *jnaani*". Verse 5 of *Maneesha Panchakam* refers to "such a one who has dissolved his individual intellect in the Eternal Ocean of Bliss, is verily *Brahman*, not a mere knower of *Brahman*" – "*yasmin nithya sukha ambudhau galitha dheer: brahmaiva na brahmavidh'*".

Karmaa, on the other hand, requires continued existence to give its *palan*.

22. Chapter I, Verses 36 (09-09-2006)

Sureswaraacharya is establishing that *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance and, therefore, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa* also. Among many reasons, one reason he gives, is, "Karmaa itself is born out of *avidhyaa*". When this is mentioned, the *poorva pakshin* raises an objection: "If *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance, because it is born of ignorance, then, *jnaanam* also cannot destroy ignorance, since *jnaanam* is also born of ignorance". He explains: "*Jnaanam* is born of the *thriputi* of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*, which would mean that *jnaana uthpatthi*: (rise of knowledge) is dependent on *dvaitham*, which, even according to you (*vedhaanthin*), is born of *ajnaanam*. Then, how can that *jnaanam*, born of *ajnaanam*, destroy *ajnaanam*?"

To this objection, Sureswaraacharya first concedes: "It is true, that, both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* require *dvaitham* for their *jnaanam* or *uthpatthi* – *karmaa* requires *karthaa*, *karanam* and *karmaa* and *jnaanam* requires *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. *Thriputi janyathvam* is common to both and, therefore, *ajnaana janyathvam* is common to both". (The term *avidhyaa upaadhaanam* was used in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 36, to mean *ajnaana janyathvam*).

"But", the *Aacharya* says "even though both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* are born out of *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam*, while *karmaa* requires *ajnaanam* and *dvaitham* for giving its results also (i.e. for doing its functions), *jnaanam* does **not** depend on *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam* for **its** function. This is because *jnaanam*'s validity is said to be dependent only on its 'content' (the 'object of the *jnaanam*') being a fact. *Aathmajnaanam*'s 'object of knowledge' is *advaitam*, which is *sathyam*; purely depending on the *advaita vasthu*, *aathmajnaanam* gets its validity and because of this validity, destroys ignorance and destroys *dvaitham* also. *Jnaanam* does not depend on *avidhyaa* or *dvaitham*, for its function of destroying *samsaaraa*". He says (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 35): "*Aathmajnaanam svaathma uthpannau eva saasthraadhi apekshathe; uthpannam avidhyaa nivrutthau saasthraadhi na apekshathe*", meaning "For its rise alone, self-knowledge depends on scriptures etc.; but, for elimination of self-ignorance, it does not."

An example (given in another text, by another *Aacharya*) for this aspect of *jnaanam*, is the rise and function of a flame. The flame requires accessories such as oil, oil-holder, wick, match-box etc., for its rise. But, once the flame is lighted, it does not depend on the accessories for its function of "destroying darkness", which function, it achieves by its own inherent nature. The oil, wick, match box etc., cannot be said to destroy the darkness, since they are not luminous by themselves. In short, the flame is dependent on oil etc., only for its *uthpatthi*, but not for its function of *andhakaara nivrutthi*.

"In contrast, *karmaa* continues to depend on *ajnaanam* and *dvaitham*, even after its rise", the *Aachaaryaa* points out (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 35): "*Karmaa puna: svaathma uthpannau uthpannam cha dvaitham apekshathey*" –"*karmaa*, on the other hand, for its rise and also after its rise, depends on *dvaitham*". *Karmaa* requires *dvaitham* for its continued existence, as well as, for its function. Sureswaraachaaryaa explains this statement, in the portion, now under study.

This portion highlights this important difference between *jnaanam* and *karmaa*.

Any knowledge requires *thriputi* (three factors) for its **rise** – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* (the knower, a valid source and the object of knowledge). For *aathmajnaanam*, the *pramaathaa* is the student, the *pramaanam*-s are *guru* and *saasthraa*-s and the *prameyam* is *aathmaa*. For a qualified disciple, the *saadhana chathushtaya sampananna sishyaa*, knowledge 'rises' even at the time of *sravanam* and simultaneously the 'ignorance' is 'destroyed'. The knowledge does not require even time to destroy the 'ignorance'. This is similar to the flame destroying the darkness, the moment it is lit. 'Rise' of the flame and 'elimination' of darkness are simultaneous. *Jnaanam*, therefore, need not even continue to stay, for destroying ignorance, since, even as it rises, it has done its job of removing ignorance. "*Aham Brahma Asmi*" *vriththi* has destroyed ignorance. Even if the *vriththi* continues, it cannot be called *jnaana vriththi*, since it will deserve that name only at the time of removal of ignorance.

On the other hand, in the case of *karmaa*, *karmaa* cannot provide the *palan* immediately, but, has to wait for a time, to give its results. The *jyothishmaya yaaghaa*, for instance, will give *svargaa* (its promised result) to the *karthaa*, only after the *karthaa's praarabhdhaa* gets exhausted. This means that *karmaa* has to 'survive' for completing its function at the appropriate time; therefore, *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam* will continue to be required by *karmaa*, in contrast to *jnaanam*, which has no more function, once it has risen.

- क्रिया - Any action
- न बिभति - does not survive
- स्वात्मानं - by itself
- कारक निस्स्पृहा - without depending on instruments / accessories,

Nisspruhaa – without depending; *kaarakaa*-s - instruments or accessories (*devathaa*-s, *yagnyaa*-s, *agni kundaa*-s etc., will come under *kaarakaa*-s).

- कल्पकोटिव्यवहितफलदानाय - since (*karmaa*) may have to give results in the remote future, probably after the passage of even many *kalpaa*-s;

vyavahitha – far away / remote; *kalpa koti* - crores of *kalpaa-s*; *Brahmaaj/s* one day is a *kalpaa*, consisting of 2000 *chathuryughaa-s*.

This fact explains why, in our experience, at times, even good people meet with sufferings, while sinners lead happy, prosperous lives.

Karmaa has to 'stay' for giving results; so, it continues to require *dvaitham* and *ajnaanam*. This statement gives rise to the question: "Why? It is clear that *karmaa* needs *dvaitham* for its *uthpatthi*, but, why is it said to be dependent on *dvaitham* for its continuity?"

The question / doubt arises, since any object depends on various factors while it is being produced, but, not for its existence thereafter.

Sureswaraachaaryaa answers this doubt. He says that the above observation may be true of an object; but, **not true** of an action.

- **तस्याः साध्यमानमात्र रूपत्वात्** - this is because 'action' is in the form of a process.

Thasyaa: - kriyaayaa: |

Action is different from an object / a substance, in that, action is *saadhyamaana roopam* (a process), while a substance is *siddha roopam* (a product). A process cannot exist independently; an example is the *Veddhaantha* class itself, which is the process of speech, requiring a teacher, the students, the class room, the subject of study etc. *Karmaa* cannot exist independently, without *dvaitham* in the form of *kaarakaa-s* (subject, object, instrument etc.) and, therefore, is dependent on *dvaitham* for its very survival and therefore, on *ajnaanam*. *Karmaa*, therefore, cannot afford to destroy *ajnaanam*, on which it depends for its very survival **also**.

Of course, *Jnaanam* is also a process, 'happening' in the mind, as a result of *thriputi*. But, *jnaanam* does not have to continue for doing its function, since it completes its job, on its 'rise' itself. In fact, it is more appropriate to say that 'a *jnaani* does not have *ajnaanam*', than to say 'a *jnaani* has *jnaanam*'. The *jnaanam* came and has destroyed the *ajnaanam*, in a *jnaani*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 (Contd.) :

न च क्रिया आत्मज्ञानवत् स्वात्मप्रतिलम्भकाले एव स्वर्गादिपलेन कर्तारं संबध्नाति ।

***Karmaa* cannot put the agent in possession of results aimed at, like heaven, in the very moment of his execution of it (unlike knowledge which is effective instantaneously).**

The prathignyaa vaakyam (karma puna: svaathma uthpatthau uthpannam cha) is explained in this sentence.

- क्रिया - Karmaa
- कर्तारं स्वर्गादिपलेन न संबध्नाति - does not connect / link the 'performer' to the results like *svarghaa* etc.
- स्वात्मप्रतिलम्भकाले एव - even at the time of its very uthpatthi,
- आत्मज्ञानवत् - as *aathmajnaanam* does.

Prathilambha kaale – uthpatthi kaale (at the time of execution of the action)

Aathmajnaanam gives its benefit, viz., 'destroying ignorance', instantaneously, on its *uthpatthi*, whereas *karmaa* does not give the benefit, immediately on the performance of *karmaa*. Action has to survive as *adhrishtam* (in *Vedhaanthic* language) or *apoorvam* (in *poorva meemaamsaa* language) for a length of time, to give its results.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 (Contd.):

आत्मज्ञानं पुनः पुरुषार्थसिद्धौ न उत्पद्यमानस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेण अन्यद्रूपान्तरं साधनान्तरं वापेक्षते ।

On the contrary, the knowledge of the Self does not require the assumption of any other form or use of any other means, apart from its emergence into being, in the matter of effectuating the good sought through it.

- पुनः - On the other hand,
- आत्मज्ञानं - Self-knowledge
- पुरुषार्थ सिद्धौ - in the accomplishment of moksha siddhi (in this context),
- न अपेक्षते - does not depend on
- अन्यत् - any extraneous factor
- उत्पद्यमानस्वरूपव्यतिरेकेण - other than its own uthpatthi / other than the condition of its being born;

Jnaanam does not depend on *guru*, *sasthraa-s*, *pramaanam* etc., **for its function**. It does not even require their presence.

It does not require time factor also, as the use of the term '*uthpadhyamaana*' shows. '*Uthpadhyamaana*' is a 'present passive participle' use, stressing the fact that 'as even as knowledge is born, ignorance is destroyed'. If a 'past passive principle' had been used, it would have meant 'after the rise of the knowledge, ignorance is destroyed', which implies a time gap, between the 'rise' of knowledge and the 'elimination' of ignorance. As soon as one understands that one is *saakshi chaithanya svaroopaa*., the very understanding helps one to claim that one is *sarva samsaara varjitha*: /

In this context, it may be noted, that, there is a difference between 'information' and 'knowledge'. The 'content' of 'information' is a mere statement from others. 'Knowledge', by definition, is knowledge only when the 'content' of 'knowledge' is a fact for 'me', the knower.

"I am ever free" is the content of self-knowledge. "It is a fact; it is not just a theory of the *Upanishad-s*" will be the conviction, when one has acquired self-knowledge.

- **रूपान्तरं (न अपेक्षत)** - nor does it ('Self-knowledge') depend on knowledge in any other form (for accomplishment of *moksha siddhi*).

Certain philosophers talk of two versions of knowledge – the first version, which is acquired at the time of *sravanam* and the second version, when the acquired knowledge gets converted into realization through meditation. Thus, they divide 'understanding' into knowledge-type-understanding and realization-type-understanding, of which, they believe, only the latter will give liberation. Sureswaraacharya does not agree. According to him, proper study of *Vedhaanthaa* gives the student the **final** knowledge, which does not require any type of transformation or transmutation or improvement. Hence, the *Aacharya* says "*roopaantharam na apekshathe*", meaning that *aathmajnaanam* does not need any improvement for achieving liberation.

- **साधनान्तरं वा (न अपेक्षते)**- nor does Self-knowledge depend on any further action (*karma samucchayaa*) for accomplishment of *moksha siddhi*.

Meditation, *japaa*, *paaraayanam* etc. are not required for improvement of the acquired self-knowledge. They are required only for *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, which, no doubt, is an essential qualification for the seeker, since, till the seeker gets this *sampatthi*, *Vedhaanthaa* remains only as 'information'. But, it should be noted, that performance of such *saadhana-s* does not convert the information into knowledge or make any improvement to the acquired knowledge. It converts **only** the seeker ; it makes him fit for receiving the knowledge. In short, the 'improvement' is made to the seeker.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36 (Contd.) :

कुत एतत् । यतः ।

How is that? The reason follows:

Sureswaraacharya himself asks:

- **कुत एतत्** - Why do I say so ? (that jnaanam does not require any extraneous factor, other than "understanding", to give liberation)

- यतः - Because, (The answer is in the verse that follows).

Chapter I: Verse 36 –

बलवद्दि प्रमाणोत्थं सम्यग्ज्ञानं न बाध्यते ।

आकाङ्क्षते न चाप्यन्यद्साधनं प्रति साधनम् ॥ ३६ ॥

Perfect knowledge, which is strong, being based on the right evidences, is not liable to be cancelled. In its work of cancelling errors, it needs the help of no other factor.

This verse highlights the importance of *saasthraa*-s and the importance of listening to the *saasthraa*-s properly.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: “*Saasthraa* is a *pramaanam*. It produces knowledge, which destroys ignorance. Just as darkness cannot fight light and does not even have the power to stay in the presence of light, ignorance also has no power to stay in the presence of proper knowledge, which instantaneously destroys ignorance. The entire *samsaaraa*, *dvaittha prapancham*, the dream-world, *praarabhdha-sanchitha-aagaami karmaa-s*, *vaasanaa-s* etc. are all based on *ajnaanam* only. All these *karmaa-s* and *vaasanaa-s* have been collected over *kalpakoti janmaa-s* and, therefore, quantitatively very huge. But, since they are based on ignorance only, once ignorance is negated, all of them get falsified instantaneously, on acquisition of knowledge”.

Swami Chinmayaanandhaa gives an example: “Imagine a cave in a Brazilian forest, which had never been entered by a man. It had, therefore, been dark in the cave for ages. But, if a light is now lit in the cave, would it need any length of time to dispel the darkness, that has been there for thousands of years? Is not the darkness dispelled instantaneously, on the light being lit?” Likewise, *jnaanam* is so powerful that *ajnaanam*, *samsaaraa*, *karmaa-s*, *vaasanaa-s* etc., are all instantaneously destroyed by *jnaanam*. *Ajnaanam* cannot attack *jnaanam*.

23. Chapter I, Verses 36 to 38 (16-09-2006)

In this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa accepts that both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* depend on duality for their rise or *uthpatthy*. *Karmaa* requires the *thriputi* – *karthaa*, *karanam* and *karmaa*. *Jnaanam* requires the *thriputi* – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. *Thriputi* dependence is common for *karma uthpatthi* and *jnaana janyam*. *Thriputi* itself is dependent on *aathma ajnaanam*. Hence, *aathma ajnaanam* is the base for *karma uthpatthi* and *jnaana janyam*. The *Aacharyaa* concedes: "This is a fact; we accept".

But, though both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* are *ajnaana upaadhaanakam*, the ways they function are different, in two main aspects:

- (1) *Karmaa* requires continued existence for giving results, whereas *jnaanam* does not require continued existence for performing *its* functions.
- (2) *Karmaa* depends on *thriputi* for giving results also, whereas *jnaanam* does not depend on *thriputi* for doing *its* function. *Jnaanam's* validity depends on *advaitam* and therefore, for doing its function of 'destroying ignorance', it depends only on *advaitam*. This is a unique topic dealt with, by *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The moment *jnaanam* rises, it removes ignorance ; once ignorance is removed, *advaitam* is falsified, in the very wake of knowledge".

He further says : "No doubt ignorance has been existing for a long time and has a family of huge proportions - *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam*, *sanchitha*, *praarabhdha*, *aagaami karmaa-s* etc. *Jnaanam* may **appear** weak, in comparison with *ajnaanam*, to fight *ajnaanam*. It may even be doubted, that, ignorance and misconception may destroy knowledge in a fight. But, 'knowledge', being a 'fact', **is** stronger than millions of misconceptions, which are 'lies'. Falsehoods cannot stand in front of truth. *Jnaanam* cannot, therefore, be destroyed by ignorance and errors. On the other hand, *jnaanam* destroys ignorance and errors, in a trice".

One fact will survive any number of errors.

- **सम्यग्ज्ञानं न बाध्यते** - Right knowledge is not affected / cancelled,
- **बलवद्भि** - the strong *jnaanam*,

Balavaddhi is an adjective, used as a noun here, to denote *jnaanam*.

- **प्रमाण उत्थं** - having the support of *vedhaantha pramaanaa*.

The strength of 'self-knowledge' is because of the fact, that, 'self-knowledge' is based on the valid evidence of *Vedhaanthaa*.

"*Pramaanam*" in this context means "*Vedhaanthaa*". "*Pramaana uttha jnaanam*", therefore, means "self-knowledge revealed by *Vedhaanthaa*". *Prathyaksha pramaanam, anumaana pramaanam, Veda poorva pramaanam*, in fact, all *pramaanam*-s other than *Vedhaanthaa* talk **only** on *vyaavahaarika* subjects; i.e. they are all *vyaavahaarika bodhakam*. *Vedhaanthaa* is the only *pramaanam* revealing *Paaramaarthika sathyam*. Because of this fact, the *pramaanam*-s, other than *Vedhaanthaa*, cannot dent *aathma jnaanam*. Modern science also cannot affect *aathma jnaanam*, since modern science also deals with *vyaavahaarika* subjects only.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- आकाङ्क्षते च साधनम् न अन्यत् - (This knowledge) does not require the help of anything else / any other *saadhanaa* - meditation, *karmaa* etc.,

Karmaa is meant to convert only the student into a worthy listener. *Karmaa* cannot and need not improve knowledge. Once the listener is worthy, the very *sravanam* will destroy the *samsaaraa*-producing ignorance.

- बाधनं प्रति - for destroying *samsaaraa*.
Baadhanam – *samsaara naasam*; *prathi* – towards / for.

The essence: "Become a worthy listener. Listen to *Vedhaanthaa* from a proper *guru*. The job is over".

Knowledge is in the intellect; destruction of ignorance is also in the intellect. Hence, the realization "I am not *jeevaathmaa* ; I am the very *Paramaathmaa*" is a silent process.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 37:

स्वपक्षस्य हेत्ववष्टम्भेन समर्थितत्वान्निराशङ्कमुपसंहियते ।

As the position taken is fully defended by reason, the author concludes without any hesitation and uncertainty:

Sureswaraacharya restates his *siddhaanthaa*, to the *karma vaadhin*, in verse 37.

- समर्थितत्वात् - Because of the establishment,

- स्वपक्षस्य - of our own view (viz., "karmaa cannot give liberation ; jnaanam alone, independently gives liberation)
- हेतु अवष्टम्भेन - with the support of reasoning / logic,
- उपसंह्रियते the topic is now being wound up
- निराशङ्कम् - without any uncertainty / hesitation.

Chapter I: Verse 37 -

तस्माद्दुःखोदधेर्हेतोरज्ञानस्यापनुत्तये ।

सम्यग्ज्ञानं सुपर्याप्तं क्रिया चेन्नोक्तहेतुतः ॥ ३७ ॥

Therefore, perfect knowledge is sufficient for eradicating the ignorance that is the cause of the ocean of misery; and not action, for reasons already stated.

- तस्मात् - Because of the reasons given in the foregoing portion,
- सम्यग्ज्ञानं - right / proper knowledge (from right pramaanam)
- सुपर्याप्तं - is amply sufficient / more than sufficient
- अज्ञानस्य अपनुत्तये - for the removal of self-ignorance (apanutthi: - destruction)
- दुःख उदधेः हेतोः - which is the cause of the ocean of misery (samsaaraa).

Self-ignorance is the cause for mental pain, which includes the intellectual pain "why is there suffering in the world? Why should society go through problems?" etc. Only self-knowledge can remove self-ignorance and therefore, these pains.

- क्रिया चेत् - If the poorva pakshin claims that karmaa removes self-ignorance and samsaaraa (an ocean of misery),
n-i t cannot be accepted,

"Karmaa cannot remove samsaaraa; it cannot even be a support to jnaanam, in destroying ignorance". Why not ?

- उक्त हेतोः - because of the reasons already given before.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is heavily discrediting *karmaa*, throughout this chapter. But, *karmaa* **is not** useless. The *Aachaaryaa*'s contention is: "*Karmaa* cannot remove ignorance and, therefore, cannot give liberation". He does **not** say *karmaa* is useless. Later, in the same treatise, the *Aachaaryaa* will be stressing the importance of *karmaa* and how essential it is for converting the seeker into a proper listener.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 38:

ननु बलवदपि सम्यग्ज्ञानं सदप्रमाणोत्थेनासम्यग्ज्ञानेन बाध्यमानमुपलभामहे यत उत्पन्नपरमार्थबोधस्यापि कर्तृत्वभोक्त्रुत्तरागद्वेषाध्यनवबोधोत्थप्रत्यया आविर्भवन्ति ।

“But” it may be said “even if perfect knowledge is strong, we have cases in which, it is cancelled by erroneous knowledge originating from false sources. It is for this reason that even a person enlightened about Reality is subject to feelings of being an agent of actions and of being an experiencer of pleasure and pain, and subject to desire and aversions, all of which originate from ignorance”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an introduction to the next *slokaa*. The first part of the introduction, is in the form of a question from a student. “We are able to understand *Vedhaanthaa*; we accept that *jnaanam* destroys ignorance; that, all the misconceptions are also destroyed by removal of ignorance. But, the problem is, though *jnaanam* is very powerful when it rises at the time of *sravanam*, thereafter, it appears weakened and the *ajnaana janya karthruthva bokthruthva* feelings get resurrected and become so powerful, that, they seem to destroy knowledge. *Avidhyaa* and *raaghdveshaa* seem to become powerful and seem to destroy knowledge. Knowledge, therefore, may not be sufficient for destroying ignorance. It may need some other support” is the student’s doubt.

- ननु - But
- सम्यग्ज्ञानं बलवदपि सत् - though the right knowledge is powerful,
- उपलभामहे - we experience (prathyaksha anubhavena)
- बाध्यमानं - the knowledge being eliminated from us,
- असम्यग्ज्ञानेन - by mithyaa jnaanam / by ajnaanam / by erroneous notions
- अप्रमाण उत्थेन - born out of wrong pramaanam-s (adj. to asamyagjnaanam).

Wrong knowledge – *asamyag jnaanam* – is born out of non-Vedic *pramaanam-s*, such as *prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa* etc.

“Though I gain knowledge when I study scriptures (i.e. through *sravanam*), later, I find that the knowledge I have gained, is depleted by my *avidhyaa* notions. How is this? “laments the student. This is our own experience; knowledge does not seem to hold in a crisis. *Raaghaa* , *dveshaa* etc. seem to be more powerful.

- यतः - It is for this reason
- उत्पन्न परमार्थ बोधस्य अपि - even for a person enlightened about the paramaarthika sathyam,

uthpanna paramaarthaa bodha: - jnaani (aathma bodha: yasya sa: - uthpanna paramaarthaa bodha:)

- अनवबोधोत्थ प्रत्ययाः - erroneous notions, originating from ignorance (such as)
- कर्तृत्व भोक्तृत्व राग द्वेषादि - the feelings of (1) being an agent of actions (2) being an agent of experiences of results (3) desires (4) aversions etc.,
- आविर्भवन्ति - arise.

For the student, it appears that ignorance is capable of destroying knowledge.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 38 (Contd.):

न ह्यबाधिते सम्यग्जाने तद्विरुद्धानां प्रत्ययानां सम्भवोऽस्ति ।

"If perfect knowledge had not been stultified, such impressions contrary to it would not at all arise".

The *poorva pakshin* asks: "From this experience, i.e. 'even a *jnaani* experiencing *raaghaa* and *dveshad'*, what is the lesson to be drawn?" and answers the question himself: "The *jnaani* has lost his knowledge, since the conviction 'I am *poorna:*' is lost and thereafter, he himself gets lost in worldly matters. Ignorance is inimical to knowledge and so must have destroyed knowledge, giving rise again to *karthruthva-bokthruthva* feelings. *Jnaanam* does not seem to destroy ignorance permanently".

"Because of this fact, knowledge is to be reinforced by *karmaa*" is the *poorva pakshin's* stand.

- सम्यग्जाने अबाधिते - Without destruction of right knowledge,
- तद्विरुद्धानां प्रत्ययानां सम्भवः न अस्ति हि - the rise of erroneous notions cannot at all happen.

Prathyayaanaam viruddhaanaam – of erroneous notions; *sambhava:* - *uthpatthy/* rise.

Destruction of knowledge is responsible for re-arising of erroneous misconceptions. *Avidhyaa* seems to relapse; *samsaaraa* is re-born.

Up to this is the *poorva pakshin's* argument or a genuine student's doubt.

Sureswaraachaaryaa starts replying.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 38 (Contd.):

न एतद् एवम् । कुतः ।

This is not true. Why not?

- एतद् एवम् न (भवति) - What you say is not right.

The *Aachaaryaa* implies by this terse statement: "Ignorance, once destroyed, cannot come back. Destroyed ignorance cannot destroy knowledge. Even live ignorance is not capable of challenging knowledge; how can dead ignorance challenge knowledge?"

- **कुतः** - Why do I say so ?
Aachaaryaa's answer follows in the verse.

Chapter I: Verse 38 -

बाधितत्वादविध्याया विध्यां सा नैव बाधते ।

तद्वासना निमित्तत्वं यान्ति विध्यास्मृतेर्ध्रुवम् ॥ ३८ ॥

As ignorance has been stultified, it cannot cancel enlightenment. The impressions left by enlightenment arouse the remembrance of knowledge, which does remove the impressions of ignorance.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Once ignorance is gone, it cannot come back, since it is *anaadhi* i.e. it has no beginning. If it comes back, it will amount to having a beginning, which is not possible. Since it cannot even come back, it cannot produce erroneous notions. It cannot produce *prathyayaa'*."

But, then how does one, who has acquired knowledge, get back erroneous notions ?

The *Aachaaryaa* replies: "It is not ignorance that is responsible for the re-birth of erroneous notions. It is the *vaasanaa*-s that are responsible".

Then, a further question arises: "If *avidhyaa vaasanaa*-s are responsible for the resurrection of the wrong notions, does one again require *jnaanam* to destroy *avidhyaa vaasanaa*?"

"*Jnaanam* destroys *avidhyaa* – but not the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*" seems to be possible.

Sureswaraachaaryaa agrees, that *jnaanam* does not destroy *avidhyaa vaasanaa* s. *Avidhyaa* is destroyed by *vidhyaa*; *avidhyaa vaasanaa*-s are to be destroyed by *jnaana vaasanaa*. But, even for the destruction of *avidhyaa vaasanaa*-s, *karmaa* is **not** needed. *Jnaanam* and *jnaanasmruthi* will destroy *ajnaanam* and *ajnaana vaasanaa*-s respectively. *Jnaanasmruthi* is otherwise called *nidhidhyaasanam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "One need not even deliberately invoke *jnaana vaasanaa*. If *avidhyaa vaasanaa*-s arise, *jnaana vaasanaa* will be automatically invoked for a good seeker."

24. Chapter I, Verse 38 to 40 (23-09-2006)

Sureswaraacharya talked about the similarity and differences between *karmaa* and *jnaanam*. *Karmaa* and *jnaanam* are similar in requiring *thriputi* for their *uthpatthi*. But, in the production of their results, there are differences.

The first difference is, that, *Karmaa* has to stay for a length of time, to produce results only at a later date. As for *jnaanam*, it does not require continued existence, since, immediately as it rises, it does its job of destroying ignorance. In other words, *Jnaanapalan* is instantaneous, while *karmapalan* is not.

Another difference is, that, for producing results also, *karmaa* depends on *thriputi* and therefore *dvaitham*. This is because the result of *karmaa* is *bhoghaa*, which obviously requires *thriputi*. As for *jnaanam*, while it requires *dvaitham* for its *jananam* or *uthpatthy*, it does **not** depend on *dvaitham* for doing its function of removal of ignorance. On the contrary, it depends on **advaitam** for giving its results of destroying *ajnaanam* and *dvaitham*. In this aspect of destroying *dvaitham*, of which it is born, *jnaanam* can be likened to the wild forest fires, which kindled by friction between trees, in hot summers, destroy the very trees, of which they are born. The fire of *jnaanam*, rising from *thriputi*, is capable of destroying the *thriputi*.

Thereafter, i.e. after comparing and contrasting *karmaa* and *jnaanam*, the *Aacharya* himself foresees a possible question from the student (*sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 38). The question that may be raised, is: "How is it, when *jnaana palan* is claimed to be instantaneous, even people who have acquired *jnaanam*, have doubts, *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam* etc.? Does it mean that *jnaanam* does not destroy *ajnaanam* totally or does it mean that the destroyed *ajnaanam* comes back again? If so, would it also not mean, that, mere *jnaanam* is not sufficient, but, requires some other support, to avoid *avidhyaa punar uthpatthi*?"

Sureswaraacharya assures: "*Ajnaanam* once destroyed, is destroyed forever. It can never come back". Then how does one explain the experience of *samsaaraa*, even after a thorough *Vedhaanthic* study and understanding? The *Aacharya* explains: "In such cases, it is not *avidhyaa* that produces *samsaaraa*, since *avidhyaa* is gone forever. It is the *avidhyaa vaasanaa* (habit or memory), still in the mind, which is responsible for *samsaaraa*".

The student, then asks: "Since from what you say, *jnaanam* may not destroy the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*, which continues to torment the seeker, even after he has acquired *jnaanam*, do we not need something else to fight the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*? *Nithya naimitthika karmaani*

may, perhaps, be required for this purpose. *Jnaanam*, supported by *karmaa*, may destroy the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*".

Sureswaraacharya replies (in verse 38): "No; you do not require *karmaa* for destroying *avidhyaa vaasanaa* also. *Jnaanam* has its own *vaasanaa*, which will destroy *avidhyaa vaasanaa*. A sincere seeker and student of *Vedhaanthee* will have *vidhyaa vaasanaa* or *vidhyaa smruthi*. When *avidhyaa vaasanaa* arises, the *vidhyaa vaasanaa* will trigger the knowledge that the student had received".

"The activated *jnaana vaasanaa* can / should be used by the sincere seeker to destroy the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*. He need not use anything else for destroying the *avidhyaa vaasanaa*. *Jnaanam* will help forever." This is the guarantee given by Sureswaraacharya.

- **अविध्याया बाधितत्वात्** - Since *ajnaanam* has been destroyed
- **सा विध्यां न एव बाधते** - that destroyed *ajnaanam* can never obstruct / negate the knowledge already attained.

The *ajnaanam* has been destroyed at the time of *sravanam* itself. It neither survives, nor does it come back, to obstruct the *jnaanam*. *Jnaanasya naasam naasthi | Ajnaanasya punar uthpatthi: api naive naasthi*"| On the other hand:

- **तद्वासना** - The *vidhyaa vaasanaa*,
- **धृवम्** - definitely / certainly,
- **निमित्तत्वं यान्ति** - becomes the activating cause
- **विध्या स्मृतेः** - of the *Vedhaanthic* teaching , which has been received for a length of time.

Vidhyaa smruthi: and *vidhyaa vaasanaa* are synonymous.

This is a powerful *slokaa*, to be registered and remembered. One can take total recourse to this teaching; use this teaching in one's life to obtain support and strength, in facing all situations. Every student has to bring about this change, sometime in his life – the firm decision "to surrender to this teaching wholeheartedly". It is, no doubt, not easy. But, the mind has to be firmly made up, to use this teaching as life-long support. Deciding to preserve the knowledge (*nischaya*), a *sankalpaa* should be taken: "Hereafter, in my life, in all situations, in the face of all challenges, I shall make use of this teaching, as my approach". Having taken this *sankalpaa*, implementation of the resolution – i.e. *abhyaasaa* should start and continue.

Nisschayaa (decision to preserve the knowledge) **TO** *sankalpaa* (resolution to use the knowledge) **TO** *abhyaasaa* (practice/use).

Jnaana yoga begins with this concededly difficult transformation. The seeker requires tremendous faith in 'knowledge' to start on the *jnaana yoga* path. Lack of faith leads one to give lame excuses such as "My knowledge is not complete / I have only book-knowledge / I do not have *saakshaathkaaraa* / I do not have *anubhavaa*" etc. Such statements are only expressions of lack of faith. The fact is, this teaching is ample to support the seeker in crisis.

The lack of faith, also, sometimes, leads one to make a compromise. Such a person admires the *Vedhaanthic* teachings; considers the scriptures and the *aachaaryaa* as wonderful ; but, does not have the courage to use the teachings to face life. "*Vedhaantha* for study; *Bhagavaan* for facing life" is the compromise formula followed, by many a *Vedhaanthic* student.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, though not harshly critical of such a student, warns: " If you are in this compromise formula, you have not started on *jnaana yoga*. At best, you are a *karma yogi*".

The difference between a *karma yogi* and a *jnaana yogi*, is, that, the *karma yogi* depends on *Bhagavaan*, for facing life. The *jnaana yogi* depends on *Bhagavaan's* teachings for confronting life. It follows, that, the *karma yogi* has faith **only** in *Bhagavaan*, while the *jnaana yogi* has faith in *Bhagavaan* and equally fervently in His teachings, and uses them for facing life. And, because of this, a *jnaana yogi's* faith can be considered greater than that of a *karma yogi's*.

The *karma yogi* prays to the Lord to help him in his life. The *jnaana yogi* prays "nourish my faith in Your teachings". The *sankalpa* to use *jnaanam* for day-to-day life, is not broken for a *jnaana yogi*. The mere study of *Vedhaantha* will not make one a *jnaana yogi*. One has to have the *nischayaa* (the decision to preserve the knowledge), form the *sankalpa* (resolution to use the knowledge) and practice *abhyasaa*, to become a *jnaana yogi*. Since *jnaana yoga* **alone** gives liberation, if one is interested in *mokshaa* here and now, one has to become a *jnaana yogi*, in this life.

Sureswaraachaaryaa assures, that, he is with such a person. This is the significance of the word '*dhruvam*' in the *slokaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 39:

"कर्माज्ञानसमुत्थत्वात्" इत्युक्तो हेतुस्तस्य च समर्थनं पूर्वमेवाभिहितं "हितं सम्प्रेप्सताम्" इत्यादिना । तदभ्युच्चयार्थमविधान्वयेन च संसारान्वयित्वं प्रदर्शयिष्यामीत्यत आह ।

The argument stated, that, "action born of ignorance cannot remove ignorance" (Verse 35) has been strengthened in advance by the consideration of motives of

actions etc. (Verse 29). In order to supplement it, it is now proposed to show that action involves ignorance and so involves transmigratory existence.

Sureswaraacharya wants to go to the next topic and gives an introduction. He first states what he had already done and then states what he proposes to do.

- "कर्म अजान सम्थत्वात्" - For the fact "karma cannot destroy ignorance, since it is born of ignorance",
- इति हेतु उक्तः - logical reason was given (from verse 35).
- तस्य समर्थनं च - Explanation for this view also
- पूर्व एव अभिहितं - was also given earlier,
- "हितं सम्प्रेप्सताम्" इत्यादिना - starting from 'hitham samprepsathaam' (verse 29).

To recollect the explanation: "Even *vaidhika karmaa* is born of ignorance only ; performance of *karmaa* is because of desires – not because of *Vedic* injunctions, since *Vedaa*-s give only the information regarding the rituals and not the motivation for action". An example: *Vedaa*-s give the information as to how the *puthrakaameshti yaagaa* should be performed. But, the actual performance is undertaken, not because it is an injunction of the *Vedaa*-s, but, only because of the desire for a *puthraa*, which desire is born out of ignorance.

Up to this, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 39, some of the topics already discussed were re-stated.

Now, the *gadhyam* moves to the next topic.

- तद् अभ्युच्चयार्थ - To give additional support to the previous arguments,-

The previous argument referred to, is: "*Karmaa* is born out of ignorance, since, because of *ajnaanam*, *apoorathvam* results, because of which desires arise, for the fulfillment of which, *karmaa* is undertaken". The *Aachaaryaa*, now, wants to show, that, not only is *karmaa* born out of ignorance, it also 'travels' with ignorance. *Avidhyaa* not only produces *karmaa*; it also co-exists with *karmaa*.

- अत इति प्रदर्शयिष्यामि - now, I will show, in the following manner, that,
- संसार अन्वयित्वं - "continuity of *samsaaraa* (persists)
- अविध्या अन्वयेन - because of the companionship of *avidhyaa* (with *karmaa*)"
- आह - says the author.

Chapter I: Verse 39:

ब्राह्मण्याध्यात्मके देहे लात्वा नात्मेति भावनाम् ।

श्रुतेः किङ्करतामेति वाङ् मनः कार्यकर्मसु ॥ ३९ ॥

A man entertaining the belief that he is the body belonging to a certain caste, order etc., becomes obedient to the *sruthi*, in his actions of speech, mind and body.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out: "To perform *Vedic karma*, the appropriate qualifications are required. Pursuit of *jnaanam* requires the four-fold qualifications – *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*. Likewise, performance of *karmaa* also requires certain qualifications. Among them, the two important qualifications are *varnaa* and *aasramaa*. Any particular *karmaa* has to be undertaken only by the relevant *varna* – *aasrami* as prescribed in the scriptures, to produce the *adhrishta* or *apoorva palan*, promised for that particular *karmaa* by the scriptures. If a *karmaa* is performed by one, who does not have the prescribed *varnaa* and *aasramaa* qualifications, the *karmaa* will not produce the desired *adhrishta palan*. In other words, '*Varna aasrama abhimaanaa*', is a prerequisite for a *vaidhika karmaa*'.

(An interesting related subject is that of the inter-caste marriages which are not uncommon in present times. According to the *Hindu Dharmaa*, 'marriage' is a *samskaaraa*. The marriage rituals for each *varnaa* are designed for that particular *varnaa*. The *Vedic* ritualistic wedding, in the situation of an inter-caste marriage, may, therefore, satisfy the sentiment – but, will not produce the *adhrishta palan*.)

To continue with the elaboration of the *Aachaarayaa's* arguments:

Mundakopanishad defines *aathmaa*, using the terms, among others, '*agothram*' and '*avarnam*' in *Manthraa* 6 – Section 1 – Chapter I. Another well known verse runs "*Jaathi neethi kula gothra dhooragam naama roopa guna dosha varjitham na varnam na varnaasrama chaaradharmaa*:"|

But, whenever performance of any *vaidhika karmaa* is undertaken, this *varna-rahitha-aasrama-rahitha-svaroopaa* has to be consciously rejected. The performer has to, necessarily, identify with his *varnaa* and *aasramaa*, which are *anaathmaa*. In other words, *karmaa* requires *anaathma abhimaanaa* and, therefore, *adhyaasaa*. This would mean, that, *karmaa* has to travel with *ajnaanam*.

When this is true of *vaidhika karmaa*, it is certainly more true of *loukika karmaa*.

"Ignorance is perpetuated by *karmaa*, and, hence, there is no *mokshaa* for the one who is steeped in *karmaa*" is Sureswaraachaaryaa's warning.

(Again, a not irrelevant interesting fact: It is well known that a *sanyaasi* gives up *grihastha vaidhika karmaa* and also his *varnaa*. What is not that well known, is, that, when one

prostrates to a *sanyaasi*, the conventional chanting of *abhivaadhanaa*, indicating *kulam*, *gothram* etc. is prohibited, since a *sanyaasi*, always identifying with the *aathmaa*, is not supposed to pay any attention to the *anaathmaa* details of caste etc.)

ना - A man (manushya: / purusha:)

लात्वा - invoking

देहे - in the body,

ब्राह्मण्यादि आत्मके - the nature of varnaa, aasramaa etc.,

Braahmanyaadhi – ‘*braahmanyam*’ denotes *varnaa* and the use of *aadhi* denotes *aasramaa* etc. ‘*Aathmake*’ means ‘of the nature’.

- आत्मा इति भावनाम् - (and) the *abhimaanaa* as the egoistic individual,
- श्रुतेः किङ्करताम् येति - becomes a slave / servant / *daasaa* of *sruthi*,
- वाङ् मनः कार्यकर्मसु - in the fields of speech, mind and body.

‘*yethi*’ – ‘attains’; ‘*sruthe:*’ – ‘of the *Vedaa-s*’; ‘*kinkarathaa*’ – ‘the nature of being a servant’.

Mokshaa is freedom from slavery. But, such a *karmi* becomes a slave to the *vidhinishedha vaakya sruthi* and gets totally involved in all types of *karmaa* - *nithya*, *naimitthika* and *kaamyaa*. The use of the term ‘*vaang mana:*’ emphasizes the ‘total’ involvement of the *karmi* in *karmaa*.

Every *karmi* has *deha abhimaanam* and therefore, *ajnaanam* and *ajnaana janya adhyaasa:* |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 40:

यस्मात्कर्माज्ञानसमुत्थमेव तस्मात्तद्व्यावृत्तौ निवर्तत इत्युच्यते ।

As action originates from ignorance, it terminates on the removal of ignorance. The following verse enunciates this principle.

Sureswaraachaaryaa shows the contrast between *anvayaa* and *vyathirekhaa*. When *ajnaanam* and *adhyasaa* are there, *karma* also is there. When they are gone, *karmaa* also is gone.

- यस्मात् कर्म अज्ञान समुत्थं एव -- “Since *karmaa* is born out of ignorance and *varna* – *aasrama abhimaanaa*,
- तस्मात् तद् व्यावृत्तौ - - therefore, on the destruction / removal of ignorance,

The pronoun ‘*thad*’ denotes ‘*ajnaanam*’, in this context; ‘*vyaavrutthi:*’ – ‘*naasa:*’ (destruction).

- (कर्मा) निवर्तते - karmaa will go away”.
- इति उच्यते - This principle is to be enunciated (in the following verse).

After rise of *jnaanam*, it is impossible to invoke *varna - aasrama abhimaanaa* and, therefore, impossible to commit oneself to *vaidhika karmaa*. “*Ajnaana sathve karma sathvam; ajnaana abhaave karma abhaava:*” is the essence.

Chapter I: Verse 40 -

दग्धाखिलाधिकारश्चेद्ब्रह्मज्ञानाग्निना मुनिः ।

वर्तमानः श्रुतेर्मूर्ध्नि नैव स्याद्वेदकिङ्करः ॥ ४० ॥

Since a sage’s sense of identity with the body of a particular caste etc., is burnt up by the knowledge of Brahman, such a one dwells above the sruthi and he is no longer a servant of Vedic injunctions.

A *jnaani* is not a *Veda daasa:*; he is a *Veda swami*: The aim of a *Vedhaanthic* seeker should be to move from a *daasa:* in the preliminary stage, to a *swaami* ultimately.

25. Chapter I, Verse 40 to 42 (30-09-2006)

Sureswaraachaarya first established that *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance – any ignorance, including self-ignorance. Without destruction of self-ignorance, *mokshaa* is not possible. Since *karmaa* cannot destroy ignorance, it follows, that, *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa* also.

Karmaa cannot destroy ignorance, since it is born of ignorance. Ignorance leads to *apoomathvam*, which leads to desires, which lead to action (*karmaa*). *Karmaa*, thus, is a product of ignorance.

The *Aachaaryaa* established that *karmaa* is not only a product of ignorance, but, that, *karmaa* is also accompanied by ignorance, **throughout its existence**; *karmaa* travels with ignorance, all the time. Since *karmaa* is accompanied by ignorance, it follows, that, it is accompanied by *samsaaraa* also. How can that *karmaa*, for which *samsaaraa* is a companion, ever destroy *samsaaraa*?

In verse 39, the *Aachaaryaa* talked of the *karma samsaara ajnaana anvayee* ('anvayee' means 'travel with') i.e. of the fact, that, *karmaa*, *samsaaraa* and *ajnaanaa* travel together. *Yathra yathra avidhyaa anvaya: thathra thathra samsaara anvaya: |* Wherever ignorance is a companion, *samsaaraa* is also an uninvited companion.

But, how do you say that *karmaa* travels with *avidhyaa*? Sureswaraachaaryaa explains: "*Vaidhika karmaa* requires *varna-aasrama-abhimanaa*, since, according to *Vedic* injunctions, any *vaidhika karmaa* requires the appropriate *varnaa* and the appropriate *aasrama* qualifications. The *varna-aasrama-abhimanaa* goes with *deha abhimaanaa*, which goes with *adhyaasaa*, which, in turn, goes with *ajnaanaa*". Ignorance is, thus, the cause of *adhyaasaa*, *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa* and *karma anushtaanam*. In verse 39, the *Aachaaryaa* remarked "*Braahmanyadhi aathmake dehe laathvaa*", stressing that *karmaa* exists with *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa*. This trend of argument – "wherever *avidhyaa* is there, *samsaaraa* is", is based on *anvayaa* logic.

In the present verse (verse 40), the *Aachaaryaa* gives the *vyathirekhaa* argument: "When a person gains knowledge, viz. that, '*aham brahma asmi*', the immediate consequence is *deha abhimaana naasa: |* Once *deha abhimaanaa* goes, *varna-aasrama-abhimanaa* also goes. When *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa* goes, all *Vedic* injunctions become irrelevant to him; he is no more a candidate existing within the purview of *Vedic* injunctions. The *Veda Poorva Bhaagaa* addresses people of all four *varnaas* – *braahmanaas*, *kshathriyaas*, *vaisyaas* and *sudraas* and also people of all *aasramaas* – *brahmachaarins*, *grihasthaas*, *vaanaprasthaas* and *sanyaasins*. But, the person who has achieved self-knowledge, has transcended all of

them; his *karma abhimaanam* is gone. Qualifications for *karmaa* have been burnt in his case. *Karmaa*, therefore, does not exist for him”.

- **दग्ध अखिल अधिकारःचेत्** - If, one's qualifications, in the form of *varnaa* and *aasramaa* are totally burnt

Dhagdha – burnt down; *akhila* – all; *adhikaara*: - qualification (in the form of *varnaa* and *aasramaa*).

Performance of *vaidhika karmaa* not only necessitates the qualifications of the relevant *varnaa* and *aasramaa*; but, also the *abhimaanaa* as *karthaa* and *bokthaa*; and, the sense of belonging to a specific *gothraa* and *soothraa* also, to perform the specific *karmaa*, on the specified day, at the specific time etc.

A *jnaani*, on the other hand, is (to use the words used by the *Mundakopnishad*, in I.1.6, for describing *Brahman*) `agothram` and `avarnam`.

- **ब्रह्म ज्ञान अग्निना** - by the fire of brahma jnaanam (“aham brahma asmi” ithi jnaanam),
- **मुनिः** - such a jnaani
- **वेदकिङ्करः न स्यात्** - is no more a servant of Vedaa-s (karma kaandaa);
- **श्रुतेः मूर्ध्नि वर्तमानः एव** - but, resides in the Veda anthaa.

The *jnaani* transcends the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa*-s. He is no more bound by the *Vedic* injunctions – either *vidhi* or *nishedhaa*. He is, therefore, not a servant of *Vedaa*-s anymore; but, is the very subject matter of the *Veda antha* teachings – the very *Brahman*. Use of the word `moordhni`, indicates this. He is no more a *dhaasa*; but, a *swami*.

In the Bhagavadh Geetha also, Lord Krishna asserts that the *jnaani* transcends the karma kaandaa of the *Vedaa*-s, - “sabdha brahma adhivarthathe”, `sabdha brahma` denoting the Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa or the karma kaandaa.

Such a *jnaani* can claim, as in the Kaivalya Upanishad (manthraa 19) “mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvam layam yaathi | Thadh brahma advayam asmi aham”| - “Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual Brahman”|

There is no need of *karmaa* for a *jnaani*. Hence, he has no *avidhyaa* and hence no *samsaaraa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 41:

अथेतरो घनतराविध्यापटल संवीत अन्तःकरणोऽङ्गीकृत कर्तृत्वाध्यशेष कर्माधिकारकारणो
विधिप्रतिषेधचोदनसंदंशोपदष्टः कर्मसु प्रवर्तमानः ।

The other man whose inner sense is enveloped by the dense darkness of ignorance and who accepts the conditions leading to action like that of being an agent, gets stung, as it were, by commandments and prohibitions and engages in actions.

Sureswaraachaaryaa comes back to the *karmi*. In verse 40, he had said that a *jnaani* is free from *avidhyaa*, therefore, free from *karmaa*, and therefore, free from *samsaraa*. In verse 41, he comes back to the *ajnaani*, who is wedded to *karmaa*. As long as the *ajnaani* is attached to *karmaa*, he will be perpetuating ignorance, *varna* and *aasrama abhimaanaa*, *deha abhimaanaa* and *samsaraa*. Holding on to the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, such a person will travel from *samsaraa* to *samsaraa*.

A warning here will be appropriate. The contents of Sureswaraachaaryaa's teachings should be understood properly. The *Aachaaryaa* does **not** consider *karmaa* as **entirely** useless; later, he will himself talk of how essential the use of *karmaa* is, in the initial stages of the spiritual journey. But, his contention is, that, after a limited use of the *karma kaandaa*, to achieve the purposes it is intended for (viz. *chittha suddhi* and *chittha ekaagradhaa*), the seeker should move on to the *jnaana kaandaa*, since, it is *jnaanaa* alone, that can give liberation.

- **अथ इतरः** - On the other hand, the other one (i.e. the *ajnaani* / *karmi*, the one other than the *jnaani*),
- **घनतर अविध्या पटल संवीत अन्तःकरणः** - with internal vision blindfolded by a thick covering of ignorance,

ghanathara – thick ; *avidhyaa* – ignorance ; *patalam* – covering / membrane; *samveetha* - blindfolded / covered ; *antha: karanam* – inner vision.

The *ajnaani's* discriminatory faculty is covered with a thick layer of ignorance. He, therefore, looks upon himself as a *karthaa* and *bokthaa*; and, as endowed with all qualifications for *vaidhika karmaa*, such as *varnam*, *aasramam*, age etc.

An example of the 'age' qualification is '*krishna kesam*' (black hair, denoting youth) prescribed for certain *agni* rituals. Recognition of such qualifications in oneself, establishes *deha abhimaanam* also.

- **अकृत कर्तृत्वादि अशेष कर्म अधिकार कारणः** accepting /considering himself to be a:

- possessor of all the qualifications,
- such as being a *karthaa* etc., for
- performance of *karmaa*,

'*Karthruthvaadhī*' - 'doership' (the sense of being the performer of the action) etc.; *asesha* - without any left-over / entire / all; *karma adhikaara* – qualifications for performance of *karmaa*; *kaarana*: - possessor.

- **विधि प्रतिषेध चोदन संदंश उपदष्ट** : - is gripped firmly by the tongs of the pair of injunctions – *vidhi* and *prathishedha*,

samdamsa: - tongs; *upadhashta*: - gripped; *vidhi* – commandments; *prathishedha*-prohibitions.

- **कर्मसु प्रवर्तमानः**:- and is constantly engaged in action

The *jnaani* escapes the tongs of *veda vidhi nishedhaa*. But, the *karmi* who is proud of his qualifications, is, in reality, helplessly caught in the tongs of *vidhi nishedhaa*, because of *karthruthvaa abhimaanaa* and is, for ever, busy with *karmaa*.

As a *bokthaa* (reaper of results) also, the *karmi* acquires *praararabhdha punya- paapaani*, which steer him into more *samsaaraa*.

Chapter I: Verse 41 –

शुभैः प्राप्नोति देवत्वं निषिद्धैर्नरकीं गतिम् ।

उभाभ्यां पुण्यपापाभ्यां मानुष्यं लभतेऽवशः ॥ ४१ ॥

He, not being a master of himself, becomes a God by virtuous actions or goes to hell as a result of unrighteous deeds or becomes a human being, if the two kinds of action are evenly mixed in his life.

This is a popular verse, very often quoted. Sureswaraachaaryaa earlier explained as to how the *karmi* gets caught in *vidhi-nishedhaa* tongs, as a *karthaa*. Later, as a *bokthaa*, the *karmi* is caught in the *punya-paapaa* tongs.

शुभैः(कर्मभिः) देवत्वं प्राप्नोति - Through noble actions, one becomes a deva (i.e. he may go to svarghaa);

But, *svarghaa* is also *samsaaraa*. The *Thaithreeya Upanishad* grades various types of *aanandhaa-s*; *Indra aanandhaa* is one of them. Anything that is subject to gradation, is,

obviously, capable of improvement and is, therefore, *apoornam*, and liable to create feelings of jealousy etc. Further, once the *punyaa* is exhausted the *svarga vaasam* is terminated (*ksheene punye marthyalokam visanthi – Bhagavadh Geeetha – Verse 21 – Chapter IX*).

- निषिद्धैः (कर्मभिः) - through prohibited actions
- नारकीं गतिम् (प्राप्नोति) - attains *narakaa*;
- उपाभ्यां पुण्य पापाभ्या - when *punyaa* and *paapaa* are in equal measure,
- मानुष्यं लभते - attains the human world (*manushya janmaa* is *maanushyam*),
- अवशः - helplessly.

This significant word '*avasa:*' is explained in the following verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 42:

आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्ते घोरे दुःखोदधौ घटीयन्त्रवत् आरोह अवरोह न्यायेन अधम मध्यम उत्तम सुख दुःख मोह विध्युच्चपलसंपात दायिनोः विचित्रयोनीः चण्ड उत्पिञ्जलक श्वसन वेग अभिहित अम्भोधिमध्यवर्ति शुष्क अलाबुवत् शुभ अशुभ व्यामिश्र कर्म वायु समीरितः ।

The world consisting of creatures from Brahmaaji down to the lowest species is an ocean of terrible misery. Births in it are like going up and going down of a pot in a water-wheel, placing us in positions high, low and middle, in respect of pleasures, pains and illusions, momentary like flashes of lightning. The creature is tossed about by the terrific wind of good, bad and mixed deeds of the past like a dry gourd in the middle of an ocean, agitated by a stormy wind.

Scriptures talk of the journeys of the *jeevaa* from one place to another, in one *janmaa* itself and then, from one body to another, after the present *janmaa* is over. The word, *samsaaraa*, can be interpreted as the travel from one body to another. Is this 'travel' enjoyable or unpleasant?

On this question, *Vedaa-s* sound a warning. To explain their import, in simple language: "Consider examples from the mundane world; if one joins a conducted tour to places of interest, one has the freedom to choose the tour that one wants and thus the places of one's visit and stay. On the other hand, if one is abducted for some reason and forcibly taken away, obviously, one will have no say on where he is taken to or what condition he lives in. Likewise, if a human being's future is decided by him fully, at both the planning and experiential stages, it can be assumed that he has total freedom. But, it is not so. It is the individual's past *karmaa*, sometimes done in a very distant earlier *janmaa*, that decide the results of even his current actions."

This is true in the case of even a *jnaani*. Sureswaraachaaryaa says that this helpless situation is *samsaara*.

Vedaa-s give a choice:

The first option is: "If an individual is not interested in *mokshaa*, but, enjoys *karthruthvam* and *bokthruthvam*, without minding the experience of the inevitably cyclic pleasure and pain, he can choose to be a *karthaa* and *bokthaa*, following the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, which gives guidance as to how to perform *punya karmaa-s*".

But, this option has a drawback. The performer, even if he diligently pursues only *punya karmaa-s* now, cannot escape from his already accumulated *sanchitha papa karmaa*.

The second option is: "Follow the *jnaana kaandaa*, acquire *jnaanam* and as *jnaana palan*, be rid of both *sanchitha* and *aagaami karmaa-s*".

The second option is what an intelligent individual would choose. In other words, he will choose to be a *mumukshu*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this portion, gives a description of *samsaaraa* and the poor plight of the *jeevaa* in it.

- **(जीवः)** - The *jeevaa* (the subject of the sentence, is supplied),
- **आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्ते घोरे (सम्सारे)** - in this terrible *samsaaraa*, consisting of varieties of creatures, from *Brahmaji* to a blade of grass,
- *sthambha* - blade / clump of grass; *ghore* - terrible (adjective to '*samsaarey*', which word is supplied).
- **दुःख उदधौ** - and an ocean of pains (janma / mrithyu / jaraa / vyaadhi etc.),

'*Dhu:kha udhadhi:*' is another adjective to *samsaaraa*.

- **आरोह अवरोह न्यायेन** - following the rule of aarohanam and avarohanam,

Aarohanam - 'going up' (in this context, denotes higher forms of life); *avarohanam* - 'going down' (in this context, denotes lower forms of life).

No *janmaa* is permanent or eternal. The *jeevaa* has to move from *janmaa* to *janmaa*, sometimes, as higher species of creation and at other times, as lower species. The *Aachaaryaa* calls this fact '*aaroha avaroha nyaayam*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an example to this "going up and down" of the *jeevaa*.

- **घटीयन्त्रवत्** - similar to the pot in the water-wheel machine,

Ghatee – in this context, means 'a small pot'; (there is another meaning to the word, as 'clock'). *Yanthra*: - The reference is to a water-wheel device, used for drawing water from well, for irrigation. The pot, attached to the device, repeatedly goes down the well and comes up, drawing water.

- **दायिनाःविध्युत् च पल संपात** - and attacked by the results given like flashes of lightning, by the producers, *janmaa* and *karmaa*,

The word '*Dhaayinee*' literally means 'givers' / 'producers' and in this context, refers to *janmaa* and *karmaa*, which give the experiences of *sukham*, *dhu:kham* and *moham*. '*Sampaatha*:' literally means 'falling together', 'concurrence' etc. , and implies 'attack', in this context.

- **अधम मध्यम उत्तम सुख दुःख मोह** - the results being the 'low', the 'middle' and the 'high', viz., confusion, pain and pleasure,

Sukham is associated with *sathva (utthama) gunaa*; *dhu:kham* with *rajo (madhyama) gunaa*; *moha*: with *thamo (adhama) gunaa*. The *Aachaaryaa*, therefore, refers to *moham* as '*adhama*', (since it is under the power of *thamo gunaa*, the individual's intellect is immobilized or stultified), to *dhu:kham* as '*madhyama*' and to *sukham* as '*utthama*'.

The essence of this statement: The *jeevaa* is associated with *janmaa-s*, which are producers of *sukham*, *dhu:kham* and *moham*, attacking the *jeevaa*, all of a sudden, like flashes of lightning.

- **विचित्र योनीः** in varieties of births,

The aim of Sureswaraachaarya is to warn the student of the results of the *punyaa-s* and *paapaa-s*, acquired through *karmaa*, which itself is the result of *deha abhimaanaa*, which, in turn, is a result of ignorance. "Destruction of ignorance" or "acquisition of self-knowledge" is, therefore, the only way to be free of *samsaaraa*.

The word '*naishkarmya*' means 'free from all *karmaa-s*'.

(The word-by-word interpretation of the *Sambhandha gadhyam* is not complete; it is to be continued in the next class.)

26. Chapter I, Verse 42 to 44 (07-10-2006)

Sureswaraacharya is giving an elaborate description of *samsaara*, to show that the "travelling together" of *avidhya* (ignorance), *kaama* (desire) and *karma* (action) is the cause of *samsaara*. All the three being causes of *samsaara*, none of them can remove *samsaara*.

The *Aacharya's* description of *samsaara* may leave one with a doubt, that, *Vedhaantha* is very pessimistic, ever talking about the problems, trials and tribulations that a human being faces. Did not the 20th century Tamil poet, Subramania Bharathiar, sing "*eththanai kodi inbam vaitthai, Iraiva*", praising the Lord, for the numberless sources of joy and happiness He has provided all round? Why, then, should *Vedhaantha* concentrate on all the negative aspects of life, such as *mrithyu*, *jaraa*, *vyaadhi* etc., instead of on the positive aspects? This is a charge leveled by the Westerners also, against Hinduism.

But, a clear unbiased analysis will show that *Vedaa-s*, taken as a whole, do not highlight *samsaara* problems, in the initial stages. In fact, the *Veda Poorva Bhaagaa* vigorously promotes *karthruthvam* and *bokthruthvam* - which can together be termed as 'individuality'. The *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s* talks of various pleasures of this world and also of the higher worlds, and prescribe the appropriate *karmaa-s* – *kaayika*, *maanasa*, *vaachika karmaani* – to achieve these pleasures. "Even in death, you can go to a higher *lokaa*", it says, and, thus, is probably the most optimistic scriptural literature in the world. *Ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa* are also not frowned upon, by the *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa*. A prayer in the popular *Sri Rudram* runs: "*Maanasthoke thanaye maa na aayushi maa no ghoshu maa no asveshu reerisha*:" - "Let not our infants, children, cows, horses etc. be subject to misery", praying for the well-being of even animals. In Gaya, during the *sraadhaa* ceremony, *pindam* is offered even for domestic animals. Thus, *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa* promotes individuality and relationships. No doubt, it also stresses the importance of *Isvara Bhakthi* and of values in life; but, it does not talk of *asangathvam*. And, it is the *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa*, talking about the glory of worldly pleasures, which is the more voluminous portion of the *Vedaa-s*.

Only in the latter part, the *Vedaa-s* warn "As long as *karthruthvam* and *bokthruthvam* are there, you will have pleasures alright; but, pain also will be inevitable. You will have to accept both".

And, as the *Mundaka Upanishad* exhorts ("*pareekshya lokaan karma chithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath*" meaning "having examined the worlds, which are achieved through *karmaa*, a *Brahmin* should come to dispassion" – *manthraa* 12 – Sec. 2 – Chapter 1).

Discriminate people, at one stage, get dissatisfied with the relative worldly pleasures, unpredictably and inevitably sandwiched between relative pains. Rejecting the temporary worldly pleasures, such people seek eternal happiness. The *Veda Antha* portions address only such people, appealing to them to transcend the *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa*. Since the *Vedhaanthic* teaching is, thus, intended for mature and advanced seekers, it is called *raaja vidhyaa* (the supreme knowledge) and *raaja guhya yōgam* (a top secret path), by Lord Krishna, in the *Bhagavadh Geetha*.

But, even so, why should *Vedhaantha* talk only about pain and not the pleasures? Ans: It is because, the *Veda poorva karma kaandaa* has, already, so elaborately talked about the pleasures, that *Vedhaantha* takes it upon itself, to warn the individual of the inevitable pains accompanying the worldly pleasures and the need to look for eternal *aanandhaa*. The individual, of course, if not interested in the *Vedhaanthic* teachings, has the option of living according to the injunctions and guidance of the *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa*.

Vedaa-s, therefore, cannot be accused of pessimism.

Sureswaraacharya talks about the pains of *samsaaraa*, in this portion. Having first covered the fact, that, all creatures from *Brahmaaji* down to the lowest species, suffer in the terribly miserable ocean of *samsaaraa* and then, the fact, that like a pot in the waterwheel, the creatures move from birth to birth – high and low- experiencing alternately, *sukham*, *dhu:kham* and *moham*, which land on the *jeevaa* as suddenly and as disastrously as lightning, he now talks about as to how the *jeevaa* is helplessly tossed about.

The *Aachaaryaa* compares the helpless *jeevaa* to a dried gourd, floating in the ocean, in stormy weather.

Reverting to the text (continuing the incomplete sentence, from the earlier session):

- चण्ड उत्पिन्जलक श्वसन वेग अभिहित अम्भोधिमध्यवर्ति शुष्क अलाबुवत् - similar to a dry gourd, in the middle of the ocean, battered by fierce, uncontrollably powerful winds,

chanda – fierce; *uthpinjalaka* – uncontrollable; *vega* – powerful; *svasana* – wind; *abhihitha* – battered; *ambodhi madhyavarthi* - situated in the middle of the ocean; *sushka* – dry; *alaabhu:* - a form of gourd.

Praarabhdha karmaa that cannot be destroyed by *praayaschittha karmaa-s*, can be likened to the fierce, uncontrollably powerful winds.

- शुभ अशुभ व्यामिश्र कर्मवायु समीरितः - is battered by the cyclone of *karma palan*, consisting of the results of *punyam*, *paapam* and a mixture of the two.

Subha – punyakarma palan; asubha - paapakarma palan; vyaamisra – palan of a mixture of punya karmaa and paapa karmaa; karma vaayu – cyclone of karma palan; sameeritha: - battered.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, here, addresses a person, who is tired of the worldly pleasures, which are inevitably mixed with pain and is, therefore, eager to transcend them.

Chapter I: Verse 42 –

एवं चण्डक्रम्यमणोऽयमविध्याकामकर्मभिः ।

पाशितो जायते कामी म्रियते चासुकावृतः ॥ ४२ ॥

Thus, the creature is in constant movement owing to the force of ignorance, desire and action. He takes birth, bound and overcome by desire, and dies, enveloped all through, in misery.

- अविध्याकामकर्मभिः पाशितः - Bound by the ropes of ignorance, desire and action,

The word '*paasitha*.' describes the typical condition of a *jeevaa* in *samsaaraa*, who has *karthruthva-bokthruthvam* (individuality) and *ahamkaara-mamakaaram* (relationships). The individual, because of *ajnaanam* (ignorance), becomes a *kaami*. He desires things or situations either for himself (*ahamkaaraa* based) or for his near and dear (*mamakaaraa* based). A 'sense of want' is *kaamaa*. *Kaamaa* leads to *karmaa*.

- अयं कामि - such an individual, who has desires,
- एवं चण्डक्रम्यमाणः - thus, helplessly moves about;

'*Kram*' means 'to move'; '*chandakramyathe*' would mean 'helplessly moves about'.

A further tragedy, is, that, the journey of such an individual does not end with death. He is born again:

- जायते - (and) is born again (to continue the journey);

In a *manushya janmaa*, one may have some willpower to control one's movements. In an animal birth, this limited freedom is also lost; one is helplessly moved around.

- असुखावृतः - (and, as he gets older) surrounded by varieties of afflictions
- म्रियते च - perishes (miserably).

This chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is intended to prepare the seeker, for the *Vedhaanthic* teachings, beginning from the 2nd chapter. Hence, such warnings from the *Aachaaryaa*, sounding severe.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 43:

यथा उक्ते अर्थे आदरविधानाय प्रमाणोपन्यासः ।

Concerning the matter thus enunciated, with a view to create interest in the student, some authorities are adduced.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "What I say is not my personal philosophy. I am only repeating the facts of life, as already stated by scriptures".

- **यथा उक्ते अर्थे** - With respect to the statement made (in verse 42, that, *avidhyaa-kaama-karmaa* chain creates bondage)
- **आधर विधानाय** - to create more faith (in the student)
- **प्रमाण उपन्यासः** - scriptural supports are given.

Chapter I: Verse 43 –

श्रुतिश्चेमं जगदार्थं कामस्य विनिवृत्तये ।

तन्मूला संसृतिर्यस्मात्तन्नाशोऽज्ञानहानतः ॥ ४३ ॥

***Sruthi* has stated this principle for purposes of eradicating desire, for desire is at the root of transmigratory existence and it is destroyed by the elimination of ignorance.**

Vedaa-s promote karthruthva-bokthruthvam in the poorva bhaagaa and destroy karthruthva-bokthruthvam, in the antha bhaagaa.

When a person is ready for knowledge and opens up, *Vedaa-s* tell him: "Desire born out of ignorance, is the cause of *samsaaraa*". To express the same statement in a marginally different manner "Ignorant-based self-dissatisfaction, called *kaamaa*, results in *samsaaraa*".

Pujyasri Swami Dayananda eloquently defines *kaamaa*: **"THE CONSTANT STRUGGLE TO BE DIFFERENT FROM WHAT I AM NOW, IS KAAMAA"**.

Kaamaa-s are of two types. *Jnaani-s* also have desires, such as *loka sangraham*, *sarva jana shreyas* etc. Even *Bhagavaan* has *srushti-paripaalanaa-samhaaraa kaamaa*. But, these are *suddha-kaamaa-s*, which are non-binding in nature.

What are frowned upon by *Vedhaanthaa* are *asuddha kaamaa-s*, born out of self-ignorance and *ahamkaara-mamakaara-s*.

- **तन्मूला संसृतिः यस्मात्** - Since *samsaaraa* is born because of *asuddha kaamaa-s*,
- **कामस्य विनिवृत्तये** - for the purpose of removing the *asuddha kaamaa-s*,
- **श्रुतिः इमं अर्थं जगाद** - scriptures give the following teaching.

Sruthi: - *Vedaa-s*; *imam* – this / following; *artham* – teaching (in this context) ; *jagaadha* – mentions.

- **तन्नाशः** - The removal of desires
- **अज्ञान हानतः** - is by the removal of *ajnaanaa*.

Haanam – removal.

Samsaaraa is because of *karmaa*; *karmaa* is because of *kaamaa*; *kaamaa* is because of *avidhyaa*. Therefore, remove *avidhyaa* to get rid of *samsaaraa*. This is the essence of the *Vedhaanthic* teachings.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 44 :

का तु असौ श्रुतिः इति चेत् ।

Which is this *sruthi*?

The *Aachaaryaa* said (in verse 43) that he is quoting from the *sruthi*. The student, therefore, asks "Which *sruthi*? In what context?"

- **का तु असौ श्रुतिः** - "What is that *Vedic* statement (which gives the idea)?"
- **इति चेत्** - If asked thus:

Chapter I: Verse 44 –

"यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्त" "इति नु" इति च वाजिनः ।

कामबन्धनमेवेदं व्यासोऽप्याह पदे पदे ॥ ४४ ॥

The text of the *Vaajins* (followers of the *sukla yajur Vedaa* / those belonging to the sect of the *Vaajasaneeyin-s*) says "when the desires are extinguished, the mortal becomes immortal and attains *Brahman* here" (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad- IV.iv.7*) and "he, who is freed from desires., being already *Brahman*, is merged in *Brahman*" (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad- IV.iv.6*). *Vyaasaa* also says again and again, that, life is one of bondage through desire".

The phrase "*yadhaa sarve pramuchyathe*" occurs in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iv.7) and also in *Katopanishad* (II.iii.14). The second quotation in the verse, "*ithi nu*" is also from *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV. iv. 6).

The gist of the two quotations is "as long as desires are there, finitude is there. As long as finitude is there, the cycle of births and deaths continue – *punarapi jananam punarapi maranam*".

The type of one's next birth is governed by one's *kaamaa*-s also (apart from one's actions). *Jadabharathar*, in the *Bhaagavadha Mahaa Puraanam*, is a typical example. No doubt, it is *praarabdha karmaa*, that decides the nature of the *puna janmaa*; but, *kaamaa* also has a hand, in this process. It is only "desire for *mokshaa*", that will destroy *samsaaraa*.

"*Kaama naasena samsaara naasa:*" is the essence of the first quotation. This is a *vyathirekhaa* type of statement, i.e. a negative reference to the fact. The second quotation, in essence, would mean "*yathra kaama: thathra samsaara:*" – an *anvayaa* type of statement, i.e. a positive reference to the same fact.

The phrase 'vaajina:' may also be interpreted as 'from the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad'. Vaajasaneeyi Samhithaa = Sukla Yajur Vedaa = Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad.

27. Chapter I, Verse 45 to 47 (14-10-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is negating the *poorva paksha matham*, which claims that *karmaa* can give liberation. The *Aachaaryaa*, on the other hand, establishes that *karmaa* cannot give liberation. He argues that liberation is possible only through destruction of self-ignorance and since *karmaa* cannot accomplish destruction of self-ignorance, it is also not capable of giving liberation.

But, why do you say that *karmaa* cannot destroy self-ignorance? Many reasons can be given. Sureswaraachaaryaa gives two reasons. The first reason he gave, was, that *karmaa* itself is a product of ignorance, and, therefore, it cannot destroy ignorance.

In this portion, the *Aaachaaryaa* is elaborating on the second reason. He says: "*Karmaa* is not only born of ignorance; but, exists along with ignorance and therefore, exists along with *samsaaraa* also. *Karmana: avidhyaa anvayathvaath samsaara anvaya: | (Anvaya: means 'accompaniment' or 'co-existence'.)* Since *karmaa* has *avidhyaa anvaya:*, it has *samsaara anvaya:* also. It 'travel's with *samsaaraa* and therefore, cannot destroy *samsaaraa*".

How do you prove that *karmaa* goes along with *avidhyaa* ? For this also, two reasons are given by the *Aaachaaryaa*. The first reason is that, every *vaidhika karmaa* inevitably requires *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa* ; this inevitable claiming of the *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa* is a loud proclamation of ignorance, since *aathmaa* is *varna-aasrama-atheetha:* and 'knowledge' consists in 'knowing' this *aathmaa*. *Karmaa* goes with *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa*; *varna-aasrama-abhimaanaa* goes with ignorance ; therefore, *karmaa* goes with ignorance.

The second reason to believe that *karmaa* goes along with *avidhyaa*, is the fact, that *karmaa* always goes with desire. The very motive behind any action is only *kaama:* | The *Manu smruthi* declares this as: "*yath yath hi kuruthe karma thath thath kaamasya cheshtitham*". It can be concluded that "*yathra yathra karmaa, thathra thathra kaama:*". But, wherever there is *kaama:* (desire), there is ignorance, since 'desire' is only a result of *apoomathvam* - 'sense of want', a sign of self-ignorance.

A further fact to be noted, is, that, wherever there is 'desire', *samsaaraa* is also there. In short, *karmaa, kaama:, avidhyaa* and *samsaara* travel as a group.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out (in verse 44) that *Veda* itself is *pramaanam* for these facts. The *Veda* says, that, wherever there is *kaamaa*, there are *karmaa* and *samsaara* and wherever there is *kaama abhaavaa*, there are *karma abhaavaa* and *samsaara abhaavaa*. He quotes two *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad manthraa*s in verse 44. The *manthraa* first quoted, is the 7th *manthraa*, in Sec. Iv – Chapter IV of the *Upanishad*.

Referring to the text:

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते (कामाः ये अस्य हृदि श्रिताः अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवति अत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुत इति) " - " when all the desires that dwell in his heart (mind) are gone, then, he, having been mortal, becomes immortal and attains Brahman in this very body".

As could be observed, the *manthraa* implies "wherever *kaamaa* is, there are *karmaa* and *samsaaraa* | When *kaamaa* goes away, *karmaa* and *samsaaraa* also go away. *Karmaa* and *samsaaraa* alone can co-exist; *karmaa* and *mokshaa* can never co-exist."

The *manthraa* second quoted in verse 44, is part of the 6th *manthraa*, in Sec. iv – Chapter IV of the *Brahadhaarananyaka Upanishad*.

"इति नु (कामयमानः अथाकामयमानः योऽकामो निष्काम आप्तकाम आत्मकामो न तस्य प्राणाः उत्क्रामन्थि ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति)" -

"Thus the man who desires transmigrates; but, the man who does not desire , never transmigrates. He who is without desires, who is free from desires, the objects of whose desire have been attained and to whom all the objects of desire are but the Self, being but Brahman, is merged into Brahman" |

The implication of this manthraa is also "Yathra kaama: thathra samsaara: | Kaama naasena samsaara naasa:" इति च वाजिन - Thus has said the Vaajasaneeyi Samhithaa.

Vaaji is a shortened form of *Vaajasaneeyi samhithaa* or *sukla yajur vedaa*. The *sukla yajur Veda* was given out by Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa*, who was also known as *Vaajasaneeyi* or *Vaajasaneeya:*, since he is believed to be a disciple of *Suryaa*, one of whose many names is *Vaajasani:*, meaning 'giver of food'. '*Vaaja:*' means '*anaam*' (the well-known *chamakam* starts with the prayer '*vaajas cha mey*'). '*Sani:*' means 'giver' (*dhaathaa*). *Suryaa* gets this name, since he gives food to all living beings, through rains. In this verse 44, *Vaaji* denotes the *Brahadhaarananyaka Upanishad* belonging to *sukla yajur Vedaa*. '*Vaajasaneeyi manthraa:*' is '*vaajina:*' |

- व्यासः अपि आह पदे पदे - *Vyaasaa* also has repeatedly declared
- कामबन्धनं एव इदं (जगत्) - "this entire world is bound by *kaamaa*".

Kaamaa – desire; bhandhanam – shackle. The entire world is shackled by desire. Wherever *kaamaa* is there, there are *karmaa* and *samsaaraa*.

The quoted slokaa of Vyaasaachaarya is from "moksha dharmaa" of the Mahabharatham - Verse 7 – Chapter 251. It runs "Kaama bandhanam eva idham | na anyath asthi iha bhandhanam | kaama bhandhana muktha: hi na iha bhooya: abhijaayathe" meaning "The entire world is shackled by desire. There is no other shackle in the world. A person who is free from the shackle of desire (i.e. a person who is aathma rathi:/ aathmani eva thushta :) is free from the cycle of births and deaths".

The 'desire' referred to here, is only *asuddha kaamaa:*, prompted by ignorance and not a *jnaan/s* desires (such as *loka sangraham, sarva jana shreyas* etc.), which are *suddha kaamaa:*. Verse 55 – Chapter II of the *Bhagavadh Geethaa* is also relevant here. It runs

प्रजहाति यदा कामान्सर्वान्यार्थ मनोगतान् |
आत्मन्येवात्मना तुष्टः स्थितप्रज्ञस्तदोच्यते ||२- ५५||

**prajahāti yadā kāmānsarvānpārtha manōgatān |
ātmanyēvātmanā tuṣṭaḥ sthitaprajñastadōcyatē || 2- 55 | |**

– "Oh Arjuna! Satisfied in himself by himself, when one gives up all the desires obtaining in the mind, then, he is said to be of firm knowledge".

Since *kaamaa, karmaa, avidhyaa* and *samsaaraa* go together in a group, *karmaa* cannot give liberation.

***Sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 45:**

एष संसारपन्था व्याख्यातः । अथेदानीं तद्व्यावृत्तये कर्माण्यारादुपकारकत्वेन यथा मोक्षहेतुतां प्रतिपद्यन्ते तथाभिधीयते ।

Thus the pathway of transmigration is explained. Now, with a view to put an end to it, how actions become distant and mediate means for release, is going to be explained.

- **एषः संसारपन्थाः व्याख्यातः** - Thus, the chain of *samsaaraa* has been explained by us.

Panthea: - *maargaa:* / routes. The nature, consequence etc. of *samsaaraa*, were dealt with, in detail, thus far, since, only when *samsaaraa* is understood properly, one can work for *mokshaa*, in the right direction.

To recapitulate what has been discussed on this subject so far: "Ignorance leads to *apoorvathvam* (sense of want), which leads to *kaamaa* (desire), in turn, leading to *karmaa* (actions, to fulfill the desires), resulting in *punyam* and *paapam*, ultimately resulting in *punarjanma-purnamarana* cycle. This is the six-fold *samsaara chakram* - the chain of

samsaaraa, with six links. Since *karmaa* is an important link in the chain, *karmaa* cannot give liberation”.

At this stage, the *Aachaaryaa* desires to present a different angle. Till now, he was criticizing *karmaa*; from now on, he glorifies *karmaa*. From *karma nindhaa*, he moves over to *karma sthuthi*, the reasons, of course, being valid for either. The *Aachaaryaa* says: “When we criticize *karmaa*, it is a conditional criticism i.e. it is criticism of *karmaa* under certain conditions. When a person tries to achieve liberation through *karmaa*, we will strongly condemn the effort, since we are convinced that *karmaa* cannot give liberation. The *poorva meemaamsakaa*-s recommend *karmaa* as a ‘means to liberation’, quoting verses like ‘*kurvan eva iha karmaani jjeevisheth satham samaa: evam thvayi anyathha asthi na karma lipyathe nare*’ (*Isaavaasya Upanishad – manthraa* 2). We do not accept this view of theirs. On the other hand, if *karmaa* is performed as a means to *chitthasuddhi*, we shall certainly encourage it. In fact, *karmaa* alone can give *chittha suddhi*”.

- अथ इदानीं - From now on,
- कर्माण्य आरात् उपकारत्वेन - since *karmaa* helps indirectly

‘*aaraath*’ means ‘indirectly’;

‘*upakaarathvam*’ means ‘help/ assistance’.

Karmaa indirectly contributes to liberation, by giving *chittha suddhi*. It can be given up, after attaining *chittha suddhi*. But, till attainment of *chittha suddhi*, *karmaa* **is** a necessity.

- तद् व्यावृत्तये - for removal of *samsaaraa* (‘*thadh*’ denotes ‘*samsaaraa*’),

If *karmaa* is an indirect ‘contributing’ factor for liberation, what is the direct cause? Ans: ‘*Mahaavaakya vichaaraa*’ is the direct cause.

- यथा मोक्षहेतुतां प्रतिपद्यन्ते - the manner in which *karmaa* is an indirect means to *mokshaa*,
- तथा अभिधीयते - will be explained.

Chapter I: Verse 45 –

तस्यैव दुः। कथंचित्पुण्यशीलनात् खतप्तस्यः

नित्येहाक्षालितधियो वैराग्यं जायते हृदि ॥ ४५ ॥

In the heart of the creature, tormented by sorrow, as a result of some unexpected cultivation of merit and the purification of the mind, through the consequent observance of obligatory duties, the spirit of renunciation arises.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Only *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* can lead to liberation. But, a *samsaari*, who is deeply engrossed in *samsaaraa*, cannot directly get into *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. *Veda poorva bhaaghaa*, i.e. the *karma kaandaa* of the *Veda*-s, has to be introduced to him first. Initially, his lifestyle can be *kaamya-karma pradhaanam*. He can fulfill all his legitimate desires; but, he should accept and revere them as *Isvara Prasadaa*. His mind becomes purer and purer, through the *Isvara Prasaadha Bhavanaa* and, as a consequence, his worldly desires would come down. Desire for *mokshaa* will replace the worldly desires. But, mere 'desire for *mokshaa*' (i.e. *moksha icchaa* alone) is not sufficient to attain *mokshaa*. Other qualifications, *moksha yogyathaa*, should also be there. Hence, once the desire for *mokshaa* intensifies, the seeker should take to *karma yogaa*. The *kaamya-karmaani* should give way to *nithya-naimittika-karmaani*. In other words, the second stage for the seeker is a *nishkaamya-karma pradhaanaa* lifestyle. Diligent practice of *karma yogaa* helps the seeker acquire the qualifications for liberation - *vairaaghyam*, *samaadhi shadga sampatthi* etc. A *raaghi mumukshu* should continue with diligent performance of *nithya-naimittika-karmaani*, to become a *viraaghi mumukshu*'.

- एवं तस्य दुःखतप्तस्य - For the person, who is thus tormented by grief,
- कथंचित् पुण्यशीलनात् - as result of some unexpected cultivation of merit (and)
- नित्य ईहा क्षालित धियः - the purification of mind through performance of *nithya-naimittika karmaani* (such as *pancha mahaa yagnyaani*),

'*ehaa*' means '*karmad*'; '*kshaalitha*' means 'cleansed'; '*dhiya:*' means 'of the mind'.

- हृदि वैराग्यं जायते - *vairaaghyam* is born in the mind.

For a *mumukshu* (one who is keenly desirous of liberation), *vivekaa* is comparatively easy to attain. He may even achieve *samaadhi shadga sampatthi* also, without much difficulty. It is *vairaaghyam*, that is very difficult to develop. When one is willing to give up everything, for the sake of liberation, it is called *theevra vairaaghyam*. In the *Yoga Saasthraa*, it is called '*para vairaaghyam*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 46 :
कीद्रुवैराग्यमुत्पद्यत इति । उच्यते ।

kīdrugvairāgyamutpadhyata iti | ucyatē |
What kind of renunciation arises, is, thus mentioned:

What is the type of *vairaaghyam*, that is to be generated in the mind? The seeker must be prepared to lose everything he possesses, including his body, for the sake of *mokshaa*. This attitude is revealed through the story of *Nachikethas*, in the *Katopanishad*, who refused everything offered by *Yama Dharma Raja*. It is interesting to note and register that "not wanting" is easier than "willingness to lose".

But, *Vedhaantha* demands the mental preparedness to lose everything that one possesses, i.e. a *sanyaasi* mind. This is covered by the *Aachaaryaa* here, in verse 46.

Chapter I: Verse 46 –

नरकाद्दीर्यथास्याभूत्तथा काम्यफलादपि ।

यथार्थदर्शनात्तस्मान्नित्यं कर्म चिकीर्षति ॥ ४६ ॥

As formerly he was afraid of hell, now, as he sees through it, he is afraid of the fruit of the desire-prompted deeds also. Therefore, he desires to engage himself in obligatory duties only.

- यथा तस्य नरकात् भीः - Just as fear of *naraka lokaa* is there, for a person,
- तथा काम्य फलात् अपि भूत् - in the same manner, the *kaamyaa palam* (i.e. *punyam and svarghaa*) also create the same fear,
- यथार्थ दर्शनात् - by the observation of their (of results of *punyam*) nature, (namely,
- their capacity to create dependence).

Possessions are sources of *samsaaraa*. The *mumukshu* should be frightened of **dependence** on any part of the entire *anaathma prapancham*. Once the **dependence** is gone, there need be no fear. "I can make use of things; but, I shall not 'lean' on them" should be the motto.

- तस्मात् - As a result,
- नित्यं कर्म चिकीर्षति - *nithya karmaani (pancha mahaa yagnyaani)* alone are done (by such a person).

This lifestyle leads to *para vairaaghyam*.

This *sloka* is not in the form of a commandment. It is in the form of a statement, from which a diligent seeker should draw guidance.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 47:

एवं नित्यनैमित्तिक कर्मानुष्ठानेन ।

Thus, by the performance of obligatory actions, enjoined for daily observance and special occasions, the results mentioned below are achieved.

- एवं - In this manner,
- नित्यनैमित्तिक कर्मानुष्ठानेन - by performing the *pancha mahaa yagnyaani*,

The *Aachaaryaa* plans to point out, in this verse, that, by the consistent performance of the *pancha mahaa yagnyaas*, such a state of mind, namely, a mind not depending on external objects, is attained. This state of mind is a pre-requisite for *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa*.

As indicated earlier, initially, *kaamyā karmaa*-s can occupy more time. Later, they will have to be reduced and *nithya-naimittika karmaani* should get priority and prominence.

Chapter I: Verse 47 -

शुध्यमानं तु तच्चित्तमीश्वरार्पितकर्मभिः । :

वैराग्यं ब्रह्मलोकादौ व्यनक्त्यथ सुनिर्मलम् ॥ ४७ ॥

The mind, purified by the actions dedicated to God, manifests pure renunciation even with regard to high rewards like the attainment of the world of *Brahmaji*.

- ईश्वर अर्पित कर्मभिः - Through *karmaa* done with *Isvara arpitha* and *Isvara Prasaadha bhavanaa*,

Verses 30 and 31 of Chapter III, of the Bhagavadh Geetha, are relevant here:

मयि सर्वाणि कर्माणि संन्यस्याध्यात्मचेतसा ।

निराशीर्निर्ममो भूत्वा युध्यस्व विगतज्वरः ॥३- ३०॥

ये मे मतमिदं नित्यमनुतिष्ठन्ति मानवाः ।

श्रद्धावन्तोऽनसूयन्तो मुच्यन्ते तेऽपि कर्मभिः ॥३- ३१॥

mayi sarvāṇi karmāṇi saṁnyasyādhyātmacētasā |

nirāśīrṇirmamō bhūtvā yudhyasva vigatajvaraḥ || 3- 30 ||

yē mē matamidaṁ nityamanutiṣṭhanti mānavāḥ |

śraddhāvanto:'nasūyantō mucyantē tē:'pi karmabhiḥ || 3- 31 ||

meaning "Offering all actions unto Me, with a devout mind, fight, without expectations, without a sense of possession and without anxiety. Those people who always follow this teaching of Mine with faith and without being critical, are freed from the bonds of Karmaa."

- तद् चित्तं शुध्यमानं - with a cleansed mind (willing to give up),
- सुनिर्मलम् वैराग्यं व्यनक्ति - pure *vairaaghyam* manifests (as inner strength increases),

The adjective *sunirmalam* (pure) indicates that the *vairaaghyam* is not 'enforced detachment'; but, a natural result of the increased inner strength, which itself is the result of the consistent practice of *karma yoga*. This strength-based *vairaaghyam* is healthy, while *vairaaghyam* caused by disappointments and depression, is not desirable.

Also, "giving up possessions physically, but, with mental attachment to them" is dangerous. The reverse, viz., "physical possession, but, mental detachment" is better.

A measure of *vairaaghyam* that one has developed, is by an honest assessment of how many things one can give up and how many things one cannot bear to lose.

- **ब्रह्मलोकादौ** - with regard to all *anaathmaa*, including *Brahma lokam*.

"I do not want to depend on the external *anaathma prapanchaa*. I want to be *poorna:*, by myself. I do not want to seek love from others, even as I love them" should be the attitude.

28. Chapter I, Verse 47 and 48 (28-10-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is utilizing the 1st chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, to refute all the *karmavaadhin-s*, who heavily rely on the *Veda Poorva Bhaagaa* and either totally ignore or give only minimum importance to the *Veda Antha Bhagaa*. Their claim is that *karmaa* itself will give liberation. Among the *karmavaadhin-s* also, there are many sub-groups. Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the different sub-groups, one by one.

Till now, he gave different arguments to establish, that, *karmaa* – even *vaidhika karmaa* – though prescribed by the *apourusheya pramaanam*, the *Vedaa-s* – cannot give liberation, since it does not have the power to do so.

After thus refuting the views of the *karmavaadhin*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is now taking a diversion. He says “Even though *karmaa* cannot give liberation, *karmaa* cannot be said to be totally useless. It has *its* utility. In fact, it has a very important role. *Karmaa* leads to purification of mind. The *nithya naimitthika karmaani* prescribed by scriptures, especially, the *pancha mahaa yagnyaani*, play an important role in human life”.

The *nithya naimitthika karmaani* give twofold results. They give ‘spiritual growth’ as the primary result and ‘material prosperity’, even heaven, as the secondary result – *avaanthara palan*.

In the initial stages of an individual’s life, only the material benefits are talked about more. To an young newly initiated *brahmachaari*, the results of *nithya karma anushtaanam* are listed as health, scholarship, wealth, good family life etc. *Chittha suddhi*, as a benefit, is not given importance, at this stage.

After performing the *nithya naimitthika karmaa-s* diligently for some time, the individual will begin to understand the importance of spiritual growth. When, thus, the individual develops a value for spirituality, the scriptures and the *guru* lay more emphasis upon the spiritual benefit of the *nithya naimitthika karmaa-s*. The individual is gradually weaned away from *kaamyaa* and *praayaschittha karmaa-s* and is called upon to increase his *nithya naimitthika karmaa-s*, both qualitatively and quantitatively, so that his mind becomes more fit for *vedhaantha vichaaraa*. This important spiritual role (preparation of the mind for *vichaaraa*) of the *nithya naimitthika karmaani*, cannot be ignored even by a great *advaitin*. Sureswaraachaaryaa also, therefore, considers it essential to stress the need for performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*.

In verse 47, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*Isvara arpitha karamabhi: chittham sudhyamaanam (bhavathi)*" meaning "by performance of the *pancha mahaa yagnyaani*, the mind becomes purer and purer".

What is the indication of this 'purification'? Sureswaraachaaryaa says "Increase in 'sense of detachment' (*vairaaghyam*) from possessions, relationships etc."

"Supporting one's relations" may be termed 'love', a desirable sentiment. But, conversely, "expecting support from relations" is 'attachment', to be scrupulously avoided. Even 'anxiety' and 'concern' for relations should gradually come down, if not totally got rid of. Likewise, "caring for one's body" is acceptable; but "expecting one's body to be always healthy" is unrealistic. "Giving up one's expectations from or anxiety about anything, from one's own body to *Brahma lokaa*" is *vairaaghyam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out (in verse 47) that such *vairaaghyam* is achieved by practice of *karmayogaa*, saying "*Brahmalokaadhau sunirmalam vairaaghyam vyanakthi*" meaning "pure *vairaaghyam*, with regard to all *anaathmaa*, starting from *Brahma lokaa*, manifests".

The use of the verb '*vyanakthi*' (meaning 'manifests') is significant. Through this usage, an unique point is made by the *Aachaaryaa*: "It is *vairaaghyam* which is the natural state of the mind – not *raaghadvashaa*. By diligent practice of *karma yogaa*, the natural *vairaaghyam* **manifests**. It need not be born afresh, as it is already present". In God's creation, *thyaagaa* and *sanyaasaa* are natural to humans. But, because of ignorance, one 'holds on' to possessions and relations. When ignorance is got rid of, once the mind becomes healthy, the already existent *vairaaghyam* manifests.

The adjective '*sunirmalam*' is also significant. The *vairaaghyam* should come from within. It should not be enforced, by suppression of mind. *Sanyaasaa* without this natural *vairaaghyam* – i.e. *vairaaghya rahitha sanyaasaa* – can be risky and dangerous. It is relevant here to recollect Lord Krishna's warning in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (verse 6 – Chapter III) "*karmendriyani sayyamyaa ya aasthe manasaa smaran, indriyaarthaan vimoodaathmaa, mithyaachaara: sa uchyathe*" – "That deluded person, who, having externally controlled the sense organs, remains dwelling on the sense-objects mentally, is called a hypocrite". The *Aachaaryaa* avers, that, the *vairaaghyam* resulting from the diligent practice of *pancha mahaa yagnyaani* – is *sunirmalam*, natural and not enforced, similar to that of *Nachikethas*.

***Sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 48 :**

यस्माद्भ्रजस्तमोमलोपसंसृष्टमेव चित्तं कामबुद्धिशोनाकृष्य विषयदुरन्तसूनास्थानेषु निक्षिप्यते
तस्मान्नित्यनैमित्तिककर्मानुष्ठानपरिमार्जनेनापविद्भ्रजस्तमोमलं प्रसन्नमनाकुलं संमार्जितस्फटिकशिलाकल्पं

बाह्यविषय हेतुकेन च रागद्वेषात्मकेन अतिग्रहबडिशोनानाकृष्यमाणं विधूताशेषकल्मषं प्रत्यङ्मात्रप्रवणं चित्तदर्पणमवतिष्ठते । अत इदमभिधीयते ।

Because, the mind, only when tainted by rajas and thamas, gets attracted by desires, as by a bait and is thrown into the slaughter-house of sense-objects; and, when cleansed by the observance of obligatory actions and its rajas and thamas are expelled, becomes clear and tranquil like a well-washed crystal block; then, it does not get polluted by desires and aversions, engendered by sense-objects; in that state, the mind, wholly purified of all taint, remains like a clean mirror, with an inclination towards only the inmost Self. Therefore, the following is stated:

In this portion, Sureswaraacharya is defining *vairaaghyam*, in his own technical terms. According to him, a mind with *vairaaghyam* must have two virtues:

- (1) The first is, that, it should no more be under the grip of exterior sense-objects or people. A mind with *raagha-dveshaa* is under such grip. The sense-objects, by their attractiveness and the people around, by their behavior, can disturb a *raaghee* mind. Pre-occupation with objects and people enslaves the *raaghee* mind. Such a mind will not be available for *Vedhaanthalaa*. "Development of freedom from the grip of objects and people" is, therefore, the first virtue to be developed. *Chittha suddhi* consists in releasing the mind from pre-occupation with objects and people.
- (2) The second requirement is, that, the mind should naturally be interested in *aathma jnaanam*. One should not force one's mind to *Vedhaanthalaa*. The mind should be naturally inclined to dwell upon the teachings. This natural inclination towards the *aathmaa – prathyang pravanathaa* – is the second virtue or condition.

The *Aachaaryaa* assures that such a *vairaaghyam* is accomplished by practice of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*. Till such time as the *vairaaghyam* is accomplished, *nithya naimitthika karmaani* should be continued. Once that stage is reached, the seeker is ready for renunciation, at least internally.

In this introduction (*sambhandha gadhyam*) to the verse 48, the *Aachaaryaa* uses an analogy for desires and the human mind. Similar to a fish getting caught in a fisherman's hook, the mind, compared to the fish, is ensnared by the hook of 'desires'. And, just as the fish is taken away to be destroyed, the *kaamaa* hook takes away the mind to tormenting centers – the *anaathma baahya prapanthaa* sense objects. Sureswaracaahrayaa implies that every *vishaya* is a torment centre ; he uses the term '*soonaasthaanam*', the word '*soonaad*' meaning torture. Every sense object is a 'torture centre', since every object of attachment causes anxiety and concern, thus tormenting the mind.

The aim of the seeker should be to prevent the mind from getting caught by the hook of 'desire', to avoid the *soonaasthaanaa*-s. How to achieve this ? Ans: By diligent performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*. (This is the gist of verse 48 and its *sambhandha gadhyam*).

- **यस्मात् चित्तं रजस्तमोमल उपसंसृष्टं एव** - Since only the mind that is contaminated by the impurities of rajas and thamas ,

'malam' – impurity; 'upasamsruhtam' - contaminated / tainted.

The normal mind, unfortunately, is predominantly *raajasic* or *thaamasic*, and, craves for relationships and attachments. It gets disturbed by the very thought of *sanyaasaa*. An exceptional individual may evince interest in *Vedhaanthaa*, even while young, and in such cases, the interest must be ascribed to his having practiced *karma yogaa*, in his earlier birth.

- **कामबडिशेनाकृष्य** - dragged / attracted by the hook of desires,

Badisena – by the hook; *aakrushya* – attracted by / dragged by.

Every attachment/desire is a hook, dragging the mind away from the aathmaa to external objects. The Katopanishad (manthraa 1– Sec.1–Chap. II) warns: "paraanchi kaani vyathrunath svayambhoo: thasmaath paraangh pasyathi na antharaathman| kaschith dheera: prathyagh aathmaanam eikshath aavruttha chakshu: amruthathvam icchan" - "The Lord destroyed the sense organs, by making them extrovert. Therefore, everyone perceives outside, not the inner Self. Desiring immortality, only a rare, discriminative one turns away his eyes and sees the inner Self".

- **विषय दुरन्त सूनास्थानेषु निक्षिप्यते** - is dropped into the torture-houses of sense-objects, the potential sources of sorrow;

soonaa – *himsaa* / torture; *soonaasthaanam* – *himsaasthaanam* / place of torture; *nikshipyathe* – dropped / placed.

Every *vishayaa* (i.e. sense object) is a *soonaasthaanam*, where the mind is tormented. But, in a lay-person's perspective, the sense-objects give pleasure; then, how do you call them 'objects of torment'? The answer is: "because, they are **potential** sources of sorrow". This is emphasized by the use of the word '*dhurantha*', derived as '*dhu:kha yuktha antham yasya*', meaning 'whose ultimate result is sorrow'. Culmination of *vishayaa* is sorrow, since, when you are inevitably parted from the sense object, the separation gives intense pain. Lord Krishna warns in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (verse 22 – Chapter V): "*Ye hi samsparsajaa bhoghaa: dhu:kha yonaya: eva they aadhyanthavantha:*" – "Those pleasures, which are born of contact, are indeed sources

of sorrow only, since they have a beginning and an end". The Lord describes the *vishayaa-s* as *dhu:kha yonaya:* (sources of sorrow).

- **तस्मात्** - therefore,

Since the mind is ever occupied, there is no time or inclination for *vedhaantha vichaaraa*. Therefore, the mind has to be cleaned. How?

- **नित्य नैमित्तिक कर्मानुष्ठान परिमार्जनेन** - by cleaning (the mind) through observance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani;* *Parimaarjanam* – wiping away / cleaning away.
- **(चित्तं) अवतिष्ठते** - the mind remains

This long sentence of the *Aachaaryaa* is split for easier comprehension. The verb '*avathishtathe*' is, therefore, used once here. It will be used again later.

- **अपविद् रजस्तमोमलं** - cleared of the impurities of *rajas* and *thamas*,

Rajas and *thamas* will gradually decrease, because of the performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*. *Satthvaa* will become predominant. To quote the *Bhagavadh Geetha* again, the Lord exhorts Arjuna (verse 45 – Chapter II) –

त्रैगुण्यविषया वेदा निस्त्रैगुण्यो भवार्जुन |

निर्द्वन्द्वो नित्यसत्त्वस्थो निर्योगक्षेम आत्मवान् ||२- ४५||

traiguṇyaviṣayā vēdā nistraiguṇyō bhavārjuna |

nirdvandvō nityasattvasthō niryōgakṣēma ātmavān ||2- 45||

-“Oh Arjuna! The *Vedaa-s* deal with the world of three *gunaa-s*. Be free from the desire for the world of three *gunaa-s*. Be free from the hold of the pairs of opposites. Be ever established in *satthva gunaa*. Be free from concerns of 'acquisition' and 'preservation'. Be ever mindful of the Self”.

If the mind becomes more and more *saathvic*, it worries less and less about 'acquisitions' and 'preservations'. *Yoga kshemaa* concerns come down. The more possessions one has, more problems also one has. The aim should be to reduce possessions and lead a simple life.

- **प्रसन्नं** - relaxed,

Because it is relaxed, the mind is made available for *japam*, *dhyaanam*, *sravanam*, *mananam*, *nidhidhyaasanam* and other *saadhanaa-s*. Poet *Kalidaasaa*, when describing the tranquil *Maanasarovar*, compares it to the mind of a wise man.

- **अनाकुलं** - undisturbed,

Why the use of both *prasannam* and *anaakulam*, which two words mean almost the same? The answer is: '*Prasannam*' signifies 'undisturbed' and '*anaakulam*' signifies 'cannot be disturbed'. When the mind is strong enough not to be disturbed by anything, it is said to be *anaakulam*.

- **संमार्जित स्फटिक शिलाकल्पं** - - (and) very clear like a well cleaned crystal stone.

'*sammajitha*' means 'wiped well'/'cleaned well' and is adjective to *silaa kalpam*.

The second half of the *sambhandha gadhyam*, which follows, points out, that, the mind not only gets released from external objects because of the performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani* (as averred in the first half above) , but, it also 'stays' released. The mind becomes invulnerable to future temptations and attachments also, unlike *Jadabharathaa* in the *Bhaagavatha Mahaa Puraanam*, who renounced his kingdom, family and possessions and took to the forests for austerities, but, unfortunately, got attached to a deer. One has to be ever alert, to avoid vulnerability.

- **चित्तदर्पणं** - This clean mirror-like mind
- **अनाकृष्यमाणं** - not affected
- **रागद्वेषात्मकेन अतिग्रहबडिशेन** - by the powerful hook of desires and aversions,

'*Athigraha:*' is a term borrowed from the *Brahadhaaanyaka Upanishad* (III.ii.1 to III.ii.9), which calls sense objects as '*athigraha:*'. The *Brahadhaaanyaka Upanishad* refers to sense organs by the word '*graha:*', meaning 'controller / enslaver', since sense organs enslave the *jeevaa*. The sense objects are called '*athigraha:*', by the *Upanishad*, since the sense objects, in their turn, control or enslave the sense organs. Sense organs control / enslave the humans; sense objects control / enslave the sense organs. The term '*athigraha:*' would, therefore, mean 'controller of controller'. Sureswaraacharya (in this context) uses the word in the meaning of *kaamakrodhaa* or *raaghadveshaa*.

- **बाह्य विषय हेतुकेन** - caused by exterior objects (descriptive of *raagha dveshaa-s*)
- **विधूत अशेष कल्मषं** - (and, therefore) wholly free of all impurities,

vidhootha – free from ; *asesha kalmasham* - impurities, without any trace

Lord Krishna refers only to this state of mind in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* in verse 52 of chapter II, when he says:

यदा ते मोहकलिलं बुद्धिर्व्यतितरिष्यति |
तदा गन्तासि निर्वेदं श्रोतव्यस्य श्रुतस्य च ||२- ५२||

yadā tē mōhakalilaraṁ buddhirvyatitariṣyati |
tadā gantāsi nirvēdaṁ śrōtavyasya śrutasya ca ||2- 52||

- "when your intellect goes beyond the mist of delusion, then you will attain dispassion for what is yet to be heard and what is already heard".

What is the greatest advantage of such a state of mind? For such a person, plenty of time is available for *vedhaantha vichaaraa*.

- **अवतिष्ठते** - remains (the verb used again, as explained earlier)
- **प्रत्यङ् मात्र प्रवणं** - with the inclination being only towards *aathmaa*.

Prathyang – *prathyak aathman*; *maathra* - only; *pravanam* - inclination.

Even without *Vedhaantha*, a contented, detached, peaceful mind is enjoyable.

Therefore, *karmaa* is very necessary.

- **अतः इदं अभिधीयते** - Therefore, the following is stated.

29. Chapter I, Verse 48 to 52 (04-11-2006)

Chapter I: Verse 48 –

व्युत्थिताशेषकामेभ्यो यदा धीरवतिष्ठते ।
तदेव प्रत्यगात्मानं स्वयमेवाविविक्षति ॥ ४८ ॥

When the mind abides, purged of all desires, it is then, that it spontaneously inclines to merge into the inner Self.

Sureswaraachaaryaa pointed out in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to this verse, that, *karmaa* is very essential to prepare the mind, though he strongly criticized the view that *karmaa* is a means to liberation. *Karmaa* performed as a 'purifier' can be verily called *Karma Yoga*. And, in *Karma Yoga*, *nithya naimitthika karmaani* - essentially the *pancha mahaa yagnyaani* – are performed diligently. *Kaamyaa karmaa-s* and *praayaschittha karmaa-s* are gradually given up. Because of the diligent performance of *nithya-naimitthika-karmaani*, the mind gets purified and becomes fit to absorb *jnaanam*. This is the topic being covered by the *Aachaaryaa*, from verse 45.

- **यदा धीः अशेष कामेभ्यः व्युत्थितः अवतिष्ठते ते** - When the mind abides, purged of all desires,

yadhaa – when; *dhee:* -mind; *asesha kaamebhya:* - from all worldly desires; *vyuthyitha :* - purged / transcending ; *avathishtathe* – abides / remains.

- **तदा एव प्रत्यगात्मानं स्वयमेव अविविक्षति** - it is then, that, it spontaneously inclines to merge into the inmost Self.

Thadhaa eva – only then; *prathyagh aathmaanam* – innermost *aathmaa*; *avivikshathy* – turns / inclines (*aavesum icchathi* – *avivikshathy*); *svayam eva* – naturally / spontaneously.

When desires for worldly pleasures and objects cease, the process of self-enquiry becomes natural.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 49 :

अतःपरमवसिताधिकाराणि कर्माणि प्रत्वप्रवणत्वसूनौ कृतसंप्रत्तिकानि चरितार्थानि सन्ति

After this, the actions, having fulfilled their function and having transferred their responsibility, to the inclination of the mind towards the Self, reach the completion of their purpose, as it were.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say that *karmaa-s* have completed their job, once they have generated 'interest in self-knowledge'. ('Interest in' or 'eagerness for' 'self-knowledge')

is termed '*jignyaasaa*'). After this stage, *karmaa*-s have no role to play. On the other hand, the very same *karmaa*-s will turn into obstacles, by making the mind extrovert again. Hence, once introversion is achieved, *karmaa*-s will have to be given up.

- **अतः परं** - After this (i.e. after *jignyaasa* uthpatthi),
- **अवसित अधिकाराणि** - with their functions fulfilled,
- **कर्माणि चरितार्थानि सन्ति** - *karmaa*-s become satisfied for their having completed their job.

Avasitha – fulfilled / completed/ ended; *adhikaaraani* - purposes;
charithaarthaani – feel satisfied.

They feel: "If we (*karmaa*-s) continue to be here, we will be only obstacles to the seeker. The more we remain, the less time the seeker will have, for *vedhaantha vicharaad*".

- **प्रत्यक् प्रवणत्व सूनौ कृतसंप्रत्तिकानि** - (and) transfer the responsibilities to their 'son', viz., the 'inclination of the mind towards *Aathmaad*'.

Prathyak pravanathvam – *jignyaasaa* / inclination for *jnaanam*; *soonu*:- *puthra*:

The 'inclination of the mind towards *aathmaad*', in other words, 'yearning for self-knowledge' is *Brahma jignyaasaa*. Since it is *karmaa*, performed as *karma yogaa*, which produces this desire, Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to *jignyaasaa* as the 'son of *karmaad*' .

"*Karmaa* calls its 'son', *jignyaasaa*, and transfers to it, the responsibilities for further spiritual progress of the seeker", the *Aachaaryaa* says, in a poetic manner.

"*Sampratthikaan*" is a term borrowed from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (1. v. 16), which talks of a *sampratthi karmaa*, a formal ritual, by which, a father, infirm with old age, hands over all responsibilities to his son – including even the *sandhyaavandana karmaa*. '*Samprakthi*.' or '*sampradhaanam*' means 'handing over'.

Karmaa formally calls *jignyaasaa*, hands over the responsibility to *jignyaasaa* and withdraws.

Chapter I:Verse 49 –

प्रत्यक्प्रवणतां बुद्धेः कर्माण्युत्पाद्य शुद्धितः ।

कृतार्थान्यस्तमायान्ति प्रावृडन्ते गना इव ॥ ४९ ॥

Actions, having generated in the mind, through purification, the 'inclination towards the Self' and having fulfilled their purpose thus, disappear like clouds after the rainy season.

The idea presented in the *sambhandha gadhyam* is repeated in the verse.

- कर्माणि - The *karmaa-s*,
- प्रत्यक् प्रवणतां बुद्धेः - having generated *jignyaasaa* in the mind,
- शुद्धितः - by purifying (the mind)

'*suddhitha*.' indicates that the mind has been purified of worldly desires. The mind, is, therefore, more spiritually oriented.

- कृतार्थानि - (and, thus) having gained their object,
- अस्तमायान्ति - disappear / withdraw,

This is another subtle point. Sureswaraacharya says: "You need not give up *karmaa*; once maturity is achieved, *karmaa-s* will naturally cease". This is similar to the mango dropping from the tree, when ripe.

Swami Dayananda gives another example: "once the child grows up, its interest in the toys goes away".

Sureswaraacharya gives the example of the monsoon clouds moving away, after the rainy season.

- प्रावृडन्ते घनाः इव - similar to the clouds (disappearing) after the rainy season.

Praavrush – rainy season; *antha*: - end; *praavrudanthe* - at the end of the rainy season; *ghanaa*: - clouds.

During the rainy season, the clouds produce rains. At the end of the rainy season, having done their job, they withdraw. *Karmayogaa* (comparable to the clouds) 'rains' *vivekaa*, *vairaaghyaa* and *samaadhi shadgha sampatthi*. Once the mind (comparable to the fields) is saturated with these *varshaa-s*, the *karma yoga* clouds withdraw. *Grihastha aasramaa* (rainy season) ends. *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa* begins.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 50:

यतः नित्यकर्मानुष्ठानस्य एष महिमा ।

Since such is the greatness of performance of obligatory actions.

"Therefore" Sureswaraacharya says "when I criticize *karmaa-s*, I am not against *karmaa-s* as such. They **are** glorious".

- यतः - Since
- एषः महिमा - such is the glory

- नित्य कर्म अनुष्ठानस्य - of the performance of *nithya naimitthikaa karmaani*,

"All the people should perform *nithya naimitthika karmaa-s*" is the exhortation of the *Aaachaaryaa*, in the verse that follows this *sambhandha gadhyam*.

The *Brahma soothraa-s* start with the exhortation "*athaatho Brahma jignyaasaa*" – "now (after the attainment of the requisite spiritual qualities), therefore (since the results obtained by sacrifices etc. are ephemeral, whereas the result of the knowledge of *Brahman* is eternal), the inquiry into the real nature of *Brahman* should be taken up". This terse statement, at once, emphasizes the need for the performance of *karmaa* for attainment of spiritual qualities and also the desirability of giving up *karmaa-s* at the appropriate time (since the results of *karmaa-s* are impermanent).

Verse 50 – Chapter I :

तस्मान्मुमुक्षुभिः कार्यमात्मजानाभिलाषिभिः ।

नित्यं नैमित्तिकं कर्म सदैवात्मविशुद्धये ॥ ५० ॥

Therefore, aspirants after liberation seeking the knowledge of the Self, must always perform, for purposes of self-purification, actions obligatory everyday and on special occasions.

- तस्मात् - Therefore (since *karmayogaa* is very essential for spiritual inclination),
- मुमुक्षुभिः - by those who aspire for *mokshaa*
- आत्मजानाभिलाषिभिः - (and, therefore) desire *aathma jnaanam*,

abhilaashaa - desire.

Desires have to get refined gradually. Desire for *sukham* has to be refined to desire for *mokshaa*. *Sukha icchaa* has to be refined to *moksha icchaa*; therefore, to *aathma jnaanam icchaa* (since only *aathma jnaanam* can give *mokshaa*), therefore, to *vichaara icchaa* (since *jnaanam* results only from intense *vichaaraa*) and, therefore, to *sravana icchaa* (which is the first step in *vichaaraa*).

For such refinements, *karma yogaa* is very important.

- नित्यं नैमित्तिकं कर्म - the mandatory daily and occasional religious activities
- कार्यं सदा एव - should be done always
- आत्म विशुद्धये - for *chittha suddhi* (purification of the mind).

Aathmaa, in this context, denotes the mind.

Karmaa cannot give *jnaanam* or *mokshaa*; it will give purification.

Verse 11 – Chapter V, of the *Bhagavadh Geetha*, is relevant here: “yōginaḥ karma kurvanti saṅgaṃ tyaktvā”tmaśuddhayē”. – “*Karma yogi-s* perform action, without attachment, for the sake of mental purity”.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 51:

यथोक्तेऽथ सर्वजवचनं प्रमाणं ।

On the matter thus stated, the words of the omniscient Lord constitute the authority.

How does Sureswaraachaaryaa know that *karmaa* gives only purification and not *jnaanam* or *mokshaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* explains: “Lord Krishna has stated this in the *Bhagavadh Geetha*”.

- यथोक्ते अर्थे - With regard to the teaching that has been mentioned,
- प्रमाणं - the authority (is)
- सर्वजवचनं - the statement of the omniscient Lord.

The *Aachaaryaa* quotes the relevant portion of the *Bhagavadh Geetha*, in the verse.

Chapter I:Verse 51 –

"आरुरुक्षोर्मुनेर्योगं कर्म कारणमुच्यते ।

योगारूढस्य तस्यैव शम "एवेति च स्मृतिः ॥ ५१ ॥

“For one who wants to ascend to *yoga*, action is said to be the means. To the same person, when he has ascended to *yoga, sama* (renunciation of action) is said to be the means” (*Bhagavadh Geetha – VI -3*). Such is the *smruthi* passage.

- “योगं आरुरुक्षोः ने: - For the seeker, who wants to reach *jnaana yogaa*.
- कर्म कारणमुच्यते - *nithya naimitthika karmaa* is said to be a very important *saadhanaa*,

‘Yogam’, in this context, is *jnaana yogaa*.

- तस्य योगारूढस्य - Once the seeker has come to *jnaana yogaa* (after attaining
- *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*),
- शमः एव (कारणं उच्यते) - (it is said) ‘giving up *nithya naimitthika karmaa*’ is the
- means”.
- इति एव च स्मृतिः- Such is the *smruthi* (*Bhagavadh Geethaa*) passage

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his *Geetha Bhaashyam*, in this context, interprets ‘*sama*’, as ‘*sanyaasaad*’, as is his wont. For a non-*sanyaasi* seeker, the word is taken to mean “renunciation of action” or “giving up *nithya naimitthika karmaan*”.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 52:

नित्यकर्मनिष्ठानात् धर्मोत्पत्तिः । धर्मोत्पत्तेः पापहानिः । ततः चित्तशुद्धिः । ततः सम्सारयाथात्म्यावबोधः । ततः वैराग्यं । ततः मुमुक्षुत्वं । ततः तदुपायपर्येषणं । ततः सर्वकर्म तत् साधनं संन्यासः । ततः योगाभ्यासः । ततः

चित्तस्य प्रत्यक्प्रवणता । ततः तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यार्थपरिज्ञानं । ततः अविध्योच्चेदः । ततश्च स्वात्मन्येवावस्थानं "ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति" "विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते" इति ।

From the performance of obligatory actions, righteousness arises. From the arising of righteousness, sins are destroyed. Purity of mind flows from the destruction of sin. From that follows the comprehension of the real nature of transmigratory existence. From that originates renunciation. From that emerges the desire for liberation. Then the search for the means of liberation ensues. Then follows the renunciation of all actions and their means. From that follows the practice of contemplation. From it originates the inclination of the mind towards the Self. From that arises the understanding of the import of the propositions like "*that thvam asi*". From it follows the elimination of ignorance. Then the Self remains in itself. "Being *Brahman*, he attains *Brahman*" (*Brahadhaarnyaka Upanishad* IV. iv. 6) and "the freed one is freed" (*Kenopanishad* II.ii.1).

The entire range of *saadhanaa*-s is presented here beautifully, as a ladder of several rungs.

- नित्य कर्म अनुष्ठानात् -- By diligent observance of nithya naimitthika karmaa-s, A seeker's journey begins with nithya naimitthika karmaani – pancha mahaa yagnyaani.
- धर्म उत्पत्तिः - spiritual punyam increases

Kaamyaa karmaa-s increase material *punyam*, resulting in prosperity. *Nithya naimitthika karmaa*-s increase spiritual *punyam*.

- धर्म उत्पत्तेः पाप हानिः - From the *uthpatthi* of spiritual *punyam*, spiritual *paapam* goes away.

Spiritual *paapam* means "anything that is non-conducive to spiritual growth" i.e. anything which obstructs *sravana*, *manana*, *nidhidhyaasanaani*. Every material undertaking can be a *prathibhandha*: (obstacle) to *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa*.

Isaavaasya Upanishad calls even *svarga lokaa* as the "dark world", since, though all sensual pleasures are available there, there will be no inclination for *Vedhaantha*. "Lack of interest in *Vedhaanthic* study" is a *paapam*.

- ततः चित्त सुद्धिः - Thereafter, mental preparedness, in the form of interest in *Vedhaanthic* study / purification of the mind / *nithya anithya vasthu viveka*: etc.
- ततः सन्सार याथात्म्य अवबोधः - Thereafter, the awareness of the problems of *samsaaraa*.

'yaathaathmyam' means 'real nature'. The 'real nature' of *samsaaraa* is its 'hollowness' and 'problems'. 'avabodha:' means 'clear understanding'.

- **ततः वैराग्यं** - Thereafter, detachment from the world / relations / family.
- **ततः मुमुक्षुत्वं** - Thereafter, desire for liberation.

Greater the detachment from materialistic factors, greater will be the attachment for *mokshaa*. This fact can also be expressed as "attachment to *mokshaa* is inversely proportional to attachment to the world".

- **ततः तदुपाय पर्येषणं** - Thereafter, seeking the route to *mokshaa*.

As *Mundakopanishad* (verse 12 – Sec.ii – Chapter I) points out "*thadh vijnaartham gurum abhigaccheth*" - "Thereafter (the seeker, after coming to dispassion) must necessarily approach a *guru*, to attain knowledge".

- **ततः सर्व कर्म तत्साधन संन्यासः** - Thereafter, renunciation of all *karmaa*-s and all the conditions that produce *karmaa*-s
'*Saadhanaa*', in this context, denotes the "infrastructure" that produces *karmaa*-s, by which *grihastha aasramam* is implied.

30. Chapter I, Verse 52 to 54 (11-11-2006)

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 52, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about the entire range of spiritual *saadhanaa*-s, to show that *karmaa* does have a role to play in the spiritual journey – but, only a limited role. One has to enter *karmaa* and later, grow out of *karmaa*. The spiritual path is presented by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the form of a 'staircase' with a number of steps.

- **नित्य कर्म अनुष्ठानात् धर्म उत्पत्तिः** - Spiritual *punyam* results from *karmaa* (*karmayogaa*).
- **धर्म उत्पत्तेः पाप हानिः** - Spiritual *punyam* eliminates spiritual *paapam* (*paapam* meaning any obstacle to come to spirituality).
- **ततः चित्त शुद्धिः** - Thereafter, mental purity.
- **ततः संसार याथात्म्य अवबोधः** - This mental purity results in *dosha dharsanam* in *samsaaraa* (awareness of the deficiencies in worldly objects).
- **ततः वैराग्यं** - The result of *dosha dharsanam* is *vairaaghyam*, which means 'turning the mind away from *anaathmaa*'.
- **ततः मुमुक्षुत्वं** - The mind turned away from *anaathmaa*, is turned towards *aathmaa* (desire for *mokshaa* or liberation).
- **ततः तद् उपाय पर्येषणं** - From *mumukshuthvam*, results 'looking for' or 'seeking' *moksha upaayaa* / the 'means' to *mokshaa*.

'*Paryeshanam*' means 'looking for' / 'seeking'; the aspirant 'looks for' / 'seeks' *saasthraa*-s and a *guru*, to guide him towards *mokshaa*.

- **ततः सर्वकर्म तत्साधन संन्यासः** - Thereafter, renunciation of all *karmaa*-s and the infrastructure that is needed for *karmaa*-s.

The word *karmaa*, in this context, primarily means *vaidhika karmaa*. And, '*thadh saadhanaa*' denotes the infrastructure that is conducive to *karmaa*, meaning the *grihastha aasramaa*, since *brahmachaarins*-s, *vaanaaprasthaa*-s and *sanyaasins*-s cannot do *vaidhika karmaa*. "Renunciation of *vaidhika karmaa* and *grihastha aasramaa*", in the literal sense, would mean "adoption of *sanyaasa aasramaa*".

Chathurtha (sanyaasa) aasrama sveekaaram – i.e. formal renunciation of family life, including *yagnyopaveetham* and tuft – is part of the original *Vedic* scheme. But, in the present circumstances, when *varna-aasrama dharma* itself has been given the go-bye,

this advice for formal renunciation of family life and adoption of the *sanyaasa aasramaa*, may not be relevant.

In the current age, can an individual become a *sanyaasi*, for the purpose of renouncing *lokika karmaa*? Interestingly, even that is not possible. In the original concept of *sanyaasa dharmaa*, the *sanyaasi* was prohibited from staying for a length of time, in one place. He was expected to be on the move, all the time and that too singly – as an *ekaaki*. But, to-day's circumstances have made it necessary for any *sanyaasi* to be part of an Institution; and, for such a *sanyaasi*, *lokikaa* duties connected with the Institution have replaced duties to the family. In fact, quantitatively more *karmaa*-s have to be done by him, as the Institution member.

In other words, both *grihastha aasramaa* and modern *sanyaasa aasramaa* appear to be not conducive to *jnaana maargaa*. And, therefore, recourse has to be taken to the next best option, viz., that, whatever be one's external *aasramaa*, one should reduce four factors – possessions, obligations, relationships and transactions, since these four factors deprive the seeker of valuable time that could otherwise be utilized for spirituality ; they also cause preoccupation or obsession of mind.

The term, *sarvakarma thadh saadhana sanyaasa:*, can, therefore, be taken to mean, "reduction of the above four factors", so that, time and a mind free of preoccupations, will be available for *vicharaa*.

- **ततः योग अभ्यासः** - Thereafter, resorting to *ashtaanga yoga abhyaasa:*.

By the *ashtaanga yoga* practice, the mind is acclimatized and prepared for a life of study and contemplation. A mind which has been used to relationships and activities, feels terribly disturbed, when it is made to withdraw from worldly relationships and activities, for the purpose of spiritual study. We commonly see instances, when even a temporary separation from the family for professional work, is found intolerable. Therefore, even if any effort is made to withdraw from active life for the purpose of *vedhaantha vicharaa* and thus, make the environment conducive for *vicharaa*, the mind may not co-operate, because it had been used to relationships, interaction etc. Because of this 'withdrawal system', such a person will have the time, but not the aptitude for studying *Vedhaantha*. The mind, therefore, has to be trained to accept gradual withdrawal from worldly matters.

Lord Krishna, in the *Bhagavadh Githa*, stresses the importance of seclusion, for a spiritual seeker (in verse 10 – Chap. VI): "yōgī yuñjīta satatamātmānaṃ rahasi sthitaḥ | **ēkākī yatacittātmā nirāśīraparigrahaḥ.**" - "Remaining **alone in solitude**, with a restrained mind and body, without any desire, and without any possession, a *Yogi*

should constantly engage the mind in meditation". Again (in verse 11 – Chap. XIII), while listing out important values which prepare the mind for self-knowledge, the Lord stresses the need for '*viviktha desa sevithvam*' meaning 'seclusion'.

"Therefore" Sureswaraacharya says "*yoga abhyaasaa* is required to train the mind to be comfortable with itself, without relationships etc., for the purpose of long study and long contemplation". Resorting to the *Ashtaanga Yoga* consisting of *yamaa*, *niyamaa*, *aasanaa*, *praanayaamaa* and *prathyahaaraa* will be fruitful, in training the mind, for contemplation.

- **ततः चित्तस्य प्रत्यक्प्रवणता** - Because of the *yoga abhyaasaa*, the mind will learn to be comfortable and happy in being alone for *sravana*, *manana*, *nidhidhyaasanaani*.

For a prepared mind, 'being alone' is not 'loneliness', which is disturbing, but 'aloneness', which is welcome and enjoyable. This comfort of the mind / inwardness of the mind is *prathyak pravanathaa*. Once the mind is ready, one can apply the mind to *sravanam*, *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*, uninterrupted by thoughts of the four factors – possessions, obligations, relationships and transactions.

- **ततः तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्यार्थ परिज्ञानं** - Thereafter, thorough enquiry into *mahaa vaakayam* (*mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*) leading to *jnaanam*.

Parijnaanam – *aparoksha jnaanam*. This is achieved by *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani*, the constituents of *Vedhaantheta Vichaaraa*.

- **ततः अविध्या उच्छेदः** - Thereafter, 'total destruction of *ajnaanam* / '*avidhyaa naasa:*' / '*dvaitha naasa:*' | '*ucchedha:*' means 'uprooting' / 'total destruction'.
- **ततः अविध्या उच्छेदः** - Thereafter, 'total destruction of *ajnaanam* / '*avidhyaa naasa:*' / '*dvaitha naasa:*' | '*ucchedha:*' means 'uprooting' / 'total destruction'.
- **ततः स्वात्मनि एव अवस्थानं** - Thereafter, abiding in the *aathmaa* and seeing everything else as *mithyaa* / *anaathmaa*,

With *aparoksha jnaanam*, one's world view changes. As a *karmayogi*, my view is of a triad, consisting of *jeeva*, *jagath* and *Isvara*. As a *samsaari*, I am a hapless, helpless *jeevaa*, requiring *Isvara's* support to confront my *praarabdhaa*.

Jnaana yogam and *svaathmani avasthaanam* change this view and replace the triad of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* to *dhruk-dhrusya-vivekaa*. The attitude "I am *dhruk Brahman* ; everything else is *dhrusyam*" takes over.

My day starts with *aathma-anaathma dhyaanam*. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa's Praatha: smarana sthothram begins : "Praatha: smaraami hrudhi samspruadh

aathmathathvam" and ends with the line "rajvaam bhujangam iva prathibhaasitham vai". If I have aparoksha jnaanam, the entire universe is like rajjusarpaa (mithyaa), while I am like the rajju (sathyam).

"*Aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*" becomes the conviction. Even while confronting *praarabhdhaa*, I draw strength from the *aathma-anaathma* format. I consider *praarabhdhaa* also as *mithyaa*. The *sathya* 'I' can never be frightened by the *mithyaa praarabhdhaa*.

"I support everything; I do not need any support; I am not helpless or hapless; I am the happy *Brahman*" is the *jnaana nishtaa* or *jeevan mukthi*. This will lead to *videha mukthi*. "Even with *praarabhdhaa*, I am *aathmaa*; without *praarabhdhaa* also, I am *aathmaa*" is *videha mukthi*.

Thus, the spiritual journey is from *karma anushtaanam* to *videha mukthi*.

What is the *pramaanam*, for all these? Sureswaraachaaryaa quotes "*Brahmaiva san brahma aapyethi*" from *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iv.6) and "*vimuktha: cha vimuchyathe*", from *Katopanishad* (II.ii.1).

- "ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येति" - remaining in *Brahman* while alive (*jeevan mukthi*) merges into Brahman, after death (*videha mukthi*) and,
- "विमुक्तः च विमुच्यते" - remaining free, while living, becomes free after death (free from *punar janmam*).

Chapter I: Verse 52 –

पारम्पर्येण कर्मैव स्यादविद्यानिवृत्तये ।

जानवन्नाविरोधित्वात्कर्माविध्यां निरस्यति ॥ ५२ ॥

Thus, through such a series of links, action contributes to the removal of ignorance. But, it cannot directly remove ignorance, for it is not opposed to it.

What is the conclusion reached through this introduction? The answer is: "That *karmaa* is only a remote and indirect means to *mokshaa*; *jnaanaa* **alone** is the direct and proximate means. *Jnaanam* will remove ignorance directly; *karmaa* will not, but is indirectly useful.

- एवं - In this manner (as discussed above),
- कर्मा अविद्या निवृत्तये स्यात् - *karmaa* becomes a means of ignorance removal,
- पारम्पर्येण - indirectly / remotely.
- कर्मा अविध्यां न निरस्यति - *Karmaa* does not remove ignorance directly,

- जानवत् - as knowledge does,
- अविरोधित्वात् - since *karmaa* is not an enemy of ignorance.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 53 :

न च कर्मणः कार्यमण्वपि मुक्तौ सभाव्यते नापि मुक्तौ यत्संभवति तत्कर्मपेक्षते। तदुच्यते ।

It is impossible that action could do anything directly to bring about release. Nor does that which constitutes release, require the aid of action. This is going to be brought out now:

In this introduction to verse 53, Sureswaraachaaryaa explains why *karmaa* is not a direct means for *mokshaa*. He gives two reasons: (1) Whatever be the consequence of *karmaa*, is not found in *mokshaa*. *Karma kaaryam* is not seen in *mokshaa*. (2) Whatever be the consequence of *mokshaa* or the nature of *mokshaa*, you do not find in *karmaa*. The features of *mokshaa* are not seen in *karmaa*.

There is no connection between *karmaa* and *mokshaa*.

- कर्मणः कार्य - The consequences of *karmaa*

Four consequences of *karmaa* are mentioned by the *Aachaaryaa*, later, in the verse.

- मुक्तौ अणुवपि न संभाव्यते - are not found, even a little, in *mokshaa*.
- मुक्तौ यद् संभवति - Whatever is found in *mokshaa* / the nature of *moksha*
- तद् कर्म अपि न अपेक्षते - has no connection / relationship to *karmaa*.

(*Apekshaa* - connection / relationship).

- तद् उच्यते - I will explain how.

Karmaa and *mokshaa* has no *sambhandhaa* at all. *Karmaa* is in the field of *dvaithaa* ; *mokshaa* is in the field of *advaitaa*. *Karmaa* is in the field of *mithyaa*; *mokshaa* is in the field of *sathyam*. *Karmaa* is associated with time and space; *mokshaa* is dissociated from time and space. *Karmaa* is associated with change; *mokshaa* is associated with changelessness.

Chapter I:Verse 53 –

उत्पाध्यमाप्य संस्कार्य विकार्य च क्रियाफलम् ।

नैवं मुक्तिर्यतस्तस्मात्कर्म तस्या न साधनम् ॥ ५३ ॥

The result of action must be either 'production' or 'attainment' or 'improvement' or 'modification'. Release cannot come under any of these four. Therefore, action is not the means of release.

This was seen before in verse 24, where Sureswaraacharya mentioned "*chaturvidha karmakaaryam*" – "four-fold results of *karmaa*", though, he did not name them. In this verse (verse 53) he lists them.

- **क्रियाफलम्** - The result of action is
- **उत्पाद्यं** - production (or)
- **आप्यं** - reaching (or)
- **संस्कार्यं** - purification (or)
- **विकायं** - modification.
- **एवं मुक्तिः न (स्यात्)** - *Mokshaa* has nothing to with any of these.

As long as one is caught in "cause-effect" pursuit, one is trapped in *samsaaraa*. A *Vedhaanthic* student, even after coming to *Vedhaanthee*, very often, finds it difficult to get out of *samsaaraa*. "I have understood *Vedhaanthee*; I am pursuing meditation for *mokshaa* to come" is a statement in the cause-effect realm.

- **यतस्तस्मात्** - Because of this (since *mokshaa* is beyond cause-effect)
- **कर्मा तस्याः साधनम् न (भवेत्)** - *karmaa* cannot be a means for *mokshaa*.

Thasyaa: - *mukthe*: / for *mokshaa*.

Jnaanam also does not produce *mokshaa*; it only helps you realize the fact that *mokshaa* is your nature.

With this verse, Sureswaraacharya concludes the refutation of the first group of *poorva pakshin*-s, which refutation, he started in verse 23.

As may be recollected, the *Aacharya* had mentioned 3 types of *poorva pakshin* s:

- (1) *Abhyupedhya karma vaadhina*: - in verses 9 to 13.
- (2) *Anabhyupedhya karma vaadhina*: - in verses 14 to 19 and
- (3) *Jnaana karma samucchaya vaadhina*: - in verses 20 to 22.

Of the three types, the first type (*abhyupedhya karma vaadhina*;) was taken up for refutation in verse 23; the arguments against this group is completed with verse 53. This

group of *poorva pakshin-s* concede that the topic of *aathma jnaanam* is discussed in the scriptures; but, hold, that *aathma jnaanam* is **not** required for *mokshaa* and that *karmaa alone* (by itself) can give *mokshaa*.

Refuting them, the *Aachaaryaa* established that *karmaa* is not *moksha saadhanam*; it has only a limited role, 'purifying the mind', and that is all it can do.

The second group, *abhyupedhya karma vaadhina:*, do not even accept that *jnaanam* is mentioned in the *saasthraa-s*. The *Aachaaryaa* will take up the refutation of this philosophy, later.

He now takes up "*samucchaya vaadha roopa poorvapaksha niraasa:*" – "refutation of the view of the 3rd group of *poorva pakshin-s*, viz., *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadhina:*", from verse 54, which goes on up to verse 79.

What is *samucchaya vaadhaa*? The answer: "The view that only a **combination** of *karmaa* and *jnaanam* will be the cause of *mokshaa*".

This group can be further sub-divided into three sub-groups:

- (1) *Jnaana pradhaana samucchayaa* – which holds *jnaanam* as main (*anghee*) and *karmaa* as support (*angam*). According to this view, *Jnaanam* gives *mokshaa*, supported by *karmaa*.
- (2) *Karma pradhaana samucchayaa* – in which *karmaa* is considered *pradhaanam* and *jnaanam* as support (*angam*). According to this view, it is *Karmaa* that gives *mokshaa*, supported by *jnaanam*.
- (3) *Sama pradhaana samucchayaa* - in which, both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* have equal importance. "Both **together** give *mokshaa*" is the view of this group.

Sureswaraachaaryaa will be refuting all the three sub-groups; he will establish that *jnaanam* gives *mokshaa*, unsupported by *karmaa* - "*gandha lesasya abhaavaath*". In *jnaanam* and *mokshaa*, *karmaa* is not there.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 54 :

एवं तावत् केवलं कर्म साक्षात् अविध्या अपनुत्तये न पर्याप्तमिति प्रपञ्चितम्।

Thus, it has been explained that mere action is not competent to remove ignorance directly.

Sureswaraachaaryaa sums up what he has done till now, from verse 23 to 53.

-
- एवं - In this manner,
 - प्रपञ्चितं - the teaching has been given elaborately,
 - केवलं कर्मा - (that) *karmaa* alone
 - न पर्याप्तं - is not adequate / sufficient,
 - अविद्या अपनुत्तये - for removal of self-ignorance.

Apanutthi: - removal.

Karmaa includes upaasanaa also, which is maanaseeka karmaa.

31. Chapter 1, Verse 54 to 56 (18-11-2006)

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 54, Sureswaraacharya is consolidating the previous topics and introducing the next topic.

One of the previous topics was that *karmaa* cannot be a direct means to liberation, although *karmaa* does have *its* importance. The *Aachaaryaa* agreed, that, *karmaa* serves as an indirect means to liberation, by preparing the mind for *jnaana yogam*. He pointed out that *karma yogaa* is, thus, the means only to *jnaana yogaa* and it is *jnaana yogaa* which is the direct means to liberation. In other words, there is a cause-effect relationship between *karma yogam* and *jnaana yogam*; there is a cause-effect relationship between *jnaana yogam* and liberation; but, there is no direct cause-effect relationship between *karma yogam* and liberation; only an indirect cause-effect relationship.

Sureswaraacharya very clearly established this view on the nature of the relationship between *karmaa* and liberation, by saying that *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* will only purify the mind and make it fit for receiving knowledge; and, that, with the purification, *karmaa's* function is over. Thereafter, the seeker has to make a deep study of the *Veda antha* portions, the *pramaanam*; the deep study (*vichaaraa*) gives 'knowledge', which, in turn, gives *mokshaa*. This aspect, viz. "*karmaa mokshasya paramparaa saadhanaa | na saakshaath saadhanaa*" was one of the topics covered in the portion between verses 23 and 53.

The *Aachaaryaa* commences the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 54, with the statement "*kevalam karmaa avidhyaa apanutthaye saakshaath na paryaaptham ithi prapanchitham*" meaning "it has been explained, that, mere *karmaa* is not adequate to remove self-ignorance directly". The use of the word '*saakshaath*' is significant. *Karmaa* cannot act directly, to remove ignorance; but, it does have an indirect role.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 54 (Contd.):

मुक्तौ च मुमुक्षुजानतद्विषयस्वाभाव्यानुरोधेन सर्वप्रकारस्यापि कर्मणोऽसंभव उक्तो "हितं संप्रेप्सताम्" इत्यादिना।

In the argument beginning with the statement 'the scripture sheds light on the means of attaining ends etc.' (verse 29), it has been pointed out, by analyzing the nature of the seeker, the nature of knowledge and the nature of the object of knowledge (viz., *aathmaa*), that no action of whatever description can be effective in bringing about liberation.

This portion of the *gadhyam* talks of the reason, which also has been already discussed, as to why mere *karmaa* is not adequate or competent to remove ignorance.

- मुक्तौ च - With regard to liberation
- कर्मणा असंभवः उक्तः - it was established that *karmaa* cannot be effective (in bringing about the desired liberation),

What type of *karmaa*?

- सर्वप्रकारस्य अपि - whether *loukikaa* or *viadhikaa* / of whatever nature,

How was this established?

- मुमुक्षु जान तद्विषय स्वाभाव्य अनुरोधेन - by analyzing the nature of the seeker, the nature of 'knowledge' and the nature of the object of knowledge (namely *aathmaa*),

Mumukshu – seeker; *jnaanam* – knowledge; *thadh (jnaana) vishayam* – object of the knowledge (viz., Self); *svaabhaavyam* – nature (*svaabhaavyam* is another term for *svabhaavam*); *anurodha*: - consideration / analysis.

By serious analysis, we find no direct connection between *karmaa* and *mokshaa*. The absence of direct connection is arrived at, by analysis of the nature of the seeker, the nature of the knowledge and the nature of *aathmaa*. The line of analysis is: "*Mokshaa* is already our *svaroopam*. We do not require any process to bring about *mokshaa*. When no process is involved, *karmaa* also has no role to play".

- "हितं संप्रेप्सताम्" इत्यादिना - from the verse starting with "hitham samprepsathaam".

The reference is to verse 29.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 54 (Contd.):

यादृशः च आराद् उपकारकत्वेन जानोत्पत्तौ कर्मणां समुच्चयः संभवति तथा प्रतिपादितम् ।

How it (*karmaa*) can indirectly contribute to the process of liberation has also been brought out.

The *Aachaaryaa* uses the term '*karmanaam samucchaya*.' (the combination of *karmaa* with *jnaanam*). Because of this, his statement may seem to mean "I have talked about the usefulness of *jnaana-karma-samucchayam* for liberation". Is this not contradictory to his

stand against the *samucchaya vaadha poorva pakshaa*? The answer is: "No, as explained below":

There are two types of combinations – one 'simultaneous' and the other 'sequential'. The *Aachaaryaa* is not totally against *samucchayaam* also, just as he is not totally against *karmaa*. But, he accepts only a 'sequential combination', as the appropriate type of *samucchayam*.

It is *Aachaaryaa's* firm conviction, that *Karma yogaa* leads to *chittha suddhi*, which makes *jnaana yogaa* possible; and in turn, the *jnaana yogaa* leads the aspirant to 'knowledge' and 'liberation'. At the time of *karma yogaa*, *jnaana yogaa* is not functional and at the time of *jnaana yogaa*, *karma yogaa* ceases to be functional.

An example from the mundane world is the procedure of initially going through primary school education and later to the University for graduation. It is a known and accepted fact, that 'schooling' and 'college education' for an individual cannot be simultaneous. They have to be sequential.

Similar **sequential** combination of *karmaa* and *jnaanam*, **krama samucchaya:**, is accepted by the *Aachaaryaa*, while **sama samucchaya:**, **simultaneous** dependence on the combination of *karmaa* and *jnaanam*, is condemned by him, as inappropriate.

What Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to convey, is: "While strongly criticizing the stand of viewing *karmaa* as a direct means to liberation, I also pointed out that *karmaa* cannot be totally condemned. *Karmaa* does have a role to play, as an indirect means".

- ज्ञान उत्पत्तौ - "In the rise of knowledge,
- यादृशः कर्मणां समुच्चयः - in what type of combination, does karmaa
- आराद् उपकारत्वेन संभवति - help as a remote and indirect means",
- तथा प्रतिपादितम् - was also established.

Krama samucchaya: is implied by the word *araadh* (meaning remote/indirect).

The *Aachaaryaa* had already quoted (in verse 51), the slokaa from Bhagavadh Githa (slokaa 3 – Chapter VI), namely, "aaruruksho: mune: yogam karma kaaranam uchyathe | Yogaaroodasya thasya eva sama: kaaranam uchyathe" – "For a seeker, who wants to reach jnaana yogaa, karma yogaa is said to be the means. For the seeker, who has reached jnaana yoga, renunciation is said to be the means".

The gist of this teaching of Lord Krishna is also "Enter *karmaa*; *jnaana yogaa* is not there, at that time. After *karmaa*'s job is done, i.e., when the mind is purified, withdraw from *karmaa* and start *jnaanam*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 54 (Contd.):

अविध्योच्छित्तौ तु लब्धात्मस्वभावस्यात्मज्ञानस्यैवासाधारणं साधकतमत्वं नान्यस्य प्रधानभूतस्य गुणभूतस्य चेत्येतदधुनोच्यते ।

Now it is going to be stated, that, in the matter of removing ignorance, the full-fledged knowledge of the Self is the unique and best (direct) means, and, that, nothing else has this potency either as a subsidiary or as a principal factor.

Sureswaraachaaryaa briefly introduces his next topic.

- **अविध्या उच्छित्तौ तु** - In the matter of removal of ignorance, Uccitthi: - removal.
- **असाधारणं साधकतमत्वं** - being the unique and best (direct)'means'
- **लब्ध आत्मस्वभावस्य आत्मज्ञानस्य एव** - is that of Self-knowledge (athma jnaanam) alone, that has come into firm existence in the mind of the seeker,

When I say "*aham Brahma asmi*", it can be a 'knowledge' for me, only when I am convinced that it is a 'fact'. The mere thought (*vritthi*) "*aham brahma asmi*", without the conviction of it being a 'fact', is not *jnaanam*. It is only 'information' suggested by the *saasthraa-s* and the *guru*. In other words, when I look upon it as a mere hypothesis, it is not *jnaanam*. Only when I have the conviction, that, it is the 'fact', it is *jnaanam*. This is what is indicated by the *Aachaaryaa*, by the use of the adjective (to *aathma jnaanam*) "*labhdha aathmasvabhavaasya*", which term conveys "when 'knowledge' has firmly taken place ; when it is not a mere 'information' " .

- **न अन्यस्य** - (and) not of anything else, The *Aachaaryaa* means '*karmaa*' by 'anything else'. *Karmaa* cannot remove ignorance. In what form?
- **प्रधानभूतस्य गुणभूतस्य च** - either as a dominating factor or as a secondary / supporting factor.

Earlier, the *Aachaaryaa* had established that "*karmaa* **independently** cannot destroy ignorance". In this portion, he affirms that "*karmaa*, **even in combination** with

jnaanam, cannot destroy ignorance". "Anyasya samucchithasya avidhyaa ucchitthi: na bhavathi".

Three types of combination (*samucchayam*) between *karmaa* and *jnaanam* are possible: (1) *karma pradhaana samucchayam* – *karmaa* as main and *jnaanam* as secondary (2) *jnaana pradhaana samucchayam* – *jnaanam* as main and *karmaa* as secondary and (3) *sama pradhaana samucchayam* – *karmaa* and *jnaanam* having equal importance. Of these, the first two are mentioned explicitly by the *Aachaaryaa* by the use of the terms - 'pradhaana bhoothasya' and 'guna bhoothasya'. The third one (*sama pradhaana samucchayam*) is to be taken as implied.

- इति एतद् - This teaching
- अधुना उच्यते - is going to be entered into.

The *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadha*: was presented by the *Aachaaryaa*, in verses 20 to 22. Now, from verse 54, the *Aachaaryaa* is commencing the **refutation** of *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadha*: / The refutation goes on up to verse 79. Of the three types, he first talks of *karma pradhaana samucchaya vaadham*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 54 (Contd.):

तत्र ज्ञानं गुणभूतं तावदहेतुरित्येतदाह ।

First of all, it is urged that knowledge as instrumental to something else cannot be the means of release.

- तत्र - In this context,
- ज्ञानं गुणभूतं - the karma pradhaana samucchayam (where, jnaanam is secondary)
- तावत् अहेतुः - is not the cause of ignorance removal.
- इत्येतद् आह - This is being said.

Chapter I: Verse 54 –

संनिपत्य न च ज्ञानं कर्माज्ञानं निरस्यति ।

साध्यसाधनभावत्वादेककालानवस्थिते : ॥ ५४ ॥

Action, appropriating knowledge as an accessory to itself, cannot remove ignorance, because action is the means and knowledge is the end and the two, being means and end, cannot be simultaneously operative.

The first line of the verse is the proposition and the second line, the argument.

- कर्मा अज्ञानं न निरस्यति - Karmaa cannot destroy ignorance,
- ज्ञानं संनिपत्य च - even taking support of jnaanam.

What is the reason? It is because *karma yogam* and *jnaana yogam* cannot exist in proximity at all, for one to take the assistance of the other.

But, why cannot they exist in proximity? The answer is: "*Jnaana yogaa* is 'understanding' *Vedhaanthaa* ; the 'understanding' is possible only when the mind is purified and ready. It is *karma yogaa* that gives the purification of the mind - *chittha suddhi*. Thus, *karma yogaa* is the means of coming to *jnaana yogaa*. The preparation of the mind is done by *karma yogaa*, which should have succeeded in its task of preparing the mind; in other words, *karma yogaa* should have completed its job, even before *jnaana yogaa* can be employed fruitfully. Then, how can *karma yogaa* and *jnaana yogaa* co-exist?"

When *Vedhaanthaa* is working for a seeker, his mind having been fully prepared, he may continue to do *karmaa*, for the welfare of the society - '*loka sangrahartham*', as Lord Krishna pointed out in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (verse 20, Chapter III). But, the *karmaa*, is not playing any role **for him**, since it had already completed its job of purifying his mind.

Conversely, when *nithya naimitthika karmaani* are functioning – i.e. when they are still in the process of purifying the mind of the seeker, which is not yet ready for *jnaana yogaa*, the *jnaana yogaa* cannot be functional. But, would that mean that the study of *Vedhaanthaa*, at this stage, is a waste. The answer is: "No; the study will be another type of *sath karmaa*, though not *jnaana yogaa*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, only one *yogaa* will be functional for a seeker, at a given time, even if both *karmaa* and *vicharaa* are done at the same time.

The original Vedic scheme was that *grihastha aasaramaa* is for the practice of *karma yogaa* and *sanyaasa aasaramaa* for the practice of *jnaana yogaa*.

Reverting to the text:

- साध्य साधन भावत्वात् - Since one (*karma yogaa*) is *saadhanaa* (means) and the other (*jnaana yogaa*) is *saadhyam* (goal),
- एक काल अनवस्थिते: - both cannot be simultaneously functional.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 55:

समप्रधानयोरप्यसंभव एव ।

Nor can these two be combined as equal partners:

Sureswaraachaaryaa is now taking up the 3rd type of *samucchayaa vaadham* – *sama samucchayam*. He says: "I cannot accept this also".

- **समप्रधानयोःअपि असंभवःएव** - (Liberation) is not possible even through the combination of karmaa and jnaanam having equal importance.

He explains why, in the verse.

Chapter I: Verse 55 –

बाध्यबाधकभावाच्च पञ्चास्योरणयोरिव ।

एकदेशानवस्थानान्न समुच्चयता तयोः ॥ ५५ ॥

Because one is stultified and the other stultifies it, they cannot be co-existent and joined together, even as a lion and a sheep cannot work together in partnership.

In the previous verse, the *Aachaaryaa* had said that *karmaa* and *jnaanam* cannot co-exist at the same **time**, i.e., *eka kaala avasthaanam* is not possible.

In this verse, he says, that, they cannot co-exist in one **place**, i.e. in one person. *Eka desa avasthaanam* also is not possible "The impossibility of light and darkness co-existing in the same place" is an example commonly given by scriptures, to stress this view. Sureswaraachaaryaa gives the example of "a hungry lion and a lamb".

- **पञ्चास्य उरण्योःइव** - Similar to a lion and a lamb,
'Panchaasya:' - Lion (pancham yaasyam yasya sa: - one whose mouth is wide); 'urana:' - lamb.
- **बाध्य बाधक भावात्** - which, because of the 'destroyer-destroyed' relationship,
- **एक देश अनवस्थात् च** - cannot co-exist in one place,
- **तयोः समुच्चयता न** - the combination of karma yogaa and jnaana yogaa is not possible.

Karma yogaa and *jnaana yogaa* cannot co-exist in one place, viz., the aspirant.

In his *Githa Bhaashyam*, in his consolidated comments on the 1st chapter, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* points out: *Karmaa* requires the notions "I am *jeevaa*, *karthaa*, *bokthaa*

and *samsaari*. I have problems created by *praarabhdhaa*. Therefore, I have to work for solutions to the problems". In contrast, when *jnaanam* dominates the mind, the very outlook changes to "I am not a *jeevaa*. I am *akartha*. I am *aboktha*. I am *asamsaari*. I do not have even *praarabhdhaa*, which is also *mithyaa*. I choose to perform action only for *loka sangraham* (welfare of the world). I do not require *karmaa* for liberation, since I am already *muktha*." | This analysis of *Bhagavadh Paadhaa* also establishes that *karmaa* and *jnaanam* cannot co-exist.

As long as the seeker is a *karmi* or a *karma yogi*, he is subject to the triad of *jagath*, *jeeva* and *Isvara* and needs the support of *Isvara*, for confronting *praarabhdhaa*.

But, for a *jnaana yogi*, the format is replaced by the *aathma-anaathma* duo ; there are only two things: (1) 'I', the *dhruk-brahman*, who is *sathya*: and *muktha*: and (2) everything else that is confronted – *dhrusyam* , including *praarabhdhaa*, all *mithyaa*. As a *jnaana yogi*, " *aham asangasvaroopo: asmi* . I do not require a remedy for any problem, since problems do not even exist."

Hence, *karmaa* and *jnaanam* cannot co-exist.

For an unprepared mind, *Vedhaantha sravanam* is a *punya karmaa*; for a prepared mind *Vedhaantha* is *pramaanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 56:

कुतः बाध्यबाधक भावः । यस्मात् ।

How is one of them the stultifier and the other stultified : It is this way ?

In the previous verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa said that *karmaa* and *jnaanam* can never co-exist in the same mind, since one is the destroyer and the other the destroyed. He now gives the reason, why *jnaanam* will destroy *karmaa*.

- **कुतः** - What is the reason for
- **बाध्यबाधक भावः** - the relationship of the destroyed and the destroyer?
Baadhyam – destroyed; *bhaadhakam* – destroyer; *bhaava*: - relationship.
- **यस्मात्** - For the following reason (given in the verse).

Chapter I: Verse 56 –

अयथावस्त्वविध्या स्याद्विध्या तस्या विरोधिनी ।

समुच्चयस्तयोरेवं रविशार्वर्योरिव ॥ ५६ ॥

Ignorance is contrary to the nature of Reality and knowledge is opposed to ignorance. The two cannot be combined, even as the sun and darkness cannot be combined.

The essence of the teaching can be compared to: "Waking state and dreaming state cannot co-exist. If one is really awake, one need not work seriously for solving the dream problems".

32. Chapter I, Verse 56 to 60 (25-11-2006)

In these verses, beginning from verse 54 and ending with verse 79, Sureswaraacharya is refuting the *samucchaya vaadha poorva pakshaa* philosophy. This *poorva pakshaa* was introduced earlier, in verses 20 to 22. According to this philosophy, *jnaanam* and *karmaa* should be combined for achieving liberation.

As already discussed, this *samucchaya vaadham* is of three types:

- (1) *Karma pradhaana samucchayam*, according to which, *karmaa*, supported by *jnaanam* (i.e. *karmaa* as *pradhaanam* or *anghee* and *jnaanam* as *angam*) gives liberation.
- (2) *Jnaana pradhaana samucchayam*, according to which, *jnaanam*, supported by *karmaa* (i.e. *jnaanam* as *peadhaanam* or *anghee* and *karmaa* as *angam*) gives liberation.
- (3) *Sama pradhaana samucchayam*, according to which both *jnaanam* and *karmaa* are equally powerful.

Of the three, the *karma pradhaana samucchaya vaadham* was refuted by the *Aachaaryaa*, in verse 54. He pointed out, that, *karma yogaa* and *jnaana yogaa* cannot exist at the same time for a given seeker, since *karma yogaa* is the *saadhanaa* and *jnaana yogaa* is the *saadhyam*. When *saadhanaa* is operational, *saadhyam* is yet to be accomplished; and, when *saadhyam* is accomplished, *saadhanaa* becomes irrelevant. So, the two cannot co-exist.

From verse 55, Sureswaraacharya takes up the refutation of *sama samucchaya vaadham*. In verse 55, he argues, that, *karmaa* and *jnaanam*, in **equal** measures also, is not possible, since they are 'opposites', like a hungry lion and a sheep. Just as the lion will swallow the sheep, *Jnaanam* 'swallows' *karmaa*. "*Baadhya baadhaka bhaavaath*" – "because of destroyer-destroyed relationship" is now the argument, while, in the earlier verse, it was "*saadhya saadhana bhaavaath*" – "because of end-means relationship".

The *Aachaaryaa* explains, in verse 56, why *jnaanam* destroys *karmaa*.

- **अविद्या अयथा वस्तु स्यात्** - Ignorance is contrary to the nature of Reality.

'*Yathaa vasthu*' means '*sathyam*'; '*Ayathaa vasthu*' is the opposite of '*yathaa vasthu*' or '**not** *sathyam*', which means '*mithyaa*'. *Karmaa* is founded on the notions "I have a *varnaa*'; 'I have an *aasramaa*'; 'I am a *karthaa*'; 'I am a *bokthaa*' etc. These *varna-aasrama abhimaanam* and *karthruthva-bokthruthva abimaanam* are results of *mithyaa jnaanam*. *Karmaa*, is, therefore, founded on *mithyaa jnaanam* or *ajnaanam*. *Karmaa* is embodiment of *ajnaanam*; '*karmaa*' is crystallized ignorance.

- **विद्या तस्याःविरोधिनी** - Knowledge is the enemy of ignorance.
Thasyaa: - 'of *avidhya*' (therefore 'of *karma*', as *karma* is a product or result of *avidhya*.)
- **एवं तयोः समुच्चयः** - When it is so, their combination
- **रविः शार्वरयोःइव** - (is) similar to that of the sun and the darkness of night.

The analogy makes it clear, that, the combination between *karma* and *jnaanam* is not possible.

Karma yogaa needs the perspective of a triangular format – *jeevaa*, *jagath* and *Isvara*. In contrast, *Jnaana yoga*, gives a binary format (1) *aathmaa*, the 'seer' (*dhruk*) on the one hand and (2) everything that is perceived – *dhruyam* - on the other. *Jnaana yoga* leads to the conviction, that, *aathmaa* is the **only** *sathyam* (Reality) and everything else, including *praarabhdhaa*, is *mithyaa*.

In *karma yogaa*, there is need for the *jeevaa* to depend on the support of *Isvara*. In *Jnaana yogaa*, "I am *swami / asangh*", unaffected by anything.

For a *jnaana yogi*, the day starts with *aathma-anaathma* format, the challenges are met through the *aathma-anaathma* format and the day ends with *aathma-anaathma* format.

The triangular format (when 'I am helpless') and the binary format (when 'I am the master') cannot combine. At a given time, only one can be implemented.

The 'implementation' consists of three stages: (i) *nischayaa*, weighing the pros and cons of the different paths and making a choice (ii) *sankalpaa*, firmly deciding to stick to the chosen path and (iii) *abhyaasaa*, firm practice of the chosen path.

In the *Bhagavadh Githa*, Lord Krishna declares to Arjuna (verse 3 – chapter III): "lōkē'smin dvidihā niṣṭhā purā prōktā mayā'nagha| jñānayōgēna sāṅkhyānām karmayōgēna yōginām" – "O! Sinless one! In this world, two types of disciplines have been initiated by Me, in the beginning of creation, in the form of *jnaana yogaa* for the *Saamkyaa-s* and in the form of *karma yogaa* for the *Yogi-s*", making it clear, that, these are two paths distinct from each other.

Sureswaraachaaryaa also says that the two (*karma yogaa* and *jnaana yoga*) cannot combine.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 57:

तस्मादकारकब्रह्मात्मनि परिसमाप्तावबोधस्याशेषकर्मचोदनानामचोध्यस्वाभाव्यात्कुण्ठता। कथं तद्।अभिधीयते ।

Therefore, he, who has comprehended the nature of *Brahman-Aathman*, which never forms a factor in the context of action, transcends liability to injunctions of all actions. How is that? It is explained:

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that, once a person has understood *Vedhaantha* and has understood sufficiently to make use of this binary product at all times, *Karmaa* becomes irrelevant to him.

- **तस्मात्** - Therefore,
- **परिसमाप्त अवबोधस्य** - for a *jnaani*, whose *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani* have culminated in 'knowledge', 'parisamaaptham' – culmination; 'avabodha:' - knowledge.

What type of knowledge?

अकारक ब्रह्मात्मनि - " I am not a *jeevaathmaa* ; but, *brahmaathmaa*, who does not exist in the field of action; who is not an accessory to action; who has transcended action",

Kaarakam is a technical word, referring to *karthaa*, *karanam* and *kaaryam*. *Brahman* is not the subject of action, not the object of action, nor instrument of action, nor location of action, neither benefactor nor beneficiary of action. "That *Brahman* I am" has been assimilated by the *jnaani*.

Verse 19 – Chapter II, of the *Bhagavadh Githa* and *manthraa* 19 – section 2 – Chapter I, of the *Katopanishad*, which are almost identical, declare: "*na ayam hanthi na hanyathe*" – "this *aathmaa* does not kill; nor is it killed".

If such a *jnaani*, with the conviction "I am *akarthaa*", reads the various *Vedic* injunctions, what is his perception? Sureswaraachaaryaa says "Such a *jnaani* looks upon all *Vedic* commandments as irrelevant". All actions are associated with *varnaa* and *aasramaa*, as a *karthaa*. For a *jnaani*, no *Vedic* commandment will be functional.

The *Aachaaryaa* uses the word '*kuntathaad*', to describe the nature of the *Vedic* commandments, for a *jnaani*.

- अशेष कर्म चोदनानाम् - all commandments, either *vidhi* (prescribed) or *nishedhaa*(prohibited),

`*Aseshā*` – all / without any exception; `*chodhanaā*` – commandment.

- कुण्ठता - become blunt,
- अचोध्य स्वाभाव्यात् - since he is no more within the range of the commandment.

`*chodhya:*` – one who is within the range of commandment; `*svaabhaavyaath'*` – because of the very nature.

All *Vedic* commandments become non-functional and non-operational for a *jnaani*.

Such a *jnaani* does not look upon himself as a father or a son etc. All commandments, therefore, meant for a father or a son etc., become irrelevant to him. He becomes a *sanyaasi*. Both *loukika karmaani* (with respect to family, society etc.) and *vaidhika karmaani* become irrelevant to him.

Why? Sureswaraachaaryaa himself asks this question:

- कथं तद् - How do you say that ?
- अभिधीयते - I will explain (says the *Aachaaryaa*).

Then, he explains why.

Chapter I: Verse 57 –

बृहस्पतिसवे यद्वत्क्षत्रियो न प्रवर्तते ।

ब्रह्मणत्वाध्यहंमानी विप्रो वा क्षत्रकर्मणि ॥ ५७ ॥

It is similar to a *Kshakthriyaa* not engaging in the sacrifice *Brihaspathisava*; or similar to a person believing himself to be a *Braahmanaa* not undertaking the duties of a *Kshakthriyaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives a *karma kaandaa* example, to explain his view. Every *vaidhika karmaa* is based on the *varnaa* and *aasramaa* of the individual performing the *karmaa*. In other words, every *Vedic* commandment is directed towards a particular *varna-aasrami*. If a *kshakthriyaa* reads about an *yaaghaa*, by the name *Brihaspathi-sava*, which, according to the scriptures, is to be performed only by a *Braahmanaa*, he looks upon the information as irrelevant to him. Likewise, a *Braahmanaa* also (according to the *karma kaandaa*) does not

undertake the *karma* of a *kshakthriyaa*, for example, the *Raaja Sooya Yaagaa*, which is prescribed only for *kshakthriyaa*-s.

- यद्वत् - It is similar to
- क्षत्रियः बृहस्पतिसवे न प्रवर्तते - a *kshakthriyaa* not venturing into the *yagnyaa*, *Briahapathisava*
- ब्रह्मणत्वाध्यहंमानी विप्रः वा - or a person claiming to be a Brahmin
- क्षत्रकर्मणि (न प्रवर्तते) - not venturing into the duties of a *kshakthriyaa*.

A *Brahmin* will not get *prathyavaaya paapam* for non-performance of *kshakthriya karma*-s; nor would a *kshakthriyaa*, for not performing *braahmana karmaani*.

The *Aachaaryaa* asserts: "This principle is extended to the *jnaani* – **all** *karma*-s become irrelevant to him". A *sanyaasi*, who has formally renounced *grihastha aasramaa*, even if not a *jnaani*, gets no *paapam*, for not doing family duties.

The *jnaani* has **no** duties, since he is an *akartha*. Under such circumstances, where is the question of *jnaana-karma-samucchaya*?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 58 :

यथायं दृष्टान्तः एवं दार्ष्टान्तिकोऽपीत्येतदाह ।

Similar to these illustrations, is the case on hand. That is brought home in the next verse.

- यथायं दृष्टान्तः - As in the case of this example (by which all commandments are not relevant to all people, even if they are Vedic commandments),
- एवं दार्ष्टान्तिकः अपि - so, in the case of a *jnaani* (**no** commandment is relevant).

In the case of *braahmanaa*-s or *kshathriyaa*-s, only particular commandments are applicable to them. In the case of a *jnaani*, **no** commandment is applicable (*nisthraigunye pathi vicharathaam ko vidhi: ? Ko nishedha: ?*).

- इति एतद् आह - This is brought forth by the author (in the following verse).

Chapter I: Verse 58 –

विदेहो वीतसंदेहो नेतिनेत्यवशेषितः ।

देहाध्यनात्मदृक् तद्वत्तत्क्रियां वीक्षतेऽपि न ॥ ५८ ॥

The person who has transcended the body, whose doubts have all been dispelled, who has apprehended his own essential nature by discarding all superimpositions by the method of 'not this, not this', and who perceives the body etc., as non-self, does not even glance at the actions executed by the body.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "that *jnaani*, who has received the teachings and who has changed the format of his perspective (from the triad of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* to the duo of *dhruk-dhrusyam*) is free from all doubts".

"Whether 'I am *jeeva*: is the fact and *brahma asmi* is a *vesham*' or '*aham brahma asmi* is the fact and my being a father / son etc. is *vesham*'" is the doubt. A *jnaani* has no such doubts. For him '*aham brahma asmi*' is **the** fact and all his other roles are *vesham*.

When the 'roles' as father, son etc., are taken seriously, they preoccupy the mind. But, when one is convinced, that, they are all only *vesham*-s, they do not become burdens.

- **विदेहः** - Free from all the three bodies (Deha thraya rahitha: - "I am neither viswaa, nor thyjasaa, not praagnyaa but I am thureeya:),
- **वीतसंदेहः** - with all doubts dispelled,
- **नेति नेति अवशेषितः** - discarding all super-impositions by the method of 'not this, not this',

'nethi nethi ithi avaseshitha:' is the description of a wise man. The expression 'nethi, nethi' is borrowed from the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad, which negates both the visible and invisible worlds, the moortha prapancham by one 'ithi' and the amoortha prapancham by the second 'ithi'; it negates the sthoola, sookshma, kaarana sareeraani. After negating all these, what is left over is the 'observer chaithanyam' only; and, the Upanishad reveals that "'I', the left-over aathmaa, the Observer, am Brahman". 'Avaseshitha:' means the left-over adhishtaanam, after negating the body-mind-intellect complex.

- **देहादि अनात्म दृक्** - perceiving his body, the world etc., as mithyaa / anaathmaa etc. (regularly and during any crisis also),
- **तत्क्रियां न वीक्षते अपि** - does not even see the karmaa-s given by the Vedaa-s,
- **तद्वत्** - similar to that.

The term '*thadvath*' refers to the contents of the previous verse, meaning, 'similar to *braahmanaa*-s perceiving *kshathriya karmaani* and *kshakthriyaa*-s perceiving *Braahmana karmaani*'.

After negating everything, I cannot claim *varna-aasrama* identity or family identity. Hence, how can I have any *karmaa* - even *nithya-naimitthika karmaan?* Sureswaraachaarya states that such a man does not even 'look at' the *karmaa-s* - '*na api veekshathe*'. Then how can he 'do' any *karmaa* seriously, once he has understood *Vedhaantha* properly?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 59:

तस्यार्थस्याविष्करणार्थमुदाहरणम् ।

In order to explain this, an analogy is offered.

- तस्य अर्थस्य अविष्करणार्थ - To explain the fact "jagan mithyaa, brahma sathyam",
- उदाहरणम् - an example is given.

Chapter I: Verse 59 -

मृत्स्नेभके यथेभत्वं शिशुरध्यस्य वल्गति ।

अध्यस्यात्मनि देहादीन्मूढस्तद्विचेष्टते ॥ ५९ ॥

Just as a child, taking a clay-elephant to be a real elephant, reacts accordingly, the unenlightened man imagines himself to be the body etc., and behaves accordingly.

- यथा - Just as,
- शिशु - a child
- मृत्स्न इभके इभत्वं अध्यस्य - entertaining the false perception of a real elephant, in a clay elephant (a toy elephant)
- वल्गति - reacts (accordingly),

Mruthsnam – clay; *ibhaka*: - elephant; *sisu*: - child; *ibathvam* – nature of elephant;

Adhyasya – falsely perceiving; *valgathy* - the literal meaning is 'runs up and down'; the child may run away from the toy elephant because of fear or may run towards it, because of attraction.

- तद्वत् - in a similar manner,
- मूढ - the deluded man / the unenlightened man
- आत्मनि देहादीन् अध्यस्य - falsely perceiving his body etc. as himself,
- विचेष्टते - acts accordingly.

The implied meaning of 'acts accordingly' is 'involves himself in *karmaa*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 60:

न च वयं ज्ञानकर्मणोः सर्वत्रैव समुच्चयं प्रत्याचक्ष्महे । यत्र प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकभावो ज्ञानकर्मणोस्तत्र नास्तित्रपि शक्यते निवारयितुम् । तत्र विभागप्रदर्शनायोदाहरणं प्रदर्शयते ।

We do not discard the combination of action and knowledge everywhere. Where the two stand in the relation of cause and effect, not even our father can repudiate the combination. To bring out the distinction, an analogy is presented.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to make a clarification.

When we say that *jnaana-karma-samucchyam* is not possible, what particular *jnaanam* is talked of Scripture talk of two types of knowledge – *paraa vidhyaa* and *aparaa vidhyaa*.

Aparaa vidhyaa is 'material and worldly knowledge'. *Aparaa vidhyaa* and *karmaa* are friendly to each other and mutually supportive. In fact, for improving the *karmaa*, one has to have a thorough knowledge about the *karmaa*. This is true of both *loukika karmaa* and *vaidhika karmaa*. This 'mutual supporting tendency' of *aparaa vidhyaa* and *karmaa*, is referred to, by the *Aachaaryaa*, in this portion, as '*prayojya prayojaka bhaava*.'|

All worldly sciences lead to *aparaa vidhyaa*. Veda poorva bhaagaa comes under *aparaa vidhyaa*. Puraanaa-s also come under *aparaa vidhyaa*.

Aparaa vidhyaa does not change the perception of '*jeeva, jagath and Isvara*' triad. It maintains the distinction. The individual feels persecuted by the world and looks to *Isvara* for support, when in crisis, as *Draupadi* did.

The one *vidhyaa* that replaces the *jeeva -jagath-Isvara* format with *dhruk-dhrusya* format is *brahma vidhyaa* or *paraa vidhyaa*.

Aparaa vidhyaa-karma-samucchayam **is** possible, because of *prayojya-prayojaka bhaava*:, whereas, *brahmaavidhyaa- karma-samucchayam* is **not possible**.

- वयं सर्वत्र एव न प्रत्याचक्ष्महे - We do not reject, in all circumstances
- ज्ञान कर्मणोः समुच्चयं - the combination between *jnaanam* and *karmaa*.
- यत्र - In those instances,
- ज्ञान कर्मणयोः प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकभावः (अस्ति) - where supporter- supported relationship between *jnaanam* and *karmaa* exists,

-
- तत्र निवारयितुम् अस्मत् पित्रापि न शक्यते - there, even our father cannot reject the combination.

The *prayojya prayojaka bhaava*: - the supporter-supported relationship – is there in all *lokika saasthra*-s and in the *Veda poorva bhaagaa*. The *jeeva bhaava*: is also maintained by the *Veda poorva bhaaghaa*. *Visishtaadvaitam* and *dvaitam* also maintain the *jeeva bhaava*: permanently - even in *Vaikuntaa*, believed to be the abode of *Vishnu*. "Mokshaa", according to *Visishtaadvaitam* and *dviatham*, is, 'proximate service to the Lord, in *Vaikuntaa*'. In the *Advaitin's* vision, *visishtaadhvaitham* and *dvaitham* are also being in *karma yogaa*.

33. Chapter I, Verse 60 to 63 (02-12-2006)

In these verses, beginning from verse 54 to verse 79, Sureswaraachaaryaa is negating the *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadhaa*. He points out, that, in this context, the word *jnaanam* refers to the most unique *jeevaathma-paramaathma-aiykya-jnaanam*; and, that, this knowledge negates ignorance and all ignorance-based misconceptions. The misconceptions include the plurality in the form of *karthaa* (subject), *karmaa* (object) and *karanam* (instrument). This very plurality, required for performance of *karmaa*, is negated by *jnaanam*. Naturally, the plurality-negating knowledge can never co-exist with plurality, just as darkness cannot co-exist with light.

If, in the very rise of knowledge, duality is gone, along with that, *karmaa* is also gone, since *karmaa* requires duality – *kaarakam*. This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The presence of *jnaanam* means the absence of duality and, therefore, the absence of *karmaa*. *Jnaanam* and *karmaa* cannot go together. That is the reason that a *jnaani* does not look at *karmaa* favourably, whether the *karmaa* is *loukikaa* or *vaidhikaa*. The *Aachaaryaa* used the expression "*na veekashathay api*", in verse 58.

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 60 (currently being discussed), Sureswaraachaaryaa talks of two types of knowledge:

- (1) The first type is the *karmaa*-friendly knowledge or *karmaa*-promoting knowledge. All material sciences inspire one to engage in action, for the improvement and material prosperity of one's family and one's society. The *Veda Poorva Bhaaghaa* also inspires *karmaa*, talking about various *lokaa*-s, various rituals etc. Such *karmaa*-promoting knowledge, derived from the material sciences and the *Veda Poorva Bhaghaa*, retains the performer's individuality and sense of duality, the two basic requirements for *karmaa*. The *Aachaaryaa* concedes that **this** type of knowledge and *karmaa* can happily jell. But, according to *Vedhaanthaa*, all such knowledge is *bhraanthic jnaanam* or *ayathartha jnaanam* – 'erroneous knowledge'.
- (2) The other type of knowledge is the *paraa vidhyaa* or *yathartha jnaanam* - the *jeevaathma-pramaathma-aiykya-jnaanam*, which knowledge is **not** a qualification for *karmaa*; nor can it use *karmaa*.

The first type of knowledge, according to the *Aachaaryaa*, has '*prayojya-prayojaka-bhaava*.' - 'supporter-supported relationship'. The *aparaa vidhyaa* is the 'supporter' of action and *karmaa* is 'supported' by the *aparaa vidhyaa*.

The *Aachaaryaa* starts this *sambhandha gadhyam*, with the statement, “*jnaanakarmano: samucchayam vayam sarvathra eva na prathyaachakshmahe*”, meaning “We do not negate the combination of *jnaanam* and *karmaa*, in all situations or in every situation”.

Then, where does he accept *samucchayam*? The *Aachaaryaa* says: “*yathra prayojya prayojaka bhaava: (asthi), thathra jnaana karmano: (samucchayam) nivaarayithum asmath pithraapi na sakyathe*” – “where mutual supporter-supported relationship between *jnaanam* and *karmaa* exists, in such situations, even our father is not capable to negate the combination of *jnaanam* and *karmaa*”.

Any knowledge which preserves one’s individuality (*ahamkaara:*) and all-round duality (*dvaita prapancha:*) will come under this definition.

To recap the ‘distinction’ between the two types of ‘knowledge’:

1. In whichever knowledge the triangle of *jeevaa-jagath-Isvara* is maintained, is one type of knowledge, though it is considered *bhraanthic jnaanam* or *ayathaartha jnaanam*.
2. In whichever knowledge, the above triangular format is replaced by the binary format of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, is the second type of knowledge – the *yathaartha jnaanam*.

The first type of knowledge, preserving the *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* triad, goes with *karmaa*. In the first (*karma yogaa*) stage, *pujaa-s* and *karmaa-s* can be pursued vigorously. Even a study of *Vedhaanthee*, at this stage, is part of the triangle of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, though the study is intended to shift the perspective from the triangular format to the binary format of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*.

The second stage, *Jnaana yoga*, is for “shifting the individual from the triangular format to the binary format”.

- तत्र विभागप्रदर्शनाय - To show the difference between the *karmaa*-friendly and the *karmaa*-negating types of knowledge,
- उदाहरणं प्रदर्शयते - I shall give an example.

Verse 60 – Chapter I :

स्थाणुं चोरधियालाय भीतो यद्वत्पलायते ।

बुद्ध्यादिभिस्तथात्मानं भ्रान्तोऽध्यारोप्य चेष्टते ॥ ६० ॥

Just as a man taking a post for a robber, runs away in fright, similarly a man, wrongly identifying the Self with the intellect etc., engages in action.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives a very significant and powerful example, to understand this *Vedic* teaching clearly:

Let us imagine that a person has mistaken a post for a robber, because of darkness. He has got *chora dharsanam*. Other people know this as an erroneous knowledge; but, for the particular individual, the *chora dharsanam*, a false knowledge, is *jnaanam*. And, this '*jnaanam*' will promote a '*karmaa*' - 'running away'. Therefore, *chora dharsana jnaanam* and *palaayana karmaa* (the action of 'running away') are mutually promoter-promoted. This is also a form of *jnaana-karma-samucchaya*: |

Sureswaraachaarya gives this example and says that all 'un-enlightened' people have this *chora-dharsana-roopa jnaanam* and therefore, indulge in *karmaa*.

- यद्धत् - Just as
- स्थाणुं चोरधिया आलय - taking a post for a robber, 'sthaanu:' – post ; 'chora:' - robber ; 'dhiyaa' – in the mind ; 'aalaaya' – taking.
- भीतः पालयते - a frightened man runs away,
- भ्रान्तः - the deluded man

Adi Sankara calls the whole world '*Bhraanthaalaya*:' - location of delusions.

- बुद्ध्याधिभिः आत्मानं अध्यारोप्य - falsely superimposing the Self on the sareerathrayam / considering the sareerathrayam as the real Self, 'buddhyaadhibhi:' – on the intellect etc. (indicates sareerathrayam); 'aathmanam' – the Self ; 'adhyaaropya' - falsely placing / falsely superimposing.
- चेष्टते - acts / performs (accordingly).

Such a person resorts to both *loukika karmaa* and *vaidhika karmaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 61 :

एवं यत्रयत्र जानकर्मणोः प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकभावस्तत्र सर्वत्रायं न्यायः । यत्र तु न समकालं नापि क्रमेणोपपद्यते समुच्चयः स विषय उच्यते ।

Thus, wherever knowledge and action are related as cause and effect, this principle applies. The principle involved in cases where the two cannot be combined either simultaneously or in succession, is brought out, in the verse.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "In this particular case, *chora dharsana jnaanam* and *palaayana karmaa* can and do mutually support. Similarly, where individuality and *dvaitha dharsanam* are there, varieties of *karmaa* are also there".

- **एवं यत्र यत्र ज्ञानकर्मणोः प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकभावः (अस्ति)** - Thus, wherever knowledge and action are related as 'supporter' and 'supported'

'jnaanam', in this statement, is 'aparaa vidhyaa', which, according to Vedhaanthaa, is 'bhraanthijnaanam'. Adi Sankara considers 'aparaavidhyaa' as 'avidhyaa'.

- **तत्र सर्वत्र** - in all those cases,
- **अयं न्यायः** - this principle is applicable (i.e. samucchaya: sambhavathi).
- **यत्र तु** - On the other hand, where
- **समुच्चयः** - the combination (of jnaanam and karmaa)
- **न उपपद्यते** - is not possible,
- **समकालं** - (either) simultaneously
- **न अपि क्रमेण** - or sequentially,
- **स विषयः उच्यते** - I shall talk about that.

By the term 'sequentially', the *Aachaaryaa* refers to '*karmaa following aathma jnaanam*', which sequence, he holds, is not possible. The sequence of *aathma jnaanam* following *karmaa* **is possible** and, in fact, is the prescribed path.

"I have talked about *karmaa*-friendly knowledge; now, I will talk about *karmaa*-negating knowledge" says the *Aachaaryaa*.

Verse 61 – Chapter I :

स्थाणोः सतत्त्वविज्ञानं यथा नाङ्गं पलायने ।

आत्मनस्तत्त्वविज्ञानं तद्वन्नाङ्गं क्रियाविधौ ॥ ६१ ॥

Just as the right understanding of the post as such (as a post) , cannot incite the action of 'running away', so also, the understanding of the Self, in its real nature, cannot be instrumental to any action.

The example given in the previous verse is extended further by the *Aachaaryaa*.

The erroneous *chora dharsanam* resulted in 'running away'. *Samucchayaa* between 'knowledge' (though erroneous) and 'action', was possible. Now, let us assume that the truth is realized by the individual, that, there is no robber, but, only a post. Realization of this truth will not result in the action of 'running away'.

- **यथा स्थाणोः सतत्त्व विज्ञानं** - Just as the realization of the true nature of the post

yathaa – just as; sthaano: - of the post ; sathathvam – real nature; vijnaanam – knowledge / realization.

- **पलायने न अङ्गं (भवति)** - cannot be a supporter of the action of 'running away',
- **तद्वत्** - in a similar manner,
- **आत्मनः तत्त्व विज्ञानं** - the true 'knowledge' of the Self (that 'I' am not viswaa, thyjasaa or praagnyaa – but, 'I' am the thureeyaa),
- **अङ्गं न (भवति)** - cannot be a supporter
- **क्रियाविधौ** - in performing karmaa.

'Knowledge of the post', the true knowledge, cannot be connected with '*palaayana karmaa*'; '*aathma jnaanam*' cannot be connected with **any** karmaa. 'Individuality' cannot co-exist with *naishkarmya siddhi jnaanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 62 :

यस्मात् गुणस्य एतद् स्वाभाव्यम् ।

For what is instrumental, always, has this nature.

Sureswaraachaaryaa further elaborates on the same topic. He says "if two things should function together as 'main and support' – '*anghee* and *angam*' - they have to fulfill a condition. The 'supported' one should have a nature similar to the nature of the 'supporting' one. Both should have similar features. One should follow the other in all characteristics. *Bhraanthic jnaanam* and *karmaa* are both born of *avidhyaa*, and, therefore, they can get on well with each other.

- **यस्मात्** - Because
- **एतद् स्वाभाव्यम्** - the following is the nature
- **गुणस्य** - of the supporting / favouring factor.

What is that nature? The *Aachaaryaa* answers in the verse that follows.

Chapter I: Verse 62 –

यद्वि यस्यानुरोधेन स्वभावमनुवर्तते ।

तत्तस्य गुणभूतं स्यान्न प्रधानाद् गुणो यतः ॥ ६२ ॥

That which conforms in nature to another can be instrumental to it and not that which destroys that principle factor itself.

Sureswaraachaarya defines the nature briefly: "An 'assisting' factor should have the same nature of the 'assisted' factor.

- **यद् यस्य अनुरोधेन स्वभावं अनुवर्तते** - That factor which conforms in nature to another factor

yadh – that factor; yasya – of another factor ; anurodhena – in conformity with; svabhaavam anuvarthathey - follows the nature.

- **तद् तस्य गुणभूतं स्यात्** - that (the first factor) can become the supporting factor to the other (the second) factor;

Thadh - that (meaning the 'first factor', in this context); *thasya* – of that (meaning the 'second factor', in this context); *gunabhootham* – supporting; *syaath*- becomes.

In the example of the false perception of the post as a robber, the *paalayana karmaa* (action of running away) is the primary factor. The supporting factor is the *bhraanthic jnaanam* (false perception) of *chora dharsanam* (perceiving the post as a robber). In the same manner, any ritual can be supported **only** by the false *jnaanam* of 'duality'.

- **प्रधान अद्गुणः (गुणभूतं) न (स्यात्)** - (But) that factor which is the very destroyer of the principal factor itself, cannot become the supporting factor.

'Pradhaanam atthi' ithi 'pradhaana adh'. 'Pradhaanam', in this context, indicates the 'main factor'. 'atthi' means 'destroys'; 'that which destroys the main factor' is 'pradhaana adh'.

In the example, the realization that 'what is perceived is not a robber, but, only a post', destroys the action of 'running away'. Likewise, *Aathma jnaanam* consisting of the realizations "I do not have *varnaa* and *aasramaa*. I do not have *karthruthvam* and *bokthruthvam*" etc., destroys *karmaa*. How can this '*pradhaana adh jnaanam*', the 'knowledge' that destroys the main factor '*karmaa*', support *vaidhika karmaa*, since it is only logical that the supporting factor should not be the destroyer of the supported factor?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 63 and 64 :
यस्मात् ।

This is so, because:

More elaborations follow in the next two verses.

Chapter I: Verse 63 -
कर्मप्रकारणाकांक्षि जानं कर्मगुणो भवेत् ।

यद्दि प्रकरेण यस्य तत्तदङ्गं प्रचक्षते ॥ ६३ ॥

The knowledge that belongs to the context of action does naturally serve it as a subsidiary. What belongs to the context of anything, does become subsidiary to it.

Even though this teaching seems clear and simple, Sureswaraachaaryaa continues to reinforce the view, since this seemingly simple fact has not been understood by the *poorvameemaamsakaa-s*, who have studied both the *Veda poorva* and *Veda antha* portions and yet have formulated the *jnaana-karma-samucchaya-vaadhaa*, a powerful philosophy, in the days of *Adi Sankara*. The *meemaamsakaa-s* claim that *Vedhaantha jnaanam* also is only meant to improve the *karthaa*. They claim vehemently, that, after *Vedhaantha jnaanam*, the *karthaa* is better qualified to do *karmaa*; and, therefore, *karmaa* can be done better, after acquiring *Vedhaantha jnaanam*. In support, they quote the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* statement “*yadheva vidhyayaa karothi sraddhayaa upanishadhaa thadeva veeryathara: bhavath!*”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not agree. His view is: “*Veda poorva bhaaghaa* can improve the ‘performer’. That is understandable. But, as for *Veda antha jnaanam*, the very ‘performer’ is negated by that *jnaanam*. How, then, can that *jnaanam* be a means of improving the performer? Such a perspective is absurd”.

- **कर्म प्रकरण आकांक्षि जानं** - All the knowledge required for the *karma kaandaa*,
- **कर्मगुणः भवेत्** - is the supporter / promoter of *karmaa*.

‘*karma prakaraanam*’ – that which spells out the manner / mode / fashion of *karmaa*, which means ‘*Veda poorva bhaaghaa* or *karma kaandaa*; *aakaankshi* – required.

- **यद्दि यस्य प्रकरणे (वर्तते)** - Whichever knowledge exists in whichever context,
- **तद् तदङ्गं प्रचक्षते** - that knowledge can be used as an *angam* in that context.

What is implied by this (rather devious) statement, is, that, *karma kaanda jnaanam*, acquired by the study of the *karma kaandaa* and therefore, existing in *karma kaandaa*, can be used as an *angam* of *karmaa*.

But, *Veda anathaa* has nothing to do with rituals; and, *veda antha jnaanam* / *jnaana kaanda jnaanam* cannot be used as *angam* for *karmaa*. *Jnaanam* and *karmaa* cannot have *samucchayam*.

Exactly like a dream losing its importance, after the ‘dreamer’ wakes up, the entire world, duality and *karmaa* lose their importance, after ‘knowledge’.

34. Chapter I, Verse 63 to 67 (09-12-2006)

In these verses, (verse 54 to verse 79), Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadham* – all three of them – *karma pradhaana*, *jnaana pradhaana* and *sama pradhaana*. He asserts that none of these three is possible. But, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 60, the *Aachaaryaa* carefully makes a clarification. When he uses the word '*jnaanam*' in this context, he means the knowledge "*aham brahma asmi*", **which** *jnaanam* can never go with *karmaa*. All other types of *jnaanam* are favorable to and friendly with *karmaa*, and therefore, can go with *karmaa*. It is the *karthruthvam*-eliminating *aathma jnaanam*, which is inimical to *karmaa* and therefore, **that** *jnaanam* and *karmaa* cannot go together.

Karmaa is firmly founded on the belief "I am *karthaa* – a doer; my actions in the appropriate manner will improve me". Therefore, when the very *karthruthvam* is destroyed because of *aathma jnaanam*, *karmaa* naturally ceases.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that, in the *Veda poorva bhaaghaa*, many rituals are talked about, giving information on the manner of performance of the rituals, their efficacy etc. Information on the various *devathaa-s*, *lokaa-s* etc. is also given. **This** '*jnaanam*', derived from the *Veda poorva bhaaghaa* can be utilized for *karmaa*; in fact, that '*jnaanam*' is essential for performance of *yagnyaa-s* and other *vaidhika karmaani* in the appropriate manners. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* indicates, in verse 63, as "*karma prakaarana aakaamkshi jnaanam*" – "the knowledge that is required / necessary for *karmaa*". The word '*aakaamkshi*' means 'necessary' / 'required'. This type of knowledge, therefore, can be said to be friendly to *karmaa*. Naturally, *karma samucchayam* with this type of *jnaanam* is possible.

This knowledge which is required for efficient performance of *karmaa* is called *karma anga bhootha jnaanam* or *angam* of *karmaa*. The word *angam*, in this context, means 'support / booster / promoter / catalyst'. The general rule, therefore, is, "*yasya karmana: prakaraṇe yadh jnaanam varthathe, thadh jnaanam thasya karmana: angam bhavathi*" – "In the context of whichever *karmaa*, whichever supportive knowledge is imparted, that supportive knowledge becomes *angam* of that *karmaa*". **This** type of *jnaanam* and *karmaa* will mutually support each other. But, *Veda antha jnaanam* does not come under *karma prakaaranam* / *karma kaandaa*. It destroys *karthruthvam* itself, which *karthruthvam* is the very basis of *karmaa*.

Chapter I: Verse 64 -
स्वरूपलाभमात्रेण यत्त्वविध्यां निहन्ति न : ।

न तदङ्गम् प्रधानं वा ज्ञानं स्यात्कर्मणः क्वचित् ॥ ६४ ॥

Knowledge, which, by merely emerging into being, removes ignorance, does not combine with action either as an accessory or as an equal partner.

- यद् (ज्ञानं) - Whichever knowledge
- नः अविद्यां निहन्ति - destroys our ignorance
- स्वरूप लाभ मात्रेण - by merely rising in our (the seekers') minds,
- तद् ज्ञानं - that karthruthva-destroying knowledge
- कर्मणः अङ्गं न (भवति) - cannot be a subsidiary accessory to karmaa
- प्रधानं वा (न भवति) - nor can it be a main factor for karmaa,
- क्वचित् - under any circumstances.

'Na:' – ours; 'nihanthi' – destroys; 'avidhya', in this context, is to be interpreted as 'karthruthvam'.

"Yadh jnaanam avidhyaam nihanthi" would, therefore, mean "yadh jnaanam karthruthvam nihanthi" - "whichever knowledge destroys karthruthvam".

Aathma jnaanam destroys the ignorance of the fact "I am akarthaa". Once the firm knowledge "I am akarthaa" arises, it has to obviously destroy the notion "I am karthaa" i.e. 'karthruthvam' is destroyed.

Since karthruthvam is destroyed, jnaanam destroys karmaa also. Thus, Vedhaanthic knowledge is of a caliber, totally different from the karmaa-boosting knowledge.

In the second line of the verse, Sureswaraacharya asserts "thadh (jnaanam) karmana: angam pradhaanam vaa na syaath" – "(aathma) jnaanam cannot join karmaa, either as a leader or a follower" and follows it up, with the term "kvachith", meaning "under any circumstance".

By the usage of the term 'angam pradhaanam vaa', the Aacharya negates two types of samucchayam, viz., the karma pradhaana samucchayam and the jnaana pradhaana samucchayam. The third type, 'sama samucchaya vaadhaa' was already negated in verses 55 and 56.

Thus, "sarva vidha samucchaya: na bhavathi" is the Aacharya's firm stand.

"Jnaanam, **by itself**, can give liberation. Let karmaa come, sweep away the mental impurities and quit. Thereafter, it has no role to play. Jnaanam, **singlehandedly**, can achieve liberation for us" is Sureswaraacharya's gantaagosa: - loud proclamation.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 65 :
समुच्चयपक्षवादिनाप्यवश्यमेतदभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । यस्मात् ।

This has to necessarily be admitted by even the advocates of the combination of action and knowledge, because of the reason:

- समुच्चय पक्ष वादिना अपि - Even by the samucchaya vaadhi
- एतद् - what I have said
- अभ्युपगन्तव्यम् - has to be accepted,
- अवश्यं - necessarily.
- यस्मात् - This is because of the reason given in the verse.

The reason is given in the verse that follows.

Chapter I:Verse 65 –
अज्ञानमनिराकुर्वन्ज्ञानमेव न सिध्यति ।
विपन्नकारकग्रामं ज्ञानं कर्म न ढौकते ॥ ६५ ॥

Knowledge does not arise at all, without displacing ignorance; and, action does not even touch the knowledge, which annihilates all the factors involved in action, for it itself stands annihilated.

- ज्ञानं न सिध्यति - Jnaanam cannot arise
- अज्ञानं अनिराकुर्वन् - without displacing ajnaanam.

This is **step 1**, in the arguments presented by the Aachaaryaa.

“Darkness will have to go away, when light comes. Likewise, when jnaanam rises in the mind, ajnaanam has to go away. It cannot be present anywhere around”.

Step 2: Ajnaanam is the sustaining principle of kaaraka dvaitham.

(Karakam is a technical word, indicating the various accessories required for karmaa, including the subject (karthaa). The object, location, instrument (karanam) etc., are some other kaarakam-s).

Karmaa needs kaarakam. Ajnaanam is the support for kaarakam.

Step 3: Jnaanam destroys ajnaanam, therefore, kaarakam and therefore, kriyaa.

- विपन्न कारकग्रामं ज्ञानं - The knowledge which destroys the group of accessories to karmaa

Vipanna - destroyed / eliminated; graamam – group ; karaka graamam – group of accessories to karmaa.

'Karthaa' is the first kaarakam. The very performer of karmaa is deceased, once jnaanam arrives. Such a vipanna kaaraka jnaanam (knowledge that destroys all the kaaraka-s, starting with the karthaa) does not even go near karmaa.

- कर्मा न ढौकते - does not even go anywhere near *karmaa*. (‘*doukathey*’- ‘*gacchathl*’).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 66 :
इदं चापरं कारणं ज्ञानकर्मणोः समुच्चयनिबर्हि ।

Following is another reason for rejecting the combination of action and knowledge.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: “If you are not convinced, I will give another reason for negating *samucchayam*”.

- इदं च - The following (is)
- अपरं कारणं - another reason
- ज्ञान कर्मणोः समुच्चयनिबर्हि - that will destroy (negate) the jnaana- karma-samucchaya vaadham.

'nibarhi' means 'destroyer'.

Chapter I: Verse 66 –
हेतुस्वरूपकार्याणि प्रकाशतमसोरिव ।

विरोधीनि ततो नास्ति साङ्गत्यं जानकर्मणोः ॥ ६६ ॥

When we examine the source, nature and effect of knowledge, we find that they are all opposed to the source, nature and effect of action; and, therefore, action and knowledge cannot be joined together, as light and darkness cannot be.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa says: “If you study the main features of *jnaanam* and those of *karmaa*, you can clearly see that they are totally incompatible. Between incompatible members, association is not possible”.

How does one prove the incompatibility or non-conformity between *jnaanam* and *karmaa*? The answer is: “By studying the *hethu* (cause), *svaroopam* (nature) and *kaaryam* (consequence or effect) of *jnaanam* and also those of *karmaa*. One will find they are diagonally opposite”.

- हेतु स्वरूप कार्याणि - The cause, nature and effect
- जान कर्मणोः - of jnaanam and karmaa

- **विरोधीनि** - are totally different.
- **ततः** - This being so
- **(ज्ञान कर्मणोः) साङ्गत्यं** - co-existence between *jnaanam* and *karmaa*,
- **नास्ति** - is not there,
- **प्रकाश तमसोः इव** - similar to (the impossibility of co-existence between) light and darkness.

In *karma yogaa*, with the triangular format of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, helplessness is invoked; *jeevaa* needs the support of *Isvara*. On the other hand, in the binary format of *jnaana yogaa*, "I **am** the supporter of the whole universe". The notion "I am a lowly *jeevaa*" is diametrically opposite to the conviction "I am the powerful *aathmaa*".

To analyze the *hethu* (cause) first: "Enquiry and study of *vedaantha pramaana vaakyam*" (*vichaara bhaava* :) is the *hethu* for *jnaanam*. Non-enquiry / non-study of the *Vedhaanthea* (*vichaara abhaava*;) sustains the notion of *karthruthvam* and is, therefore, the *hethu* for *karmaa*.

As for *svaroopam* (nature), *jnaanam* is *prakaasaathmaka roopam* and *vidhyaa roopam*, while *karmaa* is *aprakaasakam* and *avidhyaathmakam*. *Karmaa* is called *aprakaasakam* or 'dark', because, in *karmaa*, "I am in darkness, with respect to who I really am". The entire *karmaa* is functioning in the semi-darkness of *adhyasaa*. Adi Sankara points out in his *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam*, that, all activities result from erroneous notions with respect to oneself and with respect to the world. *Karmaa* requires the 'darkness' of *adhyasaa*, while *jnaanam* is 'brightness' incarnate. Thus, the nature of *jnaanam* and the nature of *karmaa* are diametrically opposite to each other. Expressed in Sanskrit: "*svaroopathaa prakaasa aprakaasa roopena virodhee*".

What about the third factor, *kaaryam* or 'consequence' ? For *karmaa*, the result may be termed '*punya paapa vardhaka roopa palam*' and for *jnaanam*, as '*punya paapa naasaka roopa palam*'. In other words, *karmaa* increases *punyam* and *paapam*, while *jnaanam* destroys *punyam* and *paapam*. Obviously therefore, by analysis of the *kaaryam* also, *jnaanam* and *karmaa* are not compatible.

"*Thatha: jnaanakaramano: saangathyam naasthi*" - "Therefore, no *samucchayam* between *jnaanam* and *karmaa* is possible" - concludes the *Aachaaryaa*.

With this verse, the first stage of *jnaana-karma-samucchaya-vaadha niraasa*: (negation of the view of *jnaana-karma-samucchayam*) is complete. The *Aachaaryaa* enters into deeper, more subtle and more technical discussions from the next verse, for which, therefore, he gives a long introduction.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 67 :

एवमुपसंहृते केचित् स्वसम्प्रदाय बल आवष्टम्भात् आहुः यद् एतद् वेदान्तवाक्यात् अहं ब्रह्मेति विज्ञानं समुत्पद्यते तद् नैव स्वोत्पत्तिमात्रेण अज्ञानं निरस्यति ।

After concluding thus, we may notice two other theories. Some, drawing strength from their own tradition, maintain that the knowledge of the form "I am Brahman", which arises from the sentences of *Vedhaanthaa*, does not dispel ignorance, by its mere coming into being.

Sureswaraacharya's contentions should be properly understood and remembered:

- (1) The *Aachaaryaa* wants to emphasize, that, "clear understanding of *Vedhaanthic* teachings gives liberation". The word 'clear' has two parts. "Clear understanding of the ***mahaa vaakyaa-s***" is one part. 'Clear understanding of the fact that the **'clear understanding' is enough for liberation**' is the second part. In other words, the second part is the conviction that "nothing else other than 'clear understanding of the *mahaa vaakyaa-s*' is required for liberation".
- (2) This two-fold 'clear understanding' is gained from *sravanam* alone. By *sravanam* is meant "a consistent, systematic study of the scriptures under a competent *guru*, for a length of time". *Sravanam* is the primary *saadhanaa* for liberation.
- (3) All *saadhanaa-s*, other than *sravanam*, are only subsidiary *saadhanaa-s*, which help the seeker in the practice of the primary *saadhanaa*; i.e., they are all *anga saadhanaa-s*. *Sravanam* is primary, while *japaa*, *poojaa*, *paraayanaa* etc. are all only supportive. Meditation should help a person to come to *sravanam*. Sureswaraacharya holds that even *nidhidhyaasanam* is only an *angam*, which has to lead a student to more *sravanam*. The culmination of all *saadhanaa-s* is the *sravana saadhanam*.

In short, all *saadhanaa-s* lead to *sravana saadhanam*, which leads to the "two-fold clear understanding" (explained earlier), which, in turn, leads to liberation.

These are what Sureswaraacharya wants to establish, from now on. In this approach, he follows the '*thathvam asi prakaranam*' of *Upadesa Saahasri*.

A *poorva pakshin* (a new type, different from the *samucchaya vaadhi*) raises objections to this *Aachaaryaa's* view, viz., "Clear understanding is enough for liberation. Nothing else is needed". The *poorva pakshin* argues "Clear understanding alone is not enough. After clear understanding, meditation is required, which alone will lead to liberation".

The *poorva pakshin* is countered by the *Aachaaryaa* with the questions: "But, why? What is the deficiency in 'clear understanding'? What is the role of 'meditation'? How does it help 'clear understanding' in achieving liberation?"

At this stage, the *Aachaaryaa* brings in two types of *poorva pakshin-s*, who reply to these questions.

The first type says: "Clear understanding' is not enough to destroy ignorance **totally**. It can only partly destroy ignorance. Only a sustained 'meditation', following the 'clear understanding' can help destroy ignorance totally and lead to liberation".

This is the view that is held by a particular group of *advaitin-s*, lead by Brahmadhattaa, also a great scholar.

35. Chapter I, Verse 67 (16-12-2006)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is in the process of refuting *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadha*:

His first stage of refutation, (in which he established that *jnaanam* and *karmaa* can never be combined together, either in the form of *jnaana pradhaanaa* or in the form of *karma pradhaanaa* or in the form of *sama pradhaanaa*) has been completed. Now, the *Aachaaryaa* is entering the next stage of the refutation process, a very important and technical part of the discussions; and, in that process, he is introducing two other types of *poorva pakshin-s*.

What is the *siddhaantham*, that, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to convey?

He wants to establish: "Clear understanding of the *Vedhaanthic* teachings gives liberation. The 'clear understanding' has two components. The first component is 'clear understanding of the *mahaa vaakyaa-s'*. The second and equally or even more important component is 'clear understanding of the fact, that, nothing else other than the 'clear understanding of the *mahaa vaakyaa-s'* is required for liberation'. This two-fold clear understanding gives liberation".

The two *poorva pakshin-s*, introduced by Sureswaraachaaryaa here, are attacking the second part of the *Aachaaryaa's* contention. They argue: "'Clear understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam* alone is not sufficient for liberation. Long meditation has to follow the 'clear understanding' to achieve liberation". '*Brahma vaadhina:*' is the term used to refer to this type of *poorva pakshin-s*, whose claim is, that, ultimately, it is meditation which leads to liberation. Sureswaraachaarya strongly refutes this importance given to meditation and wants to stress that it **is** *Vedhaantah Sravanam* or *Vedhaantah Vichaaraa*, which is the final stage of *saadhanaa-s* for liberation.

The first type of *poorva pakshin* says: "Mere clear understanding is not enough. It cannot destroy ignorance. The 'clear understanding' has to be 'repeated' in the mind, which repetition, we may term as *jnaana abhyaasa:* or *jnaana bhaavanaa*. This meditation has to be practiced for a length of time, because of which, the meditation gives a cumulative power or strength to the 'knowledge'. Only reinforced by this *bhaavana samskaara* cumulative force, *jnaanaa* gets the power to destroy ignorance and give liberation. Only under such conditions, *mokshaa* can be attained". He also contends, that, this *jnaana abhyaasaa* also will be effective, **only** when *nithya naimitthika karmaa-s* are continued with. In effect, his contention is "The seeker might have achieved *jnaanam* through *Vedhaantha sravanam*. But, to make the *jnaanam* effective, he should practice meditation and also carry on with diligent performance of *nithya naimitthika karmaani*. This *karma sahitha jnaana abhyaasa:*

(meditation, accompanied by *nithya naimitthika karmaani*) will boost the seeker's '*jnaanam*' and **this** boosted '*jnaanam*' only, will give liberation".

Reverting to the text

(sambhandha gadhyam to verse 67):

- एवं उपसंहृते - As I conclude thus,
- केचित् - a group of poorva pakshin-s,

According to some commentators, Sureswaraachaaryaa, is, here, referring to Brahmadhattha, another great *Advaita aachaaryaa*.

- स्व संप्रदाय बल अवष्टम्भात् - supported by the strength of their own tradition, 'avashtambha:' - support / prop.
- आहुः - claim (that)
- यद् विज्ञानं एतद् 'अहम् ब्रह्म अस्मि' इति वेदान्त वाक्यात् समुत्पद्यते - which knowledge rises from the mahaa vaakyam "aham brahma asmi",
- तद् - that knowledge,
- स्व उत्पत्ति मात्रेण एव - by its mere coming into being / by mere rise in the mind
- अज्ञानं न निरस्यति - does not destroy ignorance.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67 (Contd.):

किं तर्हि । अहन्यहनि द्वाधीयसा कालेन उपासीनस्य सतो भावनोपचयात् निश्शेषं अज्ञानं अपगच्छति "देवो भूत्वा देवानप्येति" इति श्रुतेः।

What then? One who meditates on this truth every day and for a long time, develops inward contemplative force, by which force, ignorance, in its entirety, is removed. The *sruthi* says "becoming a god, he attains the gods" (*Brahdhaaranyaka Upanishad – IV.i.2*).

- किं तर्हि - What then? (If 'understanding' does not clear ignorance, what does?)
- उपासीनस्य सतः - For the virtuous man who practices the "aham brahma asmi" meditation,
- अहनि अहनि - day after day,
- द्वाधीयसा कालेन - over a long time,
- भावना उपचयात् - because of the cumulative strength of meditation,
- अज्ञानं अपगच्छति - ignorance goes away
- निश्शेषं - totally (without any left-over),

The word '*bhaavanaa*' has two meanings (1) practice of meditation and (2) the force resulting from the meditation.

What is the *pramaanam* for this? According to the *poorva pakshin*, there are *Vedic* injunctions for the regular *upaasanaa* "aham brahma asmi".

The *poorva pakshin* quotes from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* "Devo bhoothvaa devaan apyethi" (B.U. IV. i .2). In this portion of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, *Devathaa Upaasanaa* is talked about, along with the results of the *Devathaa Upaasanaa*. For instance, if an individual is an *upaasaka* of *Hiranyagarbhaa*, he has to, first, understand the glory of *Hiranyagarbhaa*. Then, he has to practice 'aiykya bhaavam' ('aham ithi bhaavanaa') with *Hiranyagarbhaa*.

In the 3rd *Dhyaana Sloka* of the *Lalitha Sahasra Naamam*, the devotee meditates: "Aham ithi eva bhaavaye bhavaaneem" – "I think of *Devi Bhavaani* as the Supreme I-sense".

Yet another instance, is the practice of referring to *Ayappa Bakthaa-s*, as *Ayyappanmaar-s*.

Through such constant practice of *aiykya bhaavam*, the *upaasaka* gradually acquires the traits of the *upaasya Devathaa* and ultimately, after death, 'becomes' the *upaasya Devathaa*.

The *poorva pakshin* claims: "The constant meditation 'aham brahma asmi' follows the same course. The meditation on the *mahaa vaakyam*, will gradually give the seeker the traits of *Brahman* and after death, the seeker 'merges' with *Brahman*". In other words, the *prammaana vaakyam* for *Devathaa Upaasanaa*, found in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, is extended by the *poorva pakshin*, to the 'aspirant for *mokshaad* / the 'mumukshu' also.

- "देवि भूत्वा देवानप्येति" इति श्रुतेः - based on the *sruthi vaakyam* "becoming a god, he attains gods".

Thus far are the views of the first type of *poorva pakshin*, introduced by Sureswaraachaaryaa. The second type of *poorva pakshin* follows.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67 (Contd.):

अपरे तु ब्रूवते वेदान्तवाक्यजनितं अहम् ब्रह्मेति विज्ञानं संसर्गात्मकत्वात् आत्मवस्तु याथात्म्य अवगाह्येव न भवति ।

Others, again, hold that the knowledge of the form 'I am *Brahman*' signifies a complex whole of associate parts, and, therefore, does not constitute a correct apprehension of the Self at all.

The second *poorva pakshin* presents a technical argument. He says:

"You are gaining *Brahmajnaanam* by the analysis of a *mahaa vaakyam*; in other words, *brahma jnaanam* is a *vaakya janya jnaanam*. Every *vaakya janya jnaanam* (i.e. every knowledge gained from *vaakya vicharaa*) has got a particular nature, that you have to understand. And, to understand that knowledge, you should first know what a *vaakyam* itself is. Let me analyze: What is a sentence? A *vaakyam* consists of several words connected syntactically; every word in the sentence is connected with the other words in the sentence by propositions. If the words are not connected, the resulting disjointed group of words, cannot be a sentence and cannot convey a message. The individual words have to be connected syntactically, to form a meaningful sentence - one word being the subject, another word being an object, a third word being the location, the fourth word being the instrument and so on. In short, a sentence is a string of words **connected properly**.

"Every word, in a sentence, has got a meaning i.e. every *padham* reveals the *padha artha*: | When *padham*-s are connected, the *pada arthaa*-s are also connected. Connection between the *padhaa*-s reveal the connection between the *padha arthaa*-s.

"For example, in the sentence '*paathre jalam asthi*', the word '*jalam*' is in nominative case and the word '*paathram*' is in locative case. The words '*paathram*' and '*jalam*' are connected. The connection between the words reveal the connection between their meanings. The *padha sambhandha*: reveals the *padha artha sambhandha*:, the *aadhaara-aadheya sambhandha*: |

"And, that means, every *padha arthaa* that we understand from the sentence, is not an isolated *padha arthaa*; but, is connected with other *padha arthaa*-s. In other words, whatever *padha arthaa* you understand through a sentence, is a *sambhaddha padha arthaa*, connected with other *padha arthaa*-s in the sentence. The technical word used in grammar, for this understanding, is '*samsrushta padha artha jnaanam*'. Through a sentence, we come to know about things which are all connected with other things referred to, in the sentence. Therefore, every sentence gives only '*samsrushta padha artha jnaanam*'. To repeat, by way of clarification: "*samsrushta padha artha jnaanam*" means "knowledge of various objects which are connected with various other objects". The other expressions used for this *jnaanam* are (1) '*samsargaathmaka jnaanam*', meaning 'relational knowledge' and (2) '*vaakyartha jnaanam*', meaning 'sentential knowledge' or 'book knowledge' ".

The *poorva pakshin* contends: "When you know *Brahman* from a *mahaa vaakyam*, *Brahman* is also a *padha artha*: - the meaning of the word occurring in a sentence. This *Brahman*, since it is learnt from a *vaakyam*, has to be *samsrushta padha arthaa* only; in other words,

through the *mahaa vaakyam*, you understand a *Brahman*, which is associated with other *padha arthaa*-s revealed in the *vaakyam* – whatever other objects mentioned in the sentence be. This means that the *Brahman* revealed from a *mahaa vaakyam*, is *samsrushta padhaartha* only.

“According to *Vedhaantha*, ‘*samsrushta Brahma jnaanam*’ (‘knowledge of a *Brahman* **connected** with objects’) cannot give liberation. *Asamsrushta Brahma Jnaanam* (the knowledge of that *Brahman*, which is **asangham** *Brahman* – **not connected** with any other *padhaartha*) alone can give liberation. The *mahaa vaakyartha Brahma Jnaanam*, being only *samsrushta Brahma Jnaanam* and not *asamsrushta Brahma Jnaanam*, cannot give liberation.

“You require *sajaatheeya vijaatheeya svagathe bedha rahitha kevala asangha Brahma vijnaanam*, for liberation; and, any amount of *mahaa vaakya sravanam* cannot give this type of knowledge.”

“Hence” the *poorva pakshin* continues “your *saadhanaa* is **not** complete with *vicharaa* ; i.e. *vicharaa* is not the culmination of *saadhanaa*-s. You should do another *saadhanaa* for converting *samsrushta Brahma jnaanam* into *asamsrushta Brahma jnaanam*. *Samsrushta Brahma jnaanam* is mere *jnaanam*, while *asamsrushta Brahma jnaanam* is *saakshaathkaara*: | The former is only ‘mere knowledge’; only the latter is ‘realization’ or ‘enlightenment’. By *Vaakya vicharaa*, you get only ‘knowledge’, variously called as ‘relational knowledge’, ‘book knowledge’, ‘sentential knowledge’ etc., and certainly not ‘enlightenment’. A conversion process **is essential**; and, that conversion process is ‘meditation’, termed *Bhavanaa*.

“Because of *bhaavanaa upachaya samskaaraa*, the mind gets a special power and when the mind has got sufficient cumulative strength because of meditation, it converts the *samsrushta padhaartha jnaanam* into *asamsrushta padhaartha jnaanam*; the *samsargaathmaka jnaanam* into *asamsargaathmaka jnaanam*; *vaakyartha jnaanam* into *avaakyartha jnaanam*.

“The conclusion is: Sentential knowledge **has** to be converted into non-sentential knowledge, through meditation, to achieve liberation”.

(This topic is discussed elaborately by the *Aachaaryaa*, later, in the 2nd and 3rd chapters.)

The name of the *Aachaaryaa* leading this second group of *poorva pakshin*-s is not clear. Some annotators mention the name as Mandana Misra (different, of course, from Sureswaraachaaryaa, whose name, before his renunciation, was also Mandana Misra). This second group is referred to as ‘*saakshaathkaara vaadhina*:-’- ‘Realization Theory Advocates’.

- अपरे तु - Another group of people
- ब्रूवते - vehemently argue (that)
- वेदान्तवाक्यजनितं अहं ब्रह्मेति विज्ञानं - this knowledge "I am Brahman", born out of mahaa vaakya vichaaraa,
- सम्सर्गात्मकत्वात् - because it is in the form of 'relational' Brahmajnaanam and not 'asangha' Brahmajnaanam,
- आत्मवस्तु याथात्म्य अवगाहि एव न भवति - does not become the revealer of the real nature of aathmaa (viz., being the same as Paramaathmaa).
- Aathma vasthu – aathmaa ; yaathaathmyam – reality ; avagaahi - revealer.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67 (Contd.):

किं तर्हि । एतदेव गङ्गास्रोतोवत् सततमभ्यस्यतोऽन्यदेवावाक्यार्थात्मकं विज्ञानान्तरमुत्पद्यते ।

What then? In the mind of an aspirant, who practices continuously this knowledge itself like the flow of the Ganga, a new type of knowledge arises, which is an integral apprehension, transcending verbal cognition.

- किं तर्हि - What then is to be done?
- सततं अभ्यस्तः (पुरुषस्य) - For a person constantly meditating
- एतद् एव - this same knowledge,
- गङ्गास्रोतोवत् - like the flow of river Ganga,
- अन्यद् एव अवाक्यार्थात्मकं विज्ञानान्तरं उत्पद्यते - another type of knowledge, which transcends verbal cognition and which is different from the knowledge born out of mahaa vaakya vichaaraa, arises

'avaakyaaaarthaathmakam' – 'of the nature of transcending mere words';
'vijnaanaanatham' - 'another type of knowledge' ; 'uthpadhyathe' – arises ; 'anyadeva' – different from (the knowledge born out of mahaa vaakya vichaaraa).

"Transmutation of 'knowledge' into 'realization' is achieved by meditation" is the view of the *poorva pakshin*.

In essence, the debate is: "Which is more important in the search for liberation – *saasthraa*-s or the seeker's mind?". The *poorva pakshin* says "The mind is more important, since *saasthraa*-s give only sentential knowledge and only meditation gives non-sentential knowledge, **which** is the liberating knowledge". On the other hand, Sureswaraacharya wants to establish the pre-eminence of *saasthraa*-s, in giving the knowledge required for liberation.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67 (Contd.):

तदेव अशेष अज्ञानतिमिरोत्सारीति "विज्ञाय प्रजां कुर्वति ब्राह्मणः" इति श्रुतेरिति।

It is this new knowledge that expels all darkness of ignorance. The *sruthi* says "The *Brahmana*, after understanding, must proceed to apprehend in a direct manner".

The *poorva pakshin*'s arguments continue.

- 'तदेव अशेष अज्ञान तिमिर उत्सारि' - "Only that non-sentential knowledge given by meditation (is) the destroyer of the darkness of ignorance in entirety'
- इति - is the fact that is proved
- इति श्रुते: - by the sruthi statement
- 'विज्ञाय प्रजां कुर्वति ब्राह्मणः' - 'After gaining knowledge through sravanam may theseeker practice meditation' "
- इति - so states the *poorva pakshin*.

The *poorva pakshin* quotes the *manthra* IV.iv.21 of the *Brahdhaaranyaka Upanishad*, in his support. "This *upanishadic* statement is *pramaanam* enough that *sravanam* is not sufficient. Meditation is essential" is the argument of the second *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraacharya has to refute the two *poorva pakshin*-s.

36. Chapter I, Verses 67 and 68 (23-12-2006)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67 (Contd.) :

अस्य पक्षद्वयस्य निवृत्तये इदमभिधीयते ।

What follows is in refutation of these two positions.

As a part of *jnaana-karma-samucchaya-vaadha kandanam*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is introducing two types of *poorva pakshin-s*, in this portion. By negating these two, he wants to establish the central teaching of his treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, viz. "By clearly understanding *Vedhaanthic* teaching, liberation can be achieved". This clear understanding has two components: (1) clear understanding of the *mahaa vaakyam* and (2) clear understanding of the fact, that, nothing else other than this clear understanding of the *mahaa vaakyam*, is required for liberation. The *Aachaaryaa* wants to emphasize that meditation is also not required for liberation. So, he introduces these two *poorva pakshin-s*, both of whom attach importance to meditation in the search for liberation.

The first *poorva pakshin* argues: "Clear understanding is not enough for gaining liberation. I concede that the 'clear understanding' is a knowledge – but, it is not the liberating knowledge. This 'non-liberating knowledge', acquired by *Vedhaanthic* study, has to be converted into 'liberating knowledge', through long meditation. By meditation, termed *bhaavanaa*, your mind gets a special forces, which reinforces the non-liberating knowledge; this reinforced knowledge alone will give liberation, much later". This *poorva pakshin* further contends, that, while this conversion process (from non-liberating to liberating knowledge) progresses gradually through meditation, the seeker has also to diligently practice *nithya-naimitthika-karmaani*. Thus, *jnaanam* and *karmaa* have to be combined for a long time, *jnaanam* in the form of meditation and *karmaa* in the form of *nithya-naimitthika karmaani* and that 'combination' will give liberation. "Clear understanding' from the *mahaa vaakyam* alone is not at all enough. It is non-liberating knowledge" is the stand of this *poorva pakshin*. He is also a *jnaana-karma-samucchaya vaadhin*, since he also insists on *karmaa*.

The second *poorva pakshin* also concedes that knowledge acquired through *sravanam* is 'knowledge'; but, contends: "This is not the final stage. This is because, any sentence can give only relational knowledge (*samsargaathmaka jnaanam*) or sentential knowledge (*vaakyaaartha jnaanam*). But, what is required in the field of realization is *asanga* (non-relational) *Brahma jnaanam*. Since only *samsargaathmaka jnaanam* has been attained from the study of *mahaa vaakyam*, we should convert that 'knowledge' into 'enlightenment', through long meditation. This converted knowledge **is** the final knowledge, which liberates". The second *poorva pakshin* also, like the first *poorva pakshin*, holds, that, while the seeker

is practicing meditation for the conversion of 'knowledge' into 'enlightenment', the seeker has to simultaneously continue with *nithya-naimitthika karmaani*, for the meditation to be successful.

Thus, the first *poorva pakshin* talked of "a 'special force' resulting from meditation, reinforcing the non-liberating knowledge acquired from *Vedhaanthic* study to become liberating knowledge", while, the second *poorva pakshin* talked of "the capacity of meditation to convert mere book-knowledge into 'enlightenment'". Otherwise, both *poorva pakshin-s* are essentially similar, both holding that, only after long meditation, that too, supported by *karmaa*, liberation will result.

Sureswaraachaaryaa refutes both theories **briefly** in the next verse. He presents his elaborate arguments against them, later, in the 2nd and 3rd chapters. "Mere *sravana janya jnaanam*", by itself, gives liberation. Meditation is not required for a so-called 'final liberating knowledge' " is his firm view.

- अस्य पक्षद्वयस्य निवृत्तये - For refutation of these two philosophies
- इदम् अभिधीयते - I am saying this.

His brief reply follows in the verse.

Chapter I : Verse 67 –

सकृत्प्रवृत्त्या मृदनाति क्रियाकारकरूपभृत् ।

अज्ञानमागमजानं साङ्गत्यं नास्त्यतोऽनयोः ॥ ६७ ॥

The understanding of the scriptures, at once (without any need for 'repetition' or 'meditation') destroys the ignorance that bears the forms of action and the factors involved in action. There is no combination of these two.

- आगमजानं अज्ञानं मृदनाति - Knowledge born out of a thorough study of maha vaakyam can instantly destroy ignorance,

'*aagamaa*', in this context, refers to *Vedhaantha*, especially *mahaa vaakyaa-s*. '*Mrudh*' means dust. The literal meaning of '*mrudhnaath*' is 'converts to dust'. And, therefore, '*mrudhnaath*' means '*naasayath*' or 'destroys'.

It should be carefully noted, that, in this sentence, '*aagamajnaanam*' is the subject and '*ajnaanam*' is the object and not the other way around.

- क्रिया कारक रूप भृत् - (which ignorance is) in the form of the sustainer of karmaa and kaarakam,

'*kriyaad*' means '*karmaad*' or 'action'; '*kaarakam*' means 'the various accessories required for *karmaad*', beginning with the *karthaa* (the subject), and including object, location, instrument etc.; '*bhruth*' means 'sustainer' / 'supporter'.

Ignorance is 'sustainer' of duality. When ignorance goes away, the duality is also falsified. That means "*jnaanam* destroys *ajnaanam* **and** duality".

"*Dveethiyaath vai bhayam bhavath*" – "fear is the result of *dvaitha bhaavam*" is a well-known *Upanishadic* statement (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* - I.iv.2).

"When *jnaanam* rises, *dvaitham* goes away; *samsaaraa* also goes away; liberation results. Thus, 'clear understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam* is enough to achieve liberation" is the essence of this statement (*aagamajnaanam kriyaa karaka roopa bhruth ajnaanam mrudhunaath*) of the *Aachaaryaa*.

By this statement, he has answered the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, who had claimed that 'sentences' (by which he implies *mahaa vaakyam*-s) can give only relational knowledge. Sureswaraachaaryaa maintains "While it is true, that, in general, sentences can give only relational knowledge, in the exceptional case of *mahaa vaakyam*, the *vaakyam* itself gives non-relational *advaita jnaanam*, the final knowledge, without the need for the *saadhanaa* of mediation".

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not support his statement with any explanation in this portion. Later, he dwells elaborately on this topic of 'sentences giving relational knowledge'. He uses a term (later) – '*vaakyaath avaakyaartha:*' - stressing that pure *brahma jnaanam* is obtained from the very *sravanam* of the *mahaa vaakyam*, without the need for any further *saadhanaa*. "*Aagama jnaanam* is *ajnaana naasaka jnanam*" is his conviction.

- **सकृत्प्रवृत्त्या** - in one stroke.

By the use of this term '*sakruthpravrutthayaad*', the *Aachaaryaa* strongly refutes the 1st *poorva pakshin*, who had said "instantaneous liberation is not achieved by knowledge. 'Repetition' is required". The *Aachaaryaa* counters: "**No**; no repetition (*aavrutthi*) is needed. By one stroke, liberation is achieved by destruction of *ajnaanam*. Knowledge destroys *ajnaanam*, in one stroke, by its rise alone, similar to the 'lighting of a lamp' removing the darkness straightaway. *Aavrutthi* (repetition) and *bhaavanaa* (meditation) are not required".

"Clear understanding of the *sruthi*, by study, is the final and liberating knowledge. You do not require a separate '*saakshaathkaaraad*' / realization / mystic feelings etc., for liberation" is Sureswaraachaaryaa's firm stand.

If meditation is not required after 'understanding', do you require 'karma samucchaya'? The *Aachaaryaa* responds: "When meditation itself is not required, why *karmaa*?"

- अतः - This being the case (i.e. when even meditation is not required)
- साङ्गत्यं न अस्ति - there is no combination (samucchayam)
- अनयाः - between jnaana abhyaasaa and karma abhyaasaa.

A doubt may arise. If mere *sravanam* gives clear understanding and liberation, why should the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* talk about "srothavya:, **manthavya:**, **nidhidhyaasithavya:**" – an exhortation to "hear, **clear doubts** and **meditate**" ? How does one reconcile this teaching of the *Upanishad* with the *Aachaaryaa's* stand.

Obviously, the word 'srothavya:', in the above quotation, cannot be and is not against the *Aachaaryaa's* views, since it implies the following facts also:

- (1) Meditation cannot be a source of knowledge – material or spiritual. Knowledge can result only from an appropriate means or instrument. Imagination or wishful thinking cannot be called knowledge. Scriptures and tradition list six sources of knowledge / *pramaanam*-s. It should be noted that this list does **not** include meditation. This fact is a strong support to the contention of Sureswaraachaaryaa, that meditation cannot be the source of 'liberating knowledge'.
- (2) While any knowledge can come only from one or more of the above six *pramaanam*-s, *brahma jnaanam* specifically, can result only from the 6th *pramaanam*, viz., the *apourusheya Veda pramaanam*. The theoretical study of *Veda pramaanam* is *sravanam*. Analysis of *thadhpadhaa* and *thvampadhaa* is *pramaana* operation. The culmination of spiritual knowledge is through *sravanam* i.e. the study of *Veda pramaanam*, especially the *mahaa vaakyaani*.

But, what about use of the terms 'manthavya:' and 'nidhidhyaasithavya:.'| Do these terms not contradict the *Aachaaryaa's* views?

Sureswaraachaaryaa explains: "The use of 'manthavya:' and 'nidhidhyaasithavya:' should not be taken to mean that *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* should **follow** *sravanam* for achieving liberation" (though, it is generally believed so). He maintains: "Normally, *sravanam* itself should give 'clear understanding'. But, if in a particular seeker's case, it does not do so, it means that the seeker suffers from some *buddhi doshaa*: - obstacles in his mind and reasoning. The *saadhanaa*-s of *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are required **only** in this area, namely, '**for removal of the mental obstacles**'. They are **not** meant for

enlightenment or realization. They only prepare the seeker's mind for effective *sravanam*. The seeker **has to go back to** *sravanam*, after the mind is adequately prepared. The climax has to be only in *sravanam*. Effective *sravanam* **alone** gives you the final knowledge". "So" Sureswaraacharya concludes: "nothing else apart from 'clear understanding' is required for liberation".

This gives rise to further questions. What are the mental blocks, because of which *sravanam* is ineffective? And, how are they removed?

The 1st mental block : It is generally true, that knowledge derived from a book, is very often a non-final knowledge and that, this 'book-knowledge' should be converted into 'enlightenment', by bringing into practical use the contents of the book. Unfortunately, we have a tendency to extend this concept to *Vedhaanthic* study also. We tend to believe "By *Vedhaanthic* study, I receive only 'book-knowledge' of *Brahman*. I now have to 'experience' it". But, this is a misconception and is the 1st mental block. This has to be removed by *mananam*, which consists in an analysis of "Which source gives final 'liberating' knowledge? Which source does not?" etc. A diligent analysis will result in the understanding". In general, 'book-knowledge' is not final. But, *Vedhaantha* is an exception. The *apourusheya sabda pramaanam* can and does give the final knowledge". This conviction should come by *mananam*. Thus, through *mananam*, the 1st mental block is removed.

(While all *pourusheya pramaanam*-s, resulting in different types of knowledge, different from *brahma jnaanam*, are technically termed 'upajeevipraamaanam-s', the *apourusheya Veda sabda pramaanam*, resulting in *brahma jnaanam* is termed 'upajeevya pramaanam').

The 2nd mental block may be called a 'habit block'. One always tends to judge oneself from the stand-point of the body-mind complex. This body-mind based self-judgment leads to the misconception "I have problems like anger etc.", even after a study of *Vedhaantha*, though it is not 'I' that has such problems, but only the mind of 'I'. Even an advanced aspirant, though he may tell himself that he is not *anaathmaa*, may continue the self-judgment, based on *anaathmaa*. This *anaathmaa*-based self-judgment is the greatest *vipareetha bhaavanaa*. Under such *vipareetha bhaavanaa* conditions, the aspirant can never achieve 'liberation'; and, therefore, he should remove this mental block of mind-based self-judgment, with the help of the *saadhanaa* of *nidhidhyaasanam*.

'Removing the two mental blocks and listening to *mahaa vaakyam*' will give 'freedom'. *Mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are the needed *saadhanaa*-s, for **removal of the mental blocks**. They are **not** for 'realization'. Only *sravanam* is the *mukya saadhanaa*, while *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are 'supporting' *saadhanaa*-s. It is *mananam* which can and does give the two-fold 'clear understanding' earlier explained.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 68 :

एवं तावदनानात्वं ब्रह्मणि जानकर्मणोः समुच्चयो निराकृतः । अताधुना पक्षान्तराभ्युपगमेनापि प्रत्यवस्थाने पूर्ववदनाश्वासो यथा तथाभिधीयते ।

Thus, the combination of 'knowledge' and 'action' is denied, on the theory, that *Brahman* is one divested of all plurality. Now even if another *samucchayaa* point of view is raised, I will show the logical problem in it also , in the same manner as it was shown in the earlier *samuchyaa vaadham*.

In verse 67, Sureswaraacharya refuted the *bhavanaa vaadhi* philosophers, who had claimed that meditation is the final *saadhanaa*. The *Aachaaryaa* averred that *sravanam* is the *anghi* (main) and *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are only *angam-s* (supports). "The seeker practices *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* only for the purpose of effective 'listening'. The two are not **after** *sravanam*, but, are **for** *sravanam*" was the *Aachaaryaa's* reply.

From verse 68 to verse 79, the *Aachaaryaa* discusses another group of *jnaana- karma-samucchaya vaadhina:*, who were also equally powerful during the times of Adi Sankara and Sureswaraacharya.

This group of poorva pakshin-s are known by three different names : 'bedha abedha vaadhina:', 'naanaarasa brahma vaadhina:' and 'ekasaasthra vaadhina:' | They are people who do not agree with either the poorva meemaamsakaa-s or the Advaitin-s. Poorva meemaamsakaa-s are dvaithin-s, who give importance to Veda Poorvaa and ignore Veda anthaa. Advaitin-s refute dvaitham and give less importance to Veda poorvaa, compared to Veda anthaa.

The bedha abedha vaadhi strongly feels that both poorva meemaamsakaa-s and advaitin-s are misguided in their respective partial visions, giving importance to only one part of the Veda - either the poorva bhaagam or the antha bhaagam. The beda abedha vaadhi wants to give importance to the **entire** Veda and to accept **both** dvaitham and advaitam. His concept of 'truth' is unique: "Ekam and anekam / dvaitham and advaitam / bedham and abedham".

The Aachaaryaa for this group is Bharthru Prapancha: |

Both Jeeva-Isvara bedhaa and jeeva-Isvara aikyam are acceptable to this group of poorva pakshin-s. Jnaana-karma-samucchaya: is also acceptable to them.

37. Chapter I, Verses 68 to 70 (30-12-2006)

One of the fundamental questions, discussed by the *Vedic Achaaryaa-s*, is whether *Vedaa-s* are to be treated as one whole *saasthram* or as the combination of two *saasthraa-s* – “*Ekasaasthram vaa saasthradvayam vaa vedaa:?*”

There are differences of opinion on this fundamental question.

We, the *Advaithin-s*, treat *Vedaa-s* as a mixture of two distinct *saasthraa-s* and are, therefore, called *saasthra dvaya vaadhina:.* To us, *Veda Poorvaa* or *karma kaandaa* is one *saasthraa* and *Veda anthaa* or *jnaana kaandaa* is a different *saasthraa*. This distinction is considered very important by us, since many philosophical / metaphysical conclusions are reached, based on this belief.

We treat *Vedaa-s* as two *saasthraa-s*, because of a number of reasons. The most important reason is as follows: It is an universally accepted fact, that, any *saasthraa* should have a distinct *anubhandha chathushtayam* – group of four factors – namely,

- (1) the *adhikaari* – the person to whom the *saasthraa* is addressed
- (2) the *vishayaa* – the subject matter
- (3) the *sambhandha:* - relationship between the *adhikaari* and the *vishayaa* and
- (4) the *palan* – the benefit derived from the *saasthraa*.

Every *saasthraa* will have an unique, specific, particular and relevant *anubhandha chathushtayam*. When we approach and analyze *Vedaa-s*, we find that:

- the *karma kaandaa* has got a specific *anubhandha chathushtayam* and the *jnaana kaandaa* has got another distinct and different *anubhandha chathushtayam*. For the *karma kaandaa*, the *adhikaari* is *raaghi* (the individual with desires), the *vishayaa* is *anithyam* (ephemeral), the *sambhandha:* is *chodhya-chodhana sambhandha:* and the *palan* is also *anithyam*.
- For the *jnaana kaandaa*, they are, respectively (1) *viraagi* (one who has given up desires) (2) *nithya* (eternal) *vasthu* (3) *prathibhaadhika-prathibhaadhya sambhandha:* and (4) *nithya palan*.

So, we conclude, that, the two portions of the *Vedaa-s* should be treated as two different *saasthraa-s*. Since each portion addresses its own different *adhikaari*, the portions cannot be combined. “*Samucchayaa* between *karmaa* and *jnaanam* is, therefore, never possible” is the *Advaithin's* firm view.

On the other hand, another group of philosophers claims that *Veda* is *ekasaasthraa*, because, according to them, both *karmaa* and *jnaanam* are based on the one and same *Veda pramaanam*, given by *Bhagavaan*, addressed to the **same** group of "believers and seekers". "*Veda* should be treated as *Ekasaasthraa*" claims this group, who existed even before Adi Sankara's times. "*Ekasaasthra vaadhina:*" is the name of this group, headed by an *Aachaaryaa*, *Bharthru Prapancha:*. The *Visishtaadvaithaa* philosophy is an evolution of this *Ekasaasthravaadhaa*.

Rama Raya Kavi, a scholar who came much later than Sureswaraachaaryaa, wrote a treatise, by name, *Sankaraasankara Bhaashya Vimarsa:*, wherein, he makes a comparative study of Sankara's *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam* and Ramanuja's *Brahma Soothra Bhashyam*. In this treatise, he also discusses elaborately, this question: "*Vedaa: eka saasthram vaa saasthradvayam vaa?*" and establishes that it is *saasthradvayam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this portion of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, takes on the *Ekasaasthravaadhaa*, for refutation.

The corollaries of accepting *Ekasaasthra vaadhaa* are many.

Corollary 1: The *Veda Poorva Bhaagaa* talks of *dvaitam* and the *Veda antha baaghaa* of *advaitam*. The reality, according to the *Eka saasthra vaadhi*, is, therefore, neither *dvaitam* nor *advaitam*. He claims "*Dvaitaadhvaitam*" is real.

Corollary 2: The *Veda Poorvaa* talks of the differences between *Isvara* and *Jeeva*; i.e. *jeeva-jagath-Isvara bedhaa* is the subject matter of *Veda Poorvaa*. On the other hand, the *Veda antha bhaagaa* talks of *aiykyam* or *abedhaa* between *jeevaa* and *Isvara*. "Therefore" the *Eka Saasthra Vaadhi* concludes "the ultimate relationship between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* is '*Bedhaabedhaa*'"; "Unity is real; diversity is also real" is the statement of the *eka saasthra vaadhi*. (Sureswaraacharyaa uses the term "*naanaarasam Brahman*" for this *poorva paksha* perspective.) In contrast, the *Advaitin* says "**Real** Unity is there, in **apparent** diversity".

Corollary 3: *Veda Poorvaa* talks of *karmaa* and *Veda anthaa* talks of *jnaanam*. "Therefore" the *eka saasthra vaadhi* says "there **has** to be a combination of *jnaanam* and *karmaa*." According to him, "*Jnaana-karma-samuccchayam*" will give 'liberation'" is the message of the *Vedaa*-s. A further fall-out of this corollary, is, that, according to the *eka saasthra vaadhi*, *grihastha aasramama* **alone** is a valid *aasramaam*. He holds that *sanyaasa aasrama* is not prescribed by the *Vedaa*-s. "Only the 'combination of *jnaanam* and *karmaa*' can give liberation" is his view.

This *eka saasthra vaadha* philosophy was very much prevalent, during the periods of Adi Sankara and Sureswaraachaaryaa.

The subject matter of verses 68 to 79, is "*eka saasthra vaadha kandanam*" – "refutation of this philosophy".

Reverting to the text

(sambhandha gadhyam to verse 68):

- एवं तावत् - Until now,
- जान कर्मणोः समुच्चयः निराकृतः - the combination between jnaanam and karmaa was rejected,
- अनानात्वे ब्रह्मणि - assuming Brahman as one.
- अत अधुना - From now on,
- पक्षान्तर अभ्युपगमेन प्रत्यवस्थाने अपि - considering another samucchaya point of view, which also raises objections (to our view),

pakshaanthra – another view; abhyugamena – considering; prathyavasthaane – giving objections.

- अनाश्वासः अभिधीयते - I will show its logical problem / logical incongruity, anaasvaasa: - logical problem / logical incongruity.
- यथा पूर्ववत् तथा - similar to the same manner, in which , the logical problem was shown in the earlier instance.
Yathaa – similar to; poorvavath – as in the earlier instance; thathaa - in the same manner.

Chapter I: Verse 68 –

अनुत्सारितनानात्वं ब्रह्म यस्यापि वादिनः ।

तन्मतेनापि दुस्साध्यो जानकर्मसमुच्चयः ॥ ६८ ॥

Even according to the view of the theorist for whom *Brahman* does not exclude diversity, the combination of action and knowledge remains equally impossible.

Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces the new *poorva pakshin*.

- यस्य अपि वादिनः - In the case of the philosophers for whom
- अनुत्सारितनानात्वं ब्रह्म - Brahman does not exclude diversity,

The philosophers referred to here, are the 'eka saasthra vaadhina:'.

The eka saasthra vaadhina: talk of a philosophy, where plurality continues to exist even in Brahman; for them 'plurality' is also real, whereas, for the advaitin, plurality is mithyaa ; only advaitam is real.

Uthsaaritha – negated; anuthsaaritha – not negated ; naanaathvam – plurality / diversity. 'anuthsaaritha naanaathvam' is adjective to 'Brahman'.

- तन्मतेन अपि - even from their standpoint
- जानकर्म समुच्चयः - the combination between jnaanam and karmaa
- दुस्साध्यः - is not possible.

This verse is only the introduction to the refutation of the *poorva paksham*. The *Aachaaryaa* elaborates his views subsequently, in the verses that follow.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 69:

तस्य विभाग उक्तिः दूषणविभागप्रज्ञप्तये ।

This position is further analyzed so that the criticism also may be presented analytically.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "I will divide the discussion into three levels. In the *eka saasthra vaadhin's* philosophy, he talks of *bedha-abadha sambhandha*: (translated as 'identity-in-diversity'). He holds that between *Isvara* and *jeevaa*, difference is there; identity is **also** there. Let us analyze this in three levels. First, from the *bedha paksha* viewpoint, where, we will show that *samucchayaa* is not possible. Then, we will analyze it from the view point of there being identity – *abadha pakshaa* - where also, we will show that *samucchayaa* is not possible. Finally, from the *bedha-abadha-paksha* angle also, we will show that *samucchayaa* is not possible".

The *Aachaaryaa* uses a standard method, known as *vikalpa*, which consists in dividing the *poorva paksha vaadhaa*, into different aspects and countering the opponent's theory, from each one of the aspects. While this is done to facilitate clarity in the counter-explanations, it also weakens the opponent.

- तस्य - In respect of this philosophy (of the *eka saasthra vaadhi*)
- विभाग उक्तिः - the method of 'division' (is being adopted)
- दूषण विभाग प्रज्ञप्तये - for the clear understanding of the divisions in our refutation.
Pragnyapthi: - clear understanding.

Divisions in the *poorva pakshaa* are talked about, for understanding clearly the divisions or stages in the refutation; in other words, *poorva paksha vibhaaga*: is resorted to, for clarity regarding *poorva paksha niraasa vibhaaga*: |

The details of the 'division' follow.

Chapter I: Verse 69 –

ब्रह्मात्मा वा भवेत्तस्य यदि वा अनात्मरूपकं
आत्म अनाप्तिः भवेन्मोहादितरस्याप्यनात्मनः ॥ ६९ ॥

Either Brahman is the *aathman* or it is other than the *aathman*. If it is the *aathman*, then its non-attainment is only through illusion. If it is other than the *aathman*, it ever remains a non-self, and neither by knowledge nor by action, it becomes one with *aathman*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa asks a question of this *poorva pakshin*: "Is *Paramaathmaa* identical with *jeevaathmaa* or different from *jeevaathmaa*?"

- ब्रह्म आत्मा वा भवेत् - (One possibility is) "Paramaathmaa is identical with jeevaathmaa".
- यदि वा तस्य अनात्मरूपकम् (भवेत्) - (The second possibility is) "Paramaathmaais different from jeevaathmaa".

Thasya – of Brahman (Paramaathmaa); anaathmaroopakam – of the nature of being distinct from aathmaa (jeevaathmaa).

Sureswaraachaaryaa is proceeding to maintain that karmaa is utterly useless, in either case. Then, where can there be any jnaana karma samucchayam?

He argues: "If there is identity between Isvara and jeevaa, Isvara need not be my goal, since I am already Isvara. And, thus, when I am already Isvara, if I set my goal as Isvara and crave for Isvara, it is only because of delusion. This delusion has to be removed, which removal is possible only through jnaanam. Karmaa cannot help".

- आत्म अनाप्तिः - (In the first instance, i.e. when Isvara and jeevaa are identical), thenon-attainment of Brahman,
- मोहात् भवेत् - results only from delusion.

The implication is "therefore, *karmaa* is useless".

In the second case also, where *Brahman* and *aathmaa* are considered different, *karmaa* is useless, since any amount of *karmaa* cannot convert the finite into the 'Infinite'. If *jeevaathmaa* (finitude) is my 'essential' nature, I can never lose this nature and attain *Brahmathvam*, the nature of the 'Infinite'.

- इतरस्य अनात्मनः अपि - Even in the other possibility of Brahman being different from jeevaatmaa (and, therefore a 'goal'),
- (कर्मणा अनाप्तिः भवेत्) - (Brahman cannot be attained by karmaaa).

"*Karmanaa moksha: na eva sambhavathi*" is the firm conviction of Sureswaraachaaryaa.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 70:

तत्र यदि तावत् वास्तवेनैव वृत्तेन ब्रह्मप्राप्तं आत्मस्वाभाव्यात् केवलं आसुरमोह अपिधानमात्रमेव अनाप्तिनिमित्तं तस्मिन्पक्षे ।

If, in reality, Brahman is already attained, being one's very nature, then, only the demoniac misconception must present it as unattained. In that case :

The *poorva pakshin* may ask: "How do you (*Advaitin*), then, talk of *mokshaa*, if *karmaa* cannot give *mokshaa*?". The *Advaitin* replies: "I believe, that, *mokshaa* is through *jnaanam* and not through *karmaa*. Hence, I have no problem. Only *you* have a problem, since you consider *karmaa* as a *moksha saadhanam*, when it is a logical fallacy".

"I do not require any *saadhanaa*" is the *saadhanaa*.

- तत्र यदि तावत् - In this regard, if we assume, that
- वास्तवेन वृत्तेन - in reality,
- ब्रह्मप्राप्तं - Brahman is already accomplished by me,
- आत्मस्वाभाव्यात् - being my very nature,
- केवलं आसुरमोह अपिधानमात्रं एव - the mere covering in the form of delusion natural to materialistic persons,
- अनाप्ति निमित्तं - is the cause for non-attainment of Brahman.

Aasura moham - delusion that is natural for people given to materialistic pursuits;
apidhaanam - covering.

Delusion 'covers' ('stands in the way of') reasoning and, is, therefore, the cause of non-attainment of *Brahman*. *Manthraa* II.i.1, of *Katopanishad*, which runs, "*paraanchi kaani vyathrunath svayambhoo: thasmaath paraang pasyathi na antharaathman*" – "The Lord destroyed the sense organs by making them extrovert ; therefore, every one perceived outside, not the inner Self", conveys a similar message.

तस्मिन् पक्षे - In that case,

The *Aachaaryaa* plans to state in the verse that follows: "No *karmaa* will remove any delusion. Only the understanding '*aham brahma asmi*' will give liberation".

Chapter I: Verse 70 -

मोहापिधानभङ्गाय नैव कर्माणि कारणम् ।

जानेनैव फलावाप्तेस्तत्र कर्म निरर्थकम् ॥ ७० ॥

For removing the misconception, action can never be the means. As only knowledge produces the required result, action in that situation is useless.

मोह अपिधान भङ्गाय = - For removal of this covering in the form of delusion

Moham – delusion; *apidhaanam* – cover (*pidhaanam* also means 'cover'); *bhangaaya* – to cause the removal.

- कर्माणि न कारणम् एव (भवति) - karmaa-s can never be the cause.
- ज्ञानेन एव फल अवाप्ते : - Since the result (viz., 'liberation') is attained only by 'knowledge',
- तत्र - in that context (Brahma praapthi vishaye)
- कर्म निरर्थकम् - Karmaa (either *loukikaa* or *vaidhikaa*) is irrelevant / useless.

Sureswaraachaarya holds that *karmaa* is useless in attaining *Brahman*; but, he has also earlier warned that *karmaa* **is useful**, in any number of other fields, especially in the 'preparation' / 'refinement' of the mind of the seeker. In fact, lots of *karmaa* may be **necessary** for a given individual for this purpose, but *karmaa* cannot give liberation direct.

38. Chapter I, Verses 70 and 73 (06-01-2007)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *jnaana karma samucchaya vaadha*: - the philosophy of combining knowledge and action, as a means of liberation. In this process, he is now taking on a particular type of philosophers, known as '*eka saasthra vaadhina*:', a powerful group lead by *Bharthru Prapancha Aachaaryaa*. Their philosophy is known also as *naanaa rasa brahma vaadha*: and as *bedha-abadha vaadha*: |

From verse 68, Sureswaraachaaryaa has entered into the refutation of this philosophy.

For the purpose of refutation, he has divided the arguments into three stages. Since the '*eka saasthra vaadh*' calls his philosophy as '*beda-abadha vaadha*:' also, the *Aachaaryaa* takes on the philosophy from three angles: (1) *bedha paksha*: - the assumption that *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* are different (2) *abadha paksha*: - the assumption that *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* are non-different / identical and (3) *bedha-abadha paksha*: - *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* are **both** different and identical (similar to the state of Tamil Nadu, being both identical with and different from the country, India – identical with India, because it is included in India ; but, different from India, because it is only a part of India – not the whole of India).

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to prove, that, whatever stand the *eka saasthra vaadhi* takes among the three *pakshaa*-s (the word '*pakshaa*' means 'stand' or 'view point'), *karmaa* cannot contribute to liberation. *Beda pakshe karmaa na moksha saadhanam*, *abadha pakshe karmaa na moksha saadhanam* and *bedha-abadha pakshe api karmaa na moksha saadhanam*. Therefore, *karmaa* cannot be and need not be combined with *jnaanam*, as a means to liberation.

In verse 69, the *Aachaaryaa* introduced the *poorva pakshin* and enquired of him: "Do you believe Brahman is different from *jeevaa* or identical with *jeevaa*?" and said "Either way, you have a problem".

In verse 70, Sureswaraachaaryaa considered the *abadha pakshaa* angle. He reasoned: "According to this view, Brahman and *jeevaa* are identical. But, the common perception is that there are differences between the two; this is because of ignorance; in other words, there is a 'delusion'. Therefore, to attain Brahman, what is required, is only **removal** of this delusion or false notion that *jeeva* is different from Brahman. And, notions can be removed **only** be cognitive knowledge; **never** by any amount or type of *karmaa*". Thus, the *Aachaaryaa* established, that, *abadha pakshe*, *karmaa* cannot help.

Now, in verse 71, the *Aachaaryaa* looks at the issue, from the *beda pakshaa* i.e. the view "Brahman is different from *jeevaa*" and will show, that, in this case also, *karmaa* cannot help.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 71:

अनात्मरूपके तु ब्रह्मणि न कर्म साधनभावं प्रतिपद्यते नापि ज्ञानं कर्मसमुच्चितमसमुच्चितं वा यस्मादन्यस्य स्वत एव साधकस्य ब्रह्मणोऽप्यन्यत्वं स्वत एव सिद्धम् । तत्रैवम् ।

If *Brahman* is other than the Self, neither action, nor knowledge combined with or uncombined with action, can lead to *Brahman's* identity with Self, since the aspirant is inherently other than Brahman. This being so:

This is a very important and significant portion, since, our very approach to the spiritual *saadhanaa* will be clear, only if the fundamentals are grasped.

- **अनात्मरूपके तु ब्रह्मणि** - Even in the event of *Brahman* being different from *jeevaa*,

Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking of '*beda pakshaa*' i.e. *Brahman* as different from the Self, and therefore '*anaathmaa*'. How can you say that *Brahman* is *anaathmaa*? Ans: 'I' am *aathmaa*; and, therefore, **anything** different from 'me', is *anaathmaa*; therefore, **even** *Brahman*, if different from 'me', is only *anaathmaa*.

- **कर्म साधनभावं न प्रतिपद्यते** - *karmaa* cannot assume the role of a *saadhanaa* for liberation.

If *jeevaa's* essential nature is *samsaarithvam*, it can never attain *Brahmabhaavathvam*. An intrinsically finite entity can never attain 'infinite' by any *saadhanaa*. This is what *Sureswaraachaaryaa* avers. He says: "In *beda pakshaa*, not only *karmaa*, but, **no** other *saadhanaa* also can lead to liberation". First, he ruled out *karmaa* as a *saadhanaa*, by his statement "*karma saadhanabhaavam na prathipadyathe*". Then, he proceeds to rule out other *saadhanaa*-s also.

- **न ज्ञानं अपि (साधनभावं प्रतिपद्यते)** - *Jnaanam* also does not (become the means),

When the *jeevaa's* intrinsic nature is *samsaarithvam*, *jnaanam* can, in fact, only confirm the *samsaarithvam*. And, therefore cannot lead to *mokshaa*.

Aachaaryaa divides *jnaanam* into two types: (1) *jnaanam* mixed with *karmaa*. (2) pure *jnaanam*.

- **कर्म समुच्चितं असमुच्चितं वा** - whether it is *jnaanam* combined with *karmaa* or not combined with *karmaa*,

A *samsaari jeevaa* will only be a *samsaari jeevaa* always, if *jeevaa* is **essentially** different from *Brahman*.

- **यस्मात् अन्यस्य साधकस्य स्वत एव** - since the distinction of the aspirant from *Brahman* is 'essential' or 'intrinsic' in nature (as assumed by the *bedha paksha vaadhi*),
- **ब्रह्मणस्य अन्यत्वं अपि स्वत एव सिद्धम्** - and the distinction of *Brahman* from the aspirant is also 'essential' or 'intrinsic' in nature (again, as assumed by the *bedha paksha vaadhi*).

"What cannot be given up" is 'essential' or 'intrinsic' nature. 'Finitude' is 'essential nature' (indicated by the word '*svatha:*') of *jeevaa*. Hence, if *jeevaa* has to be different from *Brahman*, as assumed by the *bedha paksha vaadhj*, *jeevaa* can never attain the 'Infinite' nature or *Brahman*. So, any type or amount of *saadhanaa* cannot help *jeevaa* to become *Brahman*, if *bedha pakshaa* is accepted.

- **तत्र एवम** - This being so (explanation follows in the verse) :

Chapter I: Verse 71 –

अन्यस्यात्मताप्राप्तौ न क्वचित् हेतुसंभवः ।

तस्मिन् सत्यपि नो नष्टः परात्मानं प्रपद्यते ॥ ७१ ॥

There can be no means which could bring about the transformation of one entity into another. If it abides as such, it cannot become even another and if it gets destroyed in the process, then also it cannot be said to have become another.

- **क्वचित् न हेतुसंभवः** - No logical reason is ever possible
- **अन्यस्य (अन्यत्) आत्मता प्राप्तौ** - in the matter of one entity attaining the nature of another entity.

anyasya – of one entity ; (*anyath*) *aathmathaa* – the nature of another entity; *praapthau* – in the matter of attainment.

Logically one cannot become another, if *jeevaa* and *Brahman* are essentially different. That means *mokshaa* is never possible.

Sureswaraachaaryaa first raises another question: "When *jeevaa* becomes *Brahman*, does it retain the *jeeva bhaava* or drop the *jeeva bhaavaa*?" He proceeds: "Let us consider the first possibility, viz., 'the *jeevaa* retains the *jeeva bhaavaa* and becomes *Brahmar*'. On consideration, we realize, that, it is not possible at all, since the finite *jeevaa* cannot become the 'infinite' *Brahman*, **retaining** the finitude. Even if, hypothetically, it does so, such a transformation will be useless for achieving 'liberation', since the *jeevaa* will retain its

samsaarithvam also. Therefore, the first option, viz., 'jeevaa becoming *Brahman*, **retaining** the *jeevathvam*', has to be ruled out".

The second possibility is "jeevaa becoming *Brahman*, dropping the *jeevathvam* status". The *Aachaaryaa* comments: "jeevaa dropping *jeevathvam*' means 'the death of *jeevaad*'. If there is no more *jeevaa*, who becomes *Brahman*?" No *jeevaa* is there to become *Brahman* or claim *Brahmajnaanam*. The second option is also, therefore, not possible.

The conclusion is, that, *jeevaa* cannot become *Brahman*, either by retaining the *jeeva bhaavaa* or giving up *jeeva bhaavaa*, if *jeevaa* and *Brahman* are entirely different i.e. from the *beda pakshaa* angle.

In *Advaitam*, *jeevaa* does not '**become**' *Brahman*. *Jeevaa is Brahman*, attaining ***Brahmabhaavaa***, in the process of *mokshaa*. To repeat for clarity: In *Advaitam* "I' am already and always *Brahman*". If, therefore, an objection is raised "If you are already *Brahman*, why should you attain *Brahman*?", the *Advaitin* will reply " 'I' , *Brahman*, attain ***Brahmabhaavaa***, by **dropping the notion** that I am *jeevaad*".

Adi Sankara, in his *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Bhaashyam*, specifically mentions: "Jeevaa does not really have to become *Brahman*, since it **is** only *Brahman*. Its 'dropping the false notion (viz., that it is *jeevaa* and not *Brahman*), through *jnaanam*' is figuratively called 'becoming' *Brahman*".

तस्मिन् सति - **By retaining jeeva bhaavaa**

नष्टः अपि - **or by even dropping jeeva bhaavaa**

(जीवः) परात्मानं न प्रपद्यते - **jeevaa does not attain Brahman.**

"Therefore, if you say *jeevaa* and *Brahman* are different, working for *mokshaa* is a futile exercise, since *mokshaa* is not at all possible, under this condition (as shown)" implies the *Aachaaryaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 72:

अपरस्मिन् पक्षे विधिः ।

On the other view, the following injunction would be reasonable.

Sureswaraachaaryaa showed that, if *jeevaa* and *Brahman* are different i.e. in *beda pakshaa*, no *saadhanaa* can lead to liberation. On the same topic, he is making a different approach now.

In the *saasthraa-s*, in the *upaasanaa* portion, it is said, that, by the practice of *abedha upaasanaa*, *jeevaa* can become *Brahman*.

Lord Krishna also declares in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (verse 6 – Chapter VIII): “*yam yam vaapi smaran bhaavam thyajyanthe kalevaram tham tham eva ethi kauntheya sadhaa thadhbhaavabhaavitha.*” - “Oh Arjuna! Thinking of whatever object a person gives up the body, at the time of death, that very object he attains, being always steeped in that thought”. *Jadabharathaa*, in the *Bhaagavatha Mahaa Puraanaa*, is a typical example for this belief.

In the *krama mukti vaadhaa*, the *Advaithins* do accept the *jeevaa* ‘attaining’ *Brahman* by *upaasanaa*, which view is supported by *saasthraa-s* also. But, the *Advaithin* does not say that, *upaasanaa* gives liberation or *Brahman* **direct**. He is of the conviction, that, by diligent practice of *upaasanaa*, the *jeevaathmaa* goes to *Brahmalokaa* and there attains the knowledge that, he is already *Brahman*; and, thus drops the notion of not being the *Paramaathmaa*. In other words, *jeevaathmaa* does not have to **become** *Paramaathmaa*. He has to only **realize** that he is already the *Paramaathmaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: “Let us **assume** that *jeevaa* and *Brahman* are now different and *jeevaa* becomes *Brahman*, later, by constant *Upaasanaa* of *Paramaathmaa*, even at the time of death”. This is **only** an assumption and not accepted, by the *Aachaaryaa*, as a fact. But, even in this purely hypothetical case, *jnaana karma samucchayam* will not help, since, what is required is only *abedha dhyaanam*.

Jnaanam and *karmaa* are opposed to each other, since performance of *karmaa* requires *samsaara jeeva bhaava:*, while *jnaana nishtaa* requires *asamsaara brahma bhaava:* | Then how can you combine the two?

Chapter I: Verse 72 –

परमात्मानुकूलेन जानाभ्यासेन दुःखिनः ।

द्वैतिनोऽपि प्रमुच्येरन्न परात्मविरोधिना ॥ ७२ ॥

Even the dualists undergoing suffering, will attain liberation, by continued meditative knowledge of God, in conformity to His nature. (But) they will not gain the result by engaging in anything contrary to the true relation to Him.

- दुःखिनः द्वैतिनः अपि - Even the dualists, who are in *samsaaraa*,
- प्रमुच्येरन् - will attain *mokshaa* (at a future date, through *karma mukthi*)
- जान अभ्यासेन - by *Upaasanaa*,
- परमात्म अनुकूलेन - conducive to the future merger with *Brahman*.

Up to this, in the verse, is the view of the *poorva pakshin* holding "Upaasanaa itself brings *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* together".

Sureswaraachaaryaa hastily adds:

Na paraathma virodhinaa - But, not by saadhanaa-s not conducive to *Paramaathmaaiikyam* .

The essence of the *Aachaaryaa's* comment is: "Even if your statement, namely that 'Upaasanaa will lead to attainment of *Brahman'* is accepted, neither *karmaa* nor *jnaana-karma samucchayam* will help".

The term '*paraathma virodhi*' implies '*karmaa*' and '*jnaana-karma samucchayam*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 73:
इतरस्मिन् पक्षे विधेरेवानवकाशत्वम् । कथम् ।

On the other view, there is no scope whatever, for any injunction. How ?

Sureswaraachaaryaa now goes back to *abedha pakshaa*, to give more objections. In verse 70, he had discussed *abedha pakshaa*, while in verses 71 and 72, he had taken up *beda pakshaa*. Now, in verse 73, he is back to *abedha pakshaa*.

On *abesha pakshaa*, "If *Brahman* and *jeevaa* are identical and non-different, you have to only drop the notion that they are different and therefore, *karmaa* is neither useful nor needed" was the reason given by the *Aachaaryaa*, in verse 70.

In this verse (no. 73), he gives one more reason.

- इतरस्मिन् पक्षे तु - In the other view (i.e. in *abedha pakshaa*),
- विधेः अनवकाशत्वम् एव - there is no scope for presenting any saadhanaa to attain *mokshaa*.
'anavakaasa:' – Absence of room or scope.
- कथम् - How do you say that?

Chapter I: Verse 73 –
समस्तव्यस्तभूतस्य ब्रह्मण्येवावतिष्ठतः ।

ब्रूत कर्मणि को हेतुः सर्वानन्यत्वदर्शिनः ॥ ७३ ॥

What is the ground for any action on the part of one, who is the microcosm of the totality, has perceived the unity of all beings and who abides only in *Brahman*?

Sureswaraacharya points out: "In the *abedha pakshaa*, according to the *eka saasthra vaadhi* (for whom there is no *nirguna Brahman*, *Brahman* is real and the world also is real), there is one *Brahman*, in which everything is included. *Brahman* is *ekam* and Brahman is also *anekam*".

"*Samastha* (total) *vyastha* (individual) *bootha*:" is the technical term used to indicate this.

This *abedha paksha vaadhi* claims: "Once I get *jnaanam*, I know I am *Brahman*, in which everything is included – the whole cosmos, the four *purushaarthaa-s* etc".

The *Aachaaryaa* counters: "After getting this knowledge that 'I am Brahman, in which everything is included', where is the question of doing any *karmaa*? What type of *karmaa* is needed? *Karmaa* has got four *saadhyam-s* (results) - *aaptham*, *uthpaadhanam*, *samskaaryam* and *vikaaryam*. After *abedha paksha jnaanam*, in which everything is included, I do not see any need for any type of *karmaa*, producing any type of result". '

39. Chapter I, Verses 73 to 76 (13-01-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya, in these verses, is dealing with the *eka saasthra vaadhi*— who treats the entire *Veda*, as one *saasthra* and, therefore, says, that every seeker has to follow both *Veda poorvaa* and *Veda anthaa* **simultaneously**. Because of this, the *eka saasthra vaadhi* accepts *jeevaathma-paramaathma-bedham* from the *Veda poorva baaghaa* angle and *jeevaathma-paramaathma-aiykyam* from the *Veda anthaa* angle. Since he considers both these relationships as equally true, he is also called *bedha abedha vaadhi*. Through this *bedha-abedha vaadham*, he preaches *jnaana-karma samucchaya*: |

Sureswaraachaarya is arguing against these views. He refutes the *bedha-abedha-vaadhi*, in three stages – (1) from *bedha paksha*: - where there is a difference between *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathma* (2) from *abedha paksha*: - where there is *aiykyam* between *jeevaathma* and *paramaathma* and (3) from *bedha-abedha paksha*: - where both difference and identity between *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa* are accepted.

He refuted *beda paksha*., in verses 71 and 72, in which he said: "If *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathma* are **essentially** different, then any amount of *karma* cannot change the fact of the difference. *Jeeva* will be essentially a *samsaari* and can never become *paramaathmaa*. Just by going near *paramaathmaa*, *jeeva* cannot not be a *samsaari*."

In the present and the following few verses, the *Achaaryaa* is taking up the *abedha paksha* angle.

In verse 70, he briefly dealt with this view, by saying: "If *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa* are essentially one and the same, then the seeming difference is obviously caused by misconception. And, when misconception is the problem, *karma* cannot be the solution. Only *jnaanam* can remove the misconception and therefore, *jnaanam* alone can be the solution to the problem".

In verse 73, the *Achaaryaa* comes back to *abedha paksha kandanam*. He first points out to the *poorva pakshi*: "If you accept *abedha pakshaa*, every *jnaani* should know that he is one with *paramaathmaa* – the conviction '*aham paramaathma abhinna: asmi*'. But, in your philosophy, *paramaathmaa* is not *nirguna Brahman* – but, the totality of Creation – 'One' from the angle of totality and 'many' from the stand of individuality – *samastha vyastha bhootha*: - enjoying 'Unity in Diversity'".

(The 'unity-in-diversity' view is similar to India being *one* nation, from *total* angle, with *different* states from *individual* angle.)

The *Achaaryaa* proceeds: "Thus, in your philosophy, when the *jnaani* has the conviction that he is abiding in the all-inclusive *Brahman*, (not the *nirguna brahman* of *Advaita*), the fourteen *lokas*, the four *purushaarthaas*, *punyam-paapam* etc. all being in that *Brahman*, the *jnaani* would have realized all the *purushaarthaas* and when all *purushaarthaas* have thus been achieved by him, why should he do any *karma* at all?"

- ब्रह्मणि एव अवतिष्ठतः - For one (the *jnaani*) who abides in *Brahman*,
- समस्तव्यस्तभूतस्य - who is in the form of unity and diversity,
- सर्व अनन्यत्व दर्शिनः - who is of the view that all things are non-different from him, *Ananyathvam – aikyam*.
- कर्मणि को हेतुः - what is the reason (motive) to perform any *karma*?
- ब्रूत - Answer (this question of mine)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 74:

सर्व कर्म निमित्त सम्भव असम्भवाभ्याम् सर्व कर्म सङ्करश्च प्राप्नोति । यस्मात् ।

Further, as there is jointly the possibility as well the impossibility grounds of all action, confusion of actions results. For:

Sureswaraachaarya continues with *abedha paksha kandanam* - negation of the *abedha pakshaa* of the *bedha abedha vaadhi*.

He argues (to the *abedha paksha vaadhi*): "You say that the *jnaani* gets the knowledge '*aham brahma asmi*', the all-inclusive *Brahman*; the fourteen *lokaas*, the entire humanity, all the *varnaas* and all the *aasramaas* are included in this *Brahman*. Your *jnaani* claims that he is *this total Brahman*; therefore, if somebody asks him 'What is your *varna*? What is your *aasramaa*?', how would he reply? What is the specific designation of *samastha Brahman*? I want to know this, since all *vaidhika karmaas* are based on the specific designation of the individual. Rituals are different for different people based on their *Vedas*, *varnaas* and *asramaas*. A *jnaani* also, if he wants to do *karma*, has to identify himself with a particular *varna* and a particular *aasramaa*. Since your *jnaani* identifies with *samastha vyastha Brahman* and, therefore, he identifies with **all** *varnaas* and *aasramaas*, he will have to do all the *karmaas*, prescribed for all human beings of different *varnaas* and *aasramaas*. While this is physically impossible, this will also result in *karma sankara dosha*: - a mix-up of all *karmaas*. Alternately, since your *jnaani* cannot specify any particular designation ("all designations" would only mean "no specific designation") he has to abandon all *karmaas*. Therefore, in *abedha pakshaa*, *karma* is not possible; *jnaana-karma samucchayam* is also not possible".

- सर्व कर्म निमित्त सम्भव असम्भवाभ्याम् - Since conditions for all *vaidhika karmaas* will either be there or not there at all,

Sarva karma nimittha - Conditions for all *vaidhika karmaas*; *Sambhava*- will result (from one angle – when the *jnaani* has all *varnaas* and *aasramaas*); *Asambhava* - will not be there (from another angle – when the *jnaani* has no *varnaa* or *aasramaa*)

- सर्व कर्म सङ्करः च प्राप्नोति - Mix-up of all karmaa will result .
- (सर्व कर्म अभावः प्राप्नोति - No karma will be possible.) This remark is “supplied”.
- यस्मात् - I will explain this (in the following verse)

Chapter I: Verse 74 –

सर्वजात्यादिमत्वे अस्य नितरां हेतु असम्भवः।

विशेषं हि अनुपादाय कर्म नैव प्रवर्तते ॥ ७४ ॥

If one sees himself as belonging to all castes etc., there is no ground for action. Unless one specifically identifies oneself with one particular caste and station, no action can be initiated.

In this verse, Sureswaraachaarya explains the second objection, viz. “when there is no specific *varnam* or *aasramam*, the individual (the *eka saasthra vaadha jnaani*) cannot perform any *karma*”. “*Sarvakarma abhaava*.” situation is explained.

- अस्य - For this *jnaani* (whose conviction is “*aham samastha vyastha roopa Brahman*” – **not** *nirguna Brahman*)
- सर्व जात्यादिमत्वे - possessing all the *varnaas* (not only the main four *varnaas* – but also the intermediary *varnaas*, resulting from inter-*varna* marriages) नितरां हेतु असम्भवः (भवति) - there is really no specific designation.
- Nitharaam - really / totally; hethu – designation (in this context)
- विशेषं हि अनुपादाय - Since the *jnaani* cannot have any specific designation (*varna* and *aasrama*)

Visesham – specific / particular (“designation” is implied); *anupaadaaya* – not identifying with.

- कर्म न प्रवर्तते – Karma is not possible.

It is because of this reason, the “inter-caste weddings” pose a problem, with regard to the wedding rituals. Any *vaidhika karma* requires the qualifying *varna*, and a proper marriage (*vaidhika*) ritual would require the participating couple to be of the same *varna*, for the ritual to be effective.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 75:

स्यात् विधिः अध्यात्म अभिमानात् इति चेत न एवम् । यस्मात् ।

If it is said that action is possible as the agent identifies himself, with one particular body etc., we deny that possibility. The reason is as follows:

The *bedha abedha vaadhi* may suggest a solution: "Why not the *jnaani* go by the designation of his physical body i.e. by the *varna*, in which he was born?"

- अध्यात्म अभिमानात् - "Based on identification with his own specific physical body (the *varna* in which he was born),
- विधिः स्यात् - the Rules (*vaidhika karma vidhi*) can apply"
- इति चेत् - If it is thus claimed,
- न एवम् - it is not possible.
- यस्मात् - The reason is as follows:

Chapter I: Verse 75 –

न च अध्यात्म अभिमानः अपि विदुषः अस्ति आसुरत्वतः ।
विदुषः अपि आसुरः चेत् अस्य निष्फलं ब्रह्मदर्शनम् ॥ ७५ ॥

Since such identification with the body is demonic in nature, an enlightened man cannot have it. If an enlightened man also can be demonic, the vision of *Brahman* would be futile.

Why cannot the *jnaani* perform *vaidhika karmaas*, based on his physical body (*varna* decided by the birth of the body)? Ans: The very idea is jarring (discordant), since a *jnaani* does not have *deha abhimaanaa*; in other words, *jnaanam* and *ahankaaraa* cannot co-exist in an individual.

This objection may be countered by the claim that *jnaanam* can be from *paaramaarthika dhrushti* and *ahankaaraa* can be from *vyaavahaarika dhrushti*. And, in support of this claim, Verse 8 of Chapter V – Bhagavadh Githa may be quoted : "*Naiva kinchith karomi ithi yuktha: manyetha thathvavith / pasyan srnvan sprusan jigran asnan gacchan svapan svasan*" – "Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining and breathing, the disciplined knower of Truth understands 'I do not do anything at all'".

But, this argument cannot be presented by the *eka saasthra vaadhi*, since, **he** does not recognise the distinction of *paaramaarthika* and *vyaavahaarika dhrushtis*. Only the *Advaitin* has the *bedha* of *paaramaarthika* and *vyaavahaarika* stages. For the *eka saasthra vaadhi*, *ahankaaraa* and *aathmaa* are equally real; there are no different orders of reality.

While for the *Advaitin*, *Brahman* is *paaramaarthikaa*, *jagrath avasthaa* (waking state) is *vyaavahaarika* and *svapna avasthaa* (dream state) is *praathibhaasikaa*, for the *dvaitin* and the *visishta advaitin*, the three stages - *paaramaarthika*, *vyaavahaarika* and

praathibhaasika are all equally real and so are *Brahman*, *jagrath avasthaa* and *svapna avasthaa*.

The *eka saasthra vaadhi*, therefore, cannot defend himself, by resorting to the distinction between *paaramaarthika dhrushti* and *vyaavahaarika dhrushti*.

- **विदुषः** - For a wise person,
- **अध्यात्म अभिमानः अपि** - physical identification also
- **न अस्ति** - is impossible,
- **आसुरत्वतः** - since such identification is a result of *ajnaanam*.

Ahankaaraa is born out of ignorance. A *jnaani* cannot have ignorance and, therefore, he cannot have *ahankaaraa*. How, then, can he have a *varna* or an *asramaa*? Without these qualifications, how, then, can he resort to *karma*? Where, then, is the possibility of *jnaana-karma samucchayam*?

If it is argued that a *jnaani* has *ahankaaraa* also i.e. *jnaanam* and *ajnaanam* co-exist, for the purpose of *jnaana-karma samucchayam*, what is the result of this view?

- **विदुषः आसुरः अपि चेत्** - If it is claimed that the wise person has *ajnaana janya ahankaaraa* also,
- **ब्रह्मदर्शनम् निष्फलं स्यात्** - then, the *jnaanam* becomes useless.

Jnaanam is meant for *ajnaana nivritthi*. If they are to co-exist, then why should one strive for *jnaanam* at all?

The word "*aasura moham*" was explained under verse 70, as "delusion natural to materialistic persons". "*Aasura:*" and "*aasurathvatha:*", in this verse 75, refer to the individual who is materialistic and is, therefore, an *ajnaani*, with *ahankaaraa* domination.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 76:

अज्ञान कार्यत्वात् न समकालं न अपि क्रमेण जान कर्मणोः वस्तु अवस्तु तन्त्रत्वात् सङ्गतिः अस्ति इत्येवम् निराकृतः अपि काशं कुशं वा अवलम्ब्याह ।

As action is the effect of ignorance, knowledge depending on reality and action not so depending on reality, cannot be combined either at the same time or in succession. Though this position has been already refuted, it presents itself as if catching at straws:

Sureswaraachaarya says: "I have shown that a *jnaani* cannot have *ajnaanam* and, therefore, he cannot have *ahankaaraa*, *deha abhimaanaa*, *varna asrama* designations, *vaidhika karma*

and *jnaana karma samucchayam*. *Karma* cannot join *jnaanam* either simultaneously or **after** *jnaanam*- *jnaana kaale vaa jnaana anthare vaa*".

Jnaana kaale - simultaneous with *jnaanam*. *Karma* is not possible, simultaneous with *jnaanam*, since identification with the body (a prerequisite for *karma*) and withdrawal from the identification (a result of *jnaanam*) cannot be simultaneous.

Jnaana anthare - After *jnaana janyam*. *Karma* is not possible, **after** *jnaana janyam* also, since, when ignorance is gone, how can there be *deha abhimaanaa* (a prerequisite for *karma*)?

- अज्ञान कार्यत्वात् - Since *karma* is a product of ignorance,
- समकालं - simultaneously
- क्रमेण अपि - or sequentially (**after** *jnaanam*)
- जानकर्मणोः सङ्गतिः - the combination between *jnaanam* and *karma*,
- न (भवति) - (is) not possible.

Sangathi: - (in this context) means *samucchaya*: - elsewhere, it means a "link".

The use of "*kramena*" has to be interpreted carefully. In *Advaita*, *karma* **preceding** *jnaanam* is accepted; in fact, considered essential, for acquisition of *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, after achieving which, the seeker drops *karma* and proceeds through *jnaana yoga*. **This** sequence is possible. What is considered impossible (by the *Advaitin*) is *jnaana anthara karma* – *karma* **following** *jnaanam*.

Sureswaraachaarya, then, takes up another important technical point. He refers to another difference between *jnaanam* and *karma*.

He describes *jnaanam* as *vasthuthanthram* - over which one has no choice; in other words *jnaanam* is not will-based.

Karma is described by the *Achaaryaa* as *avasthuthanthram* – what can be chosen; in other words, "what depends on will".

For a clear understanding, the example of attending a *Vedhaantha* class is cited. While the student can exercise his will

- (1) in choosing to attend or not to attend the class,
- (2) on the mode of traveling to the class,
- (3) on his posture, while sitting in the class,

(4) on the control of his mind, in paying attention to the teachings etc., he has no choice on the message he receives. He has choice only over his actions – but, not on the knowledge he receives.

“Thus *jnaanam* and *karma* are two essentially different processes and therefore, they cannot be combined” is the *Achaaryaa's* argument, in this portion.

40. Chapter I, Verses 76 to 78 (20-01-2007)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *bedha-abadha vaadha*: In this philosophy, the *Brahman* is looked upon as *samastha vyastha bhootham*, existing in the form of "One Total" and existing in the form of "Plurality" (as individuals, beings and things) also - "Unity in Diversity". In the view of these *poorva pakshis*, "Unity" is *sathyam* and "Diversity" is also *sathyam*.

Advaitam also talks of "unity in diversity". The difference is, that, in *Advaitam*, "unity" is *sathyam* and "diversity" is *mithyaa*. Since, to a *bedha-abadha-vaadhi*, both unity and diversity are equally *sathyam* and therefore, *Brahman* is *samastha vyastha bhootham*, the question arises: "What is the relationship of the *jeevaathmaa*, with such a *brahman*? Is the *jeevaathmaa* different from the *samastha-vyastha-bhootha Brahman* or identical with the *samastha-vyastha-bhootha Brahman*?". The *poorva pakshi* responds: "It is neither pure *bedha* nor pure *abadha* – but, *bedhaabadha* – Difference in Non-difference".

Sureswaraachaarya is refuting this philosophy. He does this, in three stages –from *bedha paksha* view, from *abadha paksha* view and from *bedaabadha pakshaa* view.

In verse 70, he started with refutation of *abadha pakshaa*; in verses 71 and 72, he refuted the *bedha pakshaa* and came back to *abadha pakshaa*, in verse 73; *abadha paksha niraasa*: (refutation of *abadha pakshaa*) goes on upto verse 77.

In the *abadha pakshaa* viewpoint, 'I', (the *jeevaathmaa*), claim one-ness with *samastha-vyastha-brahman*.

The *Achaaryaa* says: "Once I claim one-ness with the *samastha-vyastha Brahman*, it would mean that I have **all** *varnaas* and **all** *aasramaas*, identified with me. I cannot claim to be of any **one particular** *varna* or any **one particular** *aasramaa*. As long as I identify with my individual body, I can claim to belong to a particular *varna* and to a particular *aasramaa*. But, once I identify with the *samastha-vyastha-bhootha Brahman*, I assume all *varnaas* and all *aasramaas*. This results in a tricky situation: either I will have to do **all** *karmaas* or I am not qualified to do any *karma*, since being a *samastha-vyastha-brahman*, I cannot lay claim to any particular *varna* or *aasramaa*, whereas, for any *vaidhika karma*, the appropriate *varna* and *aasramaa* are pre-requisites. **Before** I achieved the *jnaanam* "*aham brahma asmi*", I had a particular designation – *varna* and *asramaa* - and the *karmaas* specified for that particular designation were possible; but, at this stage, *jnaanam* was absent. **After** acquiring *jnaanam*, (*jnaana anthare*), because of the loss of specific designations, no *karma* is possible. In effect, *karma* – either **along with** knowledge (*samakaalam*) or **after** acquiring knowledge (*kramena*) - is not possible."

Sureswaraacharya adds a brief, but, important note. "*Jnaanam* and *karma* have essentially different nature. *Karma* depends on human will. *Jnaanam*, on the other hand, does not depend on human will". The *Aacharya* uses the terms *vasthu thanthraa* (will-based) for *karma* and *avasthu thanthraa* (non-will-based) for *jnaanam*. Adi Sankara discusses this topic in his *Brahma Sootra Baashyam* (1.1.4) and in his *prakarana*, "*Sarva Vedhaantha Saara Sangraha*:".

- वस्तु अवस्तु तन्त्रत्वात् - since one (*karma*) is dependent on human will and the other (*jnaanam*) is not dependent on human will,
- जान कर्मणोः सतिः न अस्ति - combination of *jnaanam* and *karma* cannot be done.

"*Varna aasrama* designation is a pre-requisite for *karma*" is the *Achaaryaa's* stand. The *poorva pakshi* may raise an objection, in desperation, realizing that he was losing in the debate.

- इति एवम् निराकृतः अपि - Though the refutation has thus been made,
- काशं कुशं वा अवलम्ब्याह - the *poorva pakshi* may hold on to some idea or other, similar to a drowning man clutching to dry grass.

Chapter I: Verse 76 –

अथ अध्यात्मं पुनः यायात् आश्रितः मूढतां भवेत् ।

सः करोति एव कर्माणि कः हि अजं विनिवारयेत् ॥ ७६ ॥

If, by some chance, the enlightened one identifies himself with the body, he is lapsing into stupidity. He certainly performs actions. Who can prevent a fool?

What is the flimsy explanation given by the *bedha- abedha vaadhi*? He may argue: "Let us assume, that, after gaining the knowledge '*aham brahma asmi*', why should not the *jnaani* come back to his *deha abhimaanam* and his original *varnaa* and *aasramaa*, to claim a particular designation for performance of the related *vaidhika karma*?"

- अथः "Thereafter (i.e. after acquiring *jnaanam*)
- अध्यात्मं – *vyashti sareeram* / *varna aasrama abhimaanam*
- पुनः यायात् - again comes back".

If such an argument is given, what happens? The *Aacharya* is quick to point out: "such a situation only means, that the *jnaani* has come back to 'ignorance'"

- मूढतां आश्रितः भवेत् - He has come back to *ajnaanam*.

"*Deha abhimaanaam*" indicates that "*aham brahma asmī*" is only lip-service.

- सः कर्मणि करोति एव - Such a person, necessarily, will take up *karmaas*.

This is a hypothetical situation; once *jnaanam* is really attained, there is no getting back. The *Achaaryaa* is discussing only a hypothetical situation.

- कः हि अजं विनिवारयेत् - Who can stop such a person from becoming an *ajnaani* (and performing *karmaas* again)?

Karma abhimaanam will come back with deha abhimaanam.

"Therefore, how can this mean *jnaana-karma samucchayam*?" asks the *Achaaryaa* "once the *jnaani* comes back to *deha abimanaa*, *jnaanam* is gone; only *karma* is there. How, then, can there be *jnaana-karma samucchayam*? *Jnaanam* and *karma* are mutually exclusive".

Jnaana kaale varna aasrama: na asthi, karma na bhavathy (At the time of *jnaanam*, varna and aasrama are gone; so, there can be no karma) | Karma kaalee varna aasrama bhaadha: na asthi, jnaanam na bhavathy (If and when karma is undertaken, non-identification with varna and aasrama is not possible and therefore, *ajnaanam* returns) |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 77:

सिद्धत्वात् च न साध्यम् । यतः ।

The ideal is already accomplished and it is not something to be attained afresh. This is so, because:

Sureswaraachaarya gives another argument, in the context of *abedha paksha*: - "When the knowledge 'I am *samastha vyastha bootha Brahman asmī* is achieved, *karma* is not possible, from another angle also. When I claim that I am 'one' with *Brahman*, I am 'one' with all human beings ; I am 'one' with all *vaidhikaas*; I am 'one' with all the people, with all the *varnaas* and *aasramaas*; I am 'one' with all the *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* performed by the different people of different *varnaas* and *assramaas*, to different injunctions. *Samastha vyastha bootha Brahman* includes the *karmaas* also; in other words, *karmaas* are *svaroopam* of the *samastha vyastha bootha Brahman* of the *bedha-abadha-vaadhi*. (In *advaitam*, *Brahman* is *nirgunam*.) And, therefore, *karmaas* become *svaroopam* of the *bedha-abadha-vaadha jnaani* also, once he identifies with the *samastha vyastha bhootha Brahman*. What is '*svaroopam*' need not be accomplished by effort, since, "*svaroopam*", by definition, is "natural", i.e. what is "effortlessly present". *Karmaas*, therefore, need not be undertaken, after *jnaanam*".

The *Achaaryaa* gives an example for *svaroopam* of a living person- "breathing". The *bedha-abadha-jnaani* has *karma* as his *svaroopam* and hence, he need not take efforts to perform *karma*. Therefore, *jnaana-karma-samucchayam* is not possible.

Karmana svaroopena siddhathvaath saadhanam na bhavathi | For an *ajnaani*, *karma* is a *saadhana*; for a *jnaani*, *karma* is *svaroopam*.

- सिद्धत्वात् - Since all *karmaas* have been accomplished by the *jnaani*, as his very *svaroopam*,
- न साध्यम् – *karma* need not be accomplished, through effort.
- यतः - The cause:

"Therefore, you cannot present *jnaana-karma-samucchaya*: as a *saadhana*, just as I cannot present 'breathing' as a *saadhanaa*." – the *Achaaryaa* says in the following verse.

Chapter I: Verse 77 –

सामान्य इतर रूपाभ्यां कर्म आत्म एव अस्य योगिनः ।

निश्वास उच्छ्वासवत् तस्मात् न नियोगम् अपेक्षते ॥ ७७ ॥

In the *yogin*, action must be his very Self as universal or particular. It must be so independent of his effort, like respiration. Such being the case, it would need no injunction to that effect.

- कर्म अस्य योगिनः आत्म एव (भवति)- For this *jnaani* (of the *bedha-abadha-vaadhaa*), *karma* must be his very self.

This *yogi*, since he is the all-inclusive *Brahman*, includes everything in himself, including *karma*. For him "*aham*" includes "*karma*" also.

"*Aathma*", in this context, means "*svaroopam*".

Every object can be viewed from two perspectives – (1) general –*saamaanya dhrushti* and (2) particular – *visesha dhrushti*. For example, from *saamaanya dhrushti*, an individual is just a human being; but, from *visesha dhrushti* the same human being becomes an individual **with** a particular *varna*, *aasramaa*, gender etc. *Vaidhika karmaas* also can be viewed in these two perspectives: from *saamaanya dhrushti*, as just *vaidhika karmaas*; And , from *visesha dhrushti*, (1) as specific rituals following specific injunctions, belonging to a particular *Veda*, *gothra* etc., (2)as rituals prescribed for people of different *varnaas*, *aasramaas* etc., (3) as *praathas sandhyaa*, *saayam sandhyaa*, *agni hothram* etc. But, irrespective of the *dhrushti*, whether general or particular, all *karmaas* become the "nature" of the *samastha-vyastha-bhootha-brahma-jnaani*.

- सामान्य इतर रूपाभ्यां - in general or other (implying 'specific') nature.

All *karmaas* become the very nature of the *jnaani*. Like what?

- निश्वास उच्छ्वासवत् - similar to inhalation and exhalation.
- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- नियोगम् - prescription of *karma* / injunctions with regard to *karma*
- न अपेक्षते - is not required (for a *jnaani*).

Since *karma* cannot be prescribed, *jnaana-karma-samucchayam* is not possible.

With verse 77, *abedha paksha niraasa:* is over; the refutation was covered in verse 70 and later from verses 73 to 77 (totally six verses). *Bedha paksha niraasa:* was done in the two verses 71 and 72. The *beda paksha:* and the *abeda paksha:* should be looked upon as constituents or components of *bedha-abedha paksha:* /

Hereafter, Sureswaraachaarya negates the combination, *bedha-abedha paksha:* , as a mixture.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 78:

अस्तु तर्हि भिन्न अभिन्न आत्मकम् ब्रह्म । तथा च सति जान कर्मणी सम्भवतः भेद अभेद विषयत्वात् तयोः ।

Then, let *Brahman* be looked upon, as being both one and diversified. In that case, knowledge and action can very well be combined for they involve unity and diversity respectively.

This part of this *sambhandha gadhyam* is the *poorva pakshi's* suggestion. He says: "If I take only the *beda pakshaa* stand, where *Brahman* and *jeeva* can differ, I have the advantage of remaining in *karma kaandaa* and of doing *karma*, but, of course, the *advaita jnaanam* goes away. If I take only the *abedha paksha* stand, then the reverse happens – *jnaanam* remains, but, *karma* goes away. Then, why should I not hold on to both *jnaana kaandaa* and *karma kaandaa* together, so that I can have both *jnaanam* and *karma*? Individually, the two pakshaas – *bedha* and *abedha* – may be refuted by you (the *advaitin*). But, if I hold them together, how can you refute?"

- तर्हि - In that case (i.e. since *bedha paksha* and *abedha paksha* are refuted),
- ब्रह्म भिन्न अभिन्नात्मकं अस्तु - let Brahman be different **and** non-different from jeeva.

Bhinna (athmakam) – different from jeeva; abhinnaathmakam – identical with jeeva.

The *poorva pakshi* is anxious to maintain the validity of the *Veda Poorva* and *Veda antha* **simultaneously**. This is a tight proposition, which, many philosophers have been trying to reconcile. The *Veda Poorva Baaghaas* say "you are *Isvara Daasaa*"; the *Veda Anatha Baaghaas*, on the other hand say "you are *Isvara*". The philosophies of *dvaita*, *visishta advaita*, *advaita* etc., have all been trying to solve this problem. Validating the *Veda poorva* and *Veda antha* simultaneously is difficult. "Should I take to the *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* triad format or the *aathma-anaathmaka* binary format?" is a question disturbing every seeker.

- तथा च सति - If you judiciously combine both,
- जान कर्मणी सम्भवतः - you can practice both *jnaana* and *karma* simultaneously.

Jnaana karmani – the pair of jnaana and karma; sambhavatha: - is possible.

But, how? According to the *poorva pakshi*,

- तयोः भेद अभेद विषयत्वात् - since they are bedha vishayam and abedha vishayam / since they involve unity and diversity.

The *Aachaaryaa* responds.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 77:

तत्र तावत् अयम् पक्षः एव न सम्भवति । किम् कारणम् । न हि भिन्नः अयम् इति अभेदबुद्धिं अनिराकृत्य भेदबुद्धिः पदार्थम् आलिङ्गते ।

In the first place, this theory itself is untenable. What is the reason? Nothing can be conceived as 'different' without denying the conception that it is 'non-different'.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "It is very nice to be all – accommodating. No doubt *veda* is *pramaanam*, given out by God Himself – both the *Veda Poorva* and the *Veda antha*. *Veda poorva* talks of *jeeva-Isvara bedham*, while, *Veda antha* talks of *jeeva-Isvara aikyam*. But, unfortunately, you cannot combine *bedha* and *abedha*, since it is logically untenable, though *Veda* talks of both of them."

Vedas are to be respected; but, in the process, logic should not be given up. *Vedhantha* does not accept blind belief. While interpreting *Veda*, care should be taken to make sure that the interpretation does not go against logic. This approach is healthy *sraddha*. "Giving respect to *Veda*, at the cost of logic" is one extreme stand and "holding on to logic, disregarding *Veda*" (the *naasthika vaadham*) is another extreme stand.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "Hold on to both *sruthi* and *yukthi*, as *pramaanam*. Your interpretations should not contradict each other. *Bedha abedha vaadhaa* is contrary to logic. Opposite attributes cannot co-exist in one place. *Jeeva* can be **either** identical with **or** different from *Brahman*; but, cannot be **both** identical and different. *Karma kaandaa* and *jnaana kaandaa* cannot co-exist; therefore, *jnaana-karma samucchayam* is not possible."

An interesting issue, though not discussed here, in Naishkarmya Siddhi, is relevant: "If *bedha* and *abedha* cannot co-exist, if *jnaana kaandaa* and *karma kaandaa* cannot co-exist, if *jnaanam* and *karma* cannot co-exist, how is it, that, in the Bhagavadh Githa, Lord Krishna advises the *jnaani* to continue with *karma*? (Sloka 25 – Chapter III – "*sakthaa: karmani avidhvaamsa: yathaa kurvanthi bhaaratha. kuryaath vidvaan thathaa asaktha: chikeershu: lokasangraham*" – "Oh Arjuna! Just as ignorant people act with attachment to action, a wise man also should act, without attachment, with a desire to maintain the harmony of the society")".

The answer to this doubt: "Opposites cannot normally co-exist; but, they can co-exist under a rare condition, *when they are of different orders of reality* – *sathyam* and *mithyaa*, like the dry sand and mirage water, where the sand is *sathyam* and the mirage *mithyaa*. *Advaitam* looks upon *abedha* as *sathyam* and *bedha* as *mithyaa*. Under that condition, they can co-exist".

But the *beda-abedha-vaadhi* claims that both *bedha* and *abedha* are equally *sathyam*. Hence, the problem.

41. Chapter I, Verses 78 to 80 (27-01-2007)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 78:

अस्तु तर्हि भिन्न अभिन्नात्मकं ब्रह्म । तथा च सति जानकर्मणी सम्भवतः भेद अभेद विषयत्वात् तयोः । तत्र तावत् अयम् पक्षः एव न सम्भवति । किं कारणम् । न हि भिन्नः अयम् इति अभेद बुद्धिम् अनिराकृत्य भेद बुद्धिः पदार्थम् आलिङ्गते । एवम् हि अनुभ्युपगमे भिन्न अभिन्न पदार्थयोः अलौकिकत्वं प्रसज्येत । अथ निष्प्रमाणकमप्याश्रीयते तदपि उभयपक्ष अभ्युपगमात् अभेदपक्षे दुःखि ब्रह्म स्यात् अत आह ।

Then, let *Brahman* be looked upon as being both one and diversified. In that case, knowledge and action can very well be combined for they involve unity and diversity respectively. In the first place, this theory itself is untenable. What is the reason? Nothing can be conceived as 'different' without denying the conception that it is 'non-different'. If this principle is not admitted, the significance of terms 'different' and 'non-different' must be construed in some extraordinary sense. If even this consequence that they are to be conceived in a sense not supported by proper grounds, is accepted, the fact, that, both unity and diversity are affirmed, would imply by virtue of the unity (between *jeeva* and *Brahman*) that *Brahman* itself would be subject to misery. Therefore, it is said:

As a part of the refutation of *jnaana-karma samucchaya vaadham*, Sureswaraachaarya is analyzing that particular type of philosophy, known as *bedha-abadha vaadhaa*. Therein, he first talked about the logical problems if *bedha vaadhaa* is accepted; thereafter, he discussed the logical problems in accepting *abadha vaadhaa*. Now, in this portion, the *Achaaryaa* is talking about the problems that will result, if *bedhaabadha vaadha* (the combination of *bedha* and *abadha*) is accepted. He is refuting the *bedhaabadha* combination theory.

The first two sentences in this *sambhandha gadhyam* ("*Asthu tharhi bhinna abhinnaathmakam brahma | Thathaa cha sathi jnaana karmanee sambhavatha: bedha abadha vishyathvaath thayo:*" - "Then, let *Brahman* be looked upon as being both one and diversified. In that case, knowledge and action can very well be combined, for they involve unity and diversity respectively") present the *poorva pakshi's matha* (view point). Thereafter, follows the refutation of the viewpoint, by Sureswaraachaarya.

This *poorva pakshi (bedhaabadha vaadhi)* gives equal importance to *Veda Poorvaa* and *Veda Anathaa*, giving the reason that they are both given by the Lord and therefore, equally *pramaanam*. He says: "Both *Veda Poorvaa* and *Veda anthaa* should be treated on equal footing. Both *karma kaandaa* and *jnaana kaandaa* are to be equally accepted. In *karma kaandaa*, *jeevaathma-paramaathma bedham* is clearly mentioned; *karmaas* are prescribed, based on the *jeeva – Isvara bedham* only. Therefore, we have to accept the *bedham* and

also the *karma saadhanaa*. Equally, we should accept the *jnaana kaandam* also, where, of course, *jeeva-Isvara aikyam* is talked about. We have to, therefore, accept *jeeva-Isvara aikyam* and the *jnaana saadhanaa* also".

"Accepting both equally", the *bedhaabedha vaadhi* continues: "we practice a composite system, wherein *bedha* and *abedha* are both accepted; *karma saadhanaa* and *jnaana saadhanaa* are both accepted. Therefore, lifelong *karma* should be performed – *samucchayaa* should be practiced. After death, *mokshaa* is attained, by this."

Jeevan mukthi is not accepted by this *poorva pakshi*.

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this view.

- तत्र तावत् अयम् पक्षः एव न सम्भवति - This view itself is not acceptable / not tenable.
- किं कारणम् - What is the reason (for not accepting this theory)?
- भिन्नः अयम् इति बेद बुद्धिः- This concept of 'difference'(i.e. *jeevathmaa* is different from *paramaathmaa*),

If I want to perceive myself as different from *paramaathmaa*, such perception is *beda buddhi*: ("*Buddhi*:", in this context, does not mean "intellect"; it means "cognition / understanding".) This perception has to displace another perception. What is the perception to be displaced?

- अभेद बुद्धिं अनिराकृत्य -without setting aside (rejecting) the 'non- different' concept,

"*Abedha buddhi*:"is the conviction "I am identical with *paramaathmaa*".

- पदार्थम् हि न आलिङ्गते - cannot certainly be entertained.

The literal meaning of "*Aalingathe*" is "embraced"; in this context, it means "entertained/maintained".

In *Advaita* philosophy, it is possible to be a *bakthaa* and *Baghavaan* simultaneously; from *vyaavahaarika drushti* – a *baktha* and from the *paaramaarthika dhrushti* – *Bhagavaan Himself*. "*Bedha*" is accepted by the *Advaitin*, in the *vyaavahaarika* plane and "*abedha*" is realized by him, in the *paaramaarthika* plane. The opposites- *bedha* and *abedha* - can co-exist, if they are in different orders of reality. The *poorva pakshi*, on the other hand, does not even recognize two orders of reality – for him, both *bedha* and *abedha* are equally *sathyam*, because of which, Sureswaraachaarya points out: "*abedha buddhim aniraakruthya bedha buddhi: padhaartham na aalingathe*" – "without negating the concept of 'non-difference', the perception of 'difference' cannot be maintained".

“You have to accept only one of the two. You cannot say that both *bedha* and *abedha* are equally acceptable. ‘That their co-existence is a logical contradiction and only an imagination’ should be accepted by you” the *Achaaryaa* tells the *poorva pakshi*.

If the *poorva pakshi* does not accept this, what is the consequence?

- **एवम् अनभ्युपगमे** - If this logical contradiction is ignored (by the *poorva pakshin*),

“Then, you have to consider the *bedha-abedha* combination as an abnormal / mysterious theory” contends the *Achaaryaa*.

- **भिन्न अभिन्न पदार्थयाः** - the meanings of the terms ‘different’ and ‘non- different’
- **अलौकिकत्वं प्रसज्येत** - will have to be construed in some extraordinary sense.

Alaukikathvam - Extraordinary (“do not ask questions; accept even if it is *sarva pramaana viruddha*: - against all evidence”). *Prasajyetha* - will have to be construed.

Later, the *Achaarya* uses the word *nishpramaanakam* , to describe this stand .

The *poorva pakshi* may reply to the *Advaitin*: “**Your** *maayaa* is *anirvachaneeyam* – indescribable. Then, why should not **our** *bedha-abedha* concept be extraordinary?”.

- **अथ निष्प्रमाणकं अपि** - Though the concept of *bedha-abedha* is against all
- *pramaanams*, such as *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa* and *saasthraa*,
- **आश्रीयते तदपि** - if you are going to follow this,
- **उभय पक्ष अभ्युगमात्** - because you are accepting both *bedha* and *abedha*,
- **अभेद पक्षे** - by virtue of the unity (between *jeeva* and *Brahman*)
- **ब्रह्म दुःखि स्यात्-** *Brahman (Isvara)* will become a miserable *samsaari*.

If only *bedha pakshaa* (*jeeva* and *Isvara* are different) is accepted, *jeeva* is *samsaari* and *Isvara* is not; which is conceivable. But, in *abedha pakshaa*, the *jeeva* and *Isvara* being the same, *Isvara* will become a *samsaari*, associated with *jeeva's samsaaraa*. Later, Sureswaraacharya adds: “Not only does *Isvara* become a *samsaari* - He becomes a great *samsaari*, since He is associated with all the *jeevaas* and will be associated with the *samsaaraa* of every *jeeva*. *Sarva jeeva dhu:kam* (not only of the humans – but, of all the beings) will be *Isvara's*, in *abedha paksha*. *Isvara* will be a *mahaa-samsari*, though He is *sarvagnya*: (omniscient) and *sarva sakthimaan* (omni-potent). Therefore, *beda-abedha paksha*: is a ridiculous / absurd proposition”.

अत आह - Hence, I say:

Chapter I: Verse 78 –

भिन्न अभिन्नं विशेषः चेत् दुःखि स्यात् ब्रह्म ते ध्रुवम् ।

असेष दुःखिता च स्यात् अहो प्रजात्मवादिनाम् ॥ ७८ ॥

Your *Brahman* should be surely subject to misery if *Brahman* is both identical with and different from the individuals. What is more, all the misery should affect *Brahman* itself. This is indeed wonderful wisdom, on your part.

Sureswaraachaarya condenses the same statements, in the verse.

ब्रह्म विशेषः भिन्न अभिन्नम् चेत् - If Brahman is different and identical with jeevaas,

Visesha: - *jeeva*, in this context.

- ते (ब्रह्म) - Your Brahman
- दुःखि स्यात् - will be subject to misery,
- ध्रुवम् - surely / certainly.

This problem is pointed out to the *Visishtaadvaitins* also: "If all *jeevaas* become part of *Isvara* / the *sareeram* of *Isvara*, then, *Isvara* will have to suffer the sorrows of all *jeevaas*. *Isvara* will become a *samashti samsaari*".

In *Advaita*, *Isvara* will never be afflicted by sorrow, since sorrow is *mithyaa* and hence can be transcended. Only if *mithyaa* is not accepted, problems arise. While *brahma sathyam* is accepted by every philosopher, *jagan mithyaa* is a unique concept of *Advaitam*, which concept resolves many logical problems.

- अशेष दुःखिता च स्यात्:- It (your *Brahman*) has to share the sorrows of all living beings (not only humans).

The *Visishtaadvaitin* may reply: "*Dhuh:kam* will **not** belong to *Bhagavaan*. Only positive attributes and *sukham* will belong to Him". In that case, the problem will be that *Bhagavaan* will be limited. He will not be *anantha*: - but *sa antha*: / Certain things will be outside *Bhagavaan*; He will not reach areas where sorrows are there. In effect, you will

have problems whether you exclude or include sorrows in *Bhagavaan*, (if sorrows are not looked upon as *mithyaa*).

The only solution is to superimpose sorrow in *Bhagavaan*. Then, sorrow will be 'in' *Bhagavaan* - but, not affect *Bhagavaan*. This is the result of the *Advaitin's* view.

**अहो प्रजात्मवादिनाम् - Wonderful indeed is the wisdom of the bedha- abedha vaadhi!
(a sarcastic comment by the Achaaryaa.)**

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 79:

तस्मात् सम्यक् एव अभिहितं न जानकर्मणोः समुच्चयः इति उपसंहियते ।

Therefore, it is being concluded that the contention that knowledge and action cannot be combined is perfectly sound:

- तस्मात् - Therefore (i.e. because of the reasons given – from Verse 54, where *samucchaya vaadha kandanam* started),
- सम्यक् एव अभिहितम् - the proposition I gave is perfectly sound and proper. What proposition?
- जान कर्मणोः समुच्चयः न (सम्भवति) - Combination of *jnaanam* and *karma* is not possible.
- उपसंहियते- (Therefore, the topic) is being closed.

Chapter I: Verse 79 –

तमः अन्द्गत्वं यथा भानोः अग्नेः शीताद्गता यथा ।

वारिणः च उष्णता यद्दत् जानस्य एवं क्रियाद्गता ॥ ७९ ॥

Just as the sun cannot be a contributory factor of darkness, fire cannot have cold as its part and water cannot be combined with heat, knowledge cannot be integrated with action.

Conclusion of the topic is done in this verse.

Jnaana karma samucchayam is as illogical as the three examples given in this verse.

- तमः भानोः अन्द्गत्वं यथा- Similar to darkness being part of the sun (the sun having darkness, as its part),
- यथा शीता अग्नेः अद्गता- similar to coolness being part of fire,
- (यथा) उष्णता वारिणः च (अद्गता) - similar to heat being part of natural water,

According to *tharka saasthraa*, the 'nature' of water is 'coolness'.

- यद्दत् - like the three examples given,

- जानस्य एव क्रिया अङ्गता – *jnaanam* and *karma* cannot be integrated.

If *thathpurusha samaasa* interpretation is given, *kriyaa: anga:* is *kriyaanga:* (*jnaanam* being *anga:* of *kriyaa*); if *bahuvreehi samaasa* interpretation is given, *kriyaa anga: yasya* is *kriyaanga:* (*kriyaa* being *anga:* of *jnaanam*). *Jnaanam* cannot be part of *kriyaa* and *kriyaa* cannot be part of *jnaanam*. *Samucchaya:*, is, therefore, not possible.

With this, *samucchaya kandanam* is over. Sureswraachaarya wants to move to the next topic.

Sambhanda gadhyam to Verse 80:

यथोक्त उपपत्ति बलेन एव पूर्व पक्षस्य उत्सारितत्वात् वक्तव्यम् न अवशेषितम् इत्यतः

प्रतिपत्ति कर्मवत् पूर्वपक्ष परिहाराय यत्किञ्चित् तद् वक्तव्यम् इत्यतः इदम् अभिधीयते ।

By these arguments, the prima facie view stands refuted (in substance). Nothing more remains to be said. But, still, the points raised by the poorva pakshin are answered now (formally) for completing the refutation: (TEXT MEANING)

- यथोक्त उपपत्ति बलेन - By the strength of the arguments given (by me)
- *Yathoktha* - as said; *upapatthi* - arguments; *balena* – by the strength of.
- पूर्वपक्षस्य उत्सारितत्वात् – since the *poorvapakshi's* view stands rejected,
- अवशेषितम् वक्तव्यम् न - nothing more is to be said.
- इत्यतः - Therefore,
- पूर्व पक्ष परिहाराय – for the purpose of rejecting other theories of the *poorva pakshi*,

The theories will be mentioned later; the *Achaaryaa* only indicates his intention here. He gives an example for the "disposal" of the *poorvapakshi*.

- प्रति पत्ति कर्मवत् - like the *prathi patthi karma*,

The *Achaaryaa* was a *poorva meemaamsakaa*, before he became a *sanyaasin* and a disciple of Adi Sankara. Probably because of this fact, the example is from the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedas*.

Prathi patthi karma is a technical word used in *poorva meemaamsaa*. Any ritual can be undertaken only with the materials specified by the *karma kaandaa* for that particular ritual; and, at the end of the ritual, the materials have no more function and have to be disposed off. But, according to the *karma kaandaa* injunctions, the 'disposal' cannot be done in any manner, other than the manner prescribed by the *karma kaandaa* itself. The disposal of the unwanted accessory, after conclusion of the ritual, has also to be done in the prescribed 'formal' manner. This 'formal' disposal is called '*prathi patthi karma*' – the 'ritualistic disposal of unwanted material, after conclusion of the ritual'.

An example of such an accessory can be cited – *krishna vishaana*: - the horn of a type of a deer, probably a black buck. The horn is to be used, if necessary, for scratching parts of the body of the *kartha*, in case they itch, since use of the fingernails, for the purpose, is prohibited, during the course of the ritual. *Karma kaandaa* prescribes "*chathvaare krishnavishaana: usrujeth*" – "dispose off the *krishna vishaana*: in a hole (pit) dug in the ground, for the purpose".

Even the ritual performed for the assumption of the *sanyaasa asramaa*, consisting of formal renunciation of *brahmacharya* or *grihastha aasrama* rituals (the marks of *brahmacharya* and *grihastha aasramaas* – the sacred thread and tuft - are also "disposed off") is comparable to *prathi patthi karma*.

The *Achaarya* likens the "disposal of the *poorva pakshi*" to a *prathi patthi karma*. "I want to formally dispose off the *poorva pakshi*, similar to *prathi patthi*" he says.

- यत्किञ्चित् वक्तव्यम् - I have to make some more statements.
- इत्यतः - Therefore,
- इदम् अभिधीयते - I am saying this:

Chapter I: Verse 80–

"मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात्" इत्यादि अनुचितम् बहु ।

यदभाणि तदन्याय्यम् यथा तदधुना उच्यते ॥ ८० ॥

Commencing with the statement that 'release is attained by actions' (verse 9) many inappropriate assertions have been made. Now it is going to be demonstrated, that, all that is unreasonable.

Earlier, three types of *poorva paksha vaadhaa* were given – (1) from verse 9 to 13 (2) from verse 14 to 19 and (3) from verse 20 to 23.

Sureswaraachaarya goes back to the first group of *poorva pakshis*, though he had already discussed them. He negates their views now, in verses 80 to 84.

- "मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात्" इत्यादि - In the portions beginning with verse 9,
- बहु अनुचितम् अभाणि यत् - the many illogical / improper / defective theories made by the *poorva pakshi*,

"*Bhan*" meaning "to state"/ "to utter", is the root of the word *abhaani*.

- तत् अन्याय्यम् यथा तत् अधुना उच्यते - how illogical their statements are, I want to discuss now.

Thadh anyaayyam – their illogical character; *yathaa thath* – in the manner in which; *adhunaa* - now; *uchyathe* - I shall state.

42. Chapter I, Verses 80 to 81 (03-02-2007)

With the 79th verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa has completed the *jnaana-karma-samucchaya vaadha kandanam*, which he started in verse 54.

The *Achaaryaa* had introduced three groups of *poorva pakshis*, from verse 9 to verse 22. Of these three groups, the first *poorva pakshi*, introduced in verses 9 to 13, accepts that *jnaanam* is talked about in the scriptures; but, holds that *jnaanam* is **not** required for *mokshaa* and that *karma*, by itself, can give *mokshaa*. This *poorva pakshi*, is, therefore, named *abhyupedhya karma vaadhi* – "*abhyupedhya*" signifying that he accepts *jnaanam*, as a teaching of scriptures, though of course, he considers only *karma* as the *saadhanam* for *moksham*.

The 2nd group of *poorva pakshi*, introduced between verses 14 to 19, does not accept the very existence of *aathma jnaanam* as a subject of scriptures. He holds that no such subject as *aathma jnaanam* is taught by scriptures. He is, therefore, referred to as *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhi* - a staunch believer that *karma* is the only *saadhanam* for *mokshaa* and that, there is no such thing as *aathma jnaanam*.

Verses 20 to 22 covered the 3rd group of *poorva pakshis* – the *samucchayavaadhi*, whose view is that *jnaanam*, only when combined with *karma* or conversely *karma* combined with *jnaanam*, can lead to liberation.

The *Achaaryaa* is refuting the three groups, one by one. The first group – the *abhyupedhya karma vaadhi* - was refuted in verses 23 to 53. Then the *Achaaryaa* took up the 3rd group (without going into the 2nd), in verse 54. This *samucchaya vaadha niraasa*: was done by him, between verses 54 and 79.

In verse 80, the *Achaaryaa* goes back to the 1st *poorva pakshi*. He says: "I have not formally concluded the refutation of the 1st *poorva pakshi*. I would like to do so". He gives an introduction to this intention of his, in verse 80.

The *abhyupedhya poorva pakshi*, who, incidentally, has been refuted by Adi Sankaraachaarya also, even in his *Upanishad Baashyams*, has a peculiar theory. He first refers to the five types of *karmaas* – *Nithya*, *Naimitthika*, *Kaamyam*, *Nishiddha* and *Praayaschittha*.

Nithya and *naimitthika karmaas* are compulsory *Vedic* duty; non-performance of the *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* will result in incurring of a special type of *paapam*, termed *prathyavaaya paapam*.

Kaamyā karmaas are desire-based *karmaas*, performance of which will produce *punyam* for the *karthaa*, giving results in this *janma* or the later *janmaas*.

Nishiddha karmaas are "prohibited" actions, performance of which will produce *paapam* for the performer.

The first *poorva pakshi* argues: "We should manage our *karmaas*, in such an appropriate manner, that, at death, there will be no *punyam* or *paapam* to our account". The "appropriate manner" suggested by him: "Do not perform *kaamyā karmaas* at all; *punyam*, therefore, will not accrue. *Punya* balance will be reduced. Of course, avoid *nishiddha karmaas*; *paapam* resulting from such *karmaas*, is thus avoided. As for *nithya-naimittika karmaas*, perform them diligently, without failure, so that, *pratyavaaya paapam* will be avoided. By this method, at death, you will have no *punyam* or *paapam* accrued to your credit."

But, what about past *karmaas*? The *poorva pakshi* replies: "Exhaust the past *karmaas*, by experiencing their results. *Punya karmaas* will be exhausted by experiencing good things in life; *paapa karma*, by willingly suffering the results, not looking for solutions to your problems. Thus past *karma* should be exhausted, by *sukha dhu:kha anubhavam*". He continues: "Since no fresh *punya-paapam* has also been added, by managing your *karmaas* as explained, there will be nil-balance of *punyam* and *paapam*, at the time of death. There will, therefore, be, no *punarjanma*. This is *mokshaa*. Then, where is the need for *vicharaa – sravana, manana, nidhidhyaasanam*?"

These views of this *poorva pakshi* were covered in verses 9 to 13.

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "All these are impossible". In verses 81 to 84, he elaborately refutes the *abhyupedhya karma vaadhi*. Earlier also (in verses 23 to 53) he had refuted this *poorva pakshi*. He adds a few more details to his refutation now.

He gives an elaborate introduction to verse 81.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 81:

योयम् काम्यानां प्रतिषिद्धानां च त्यागः प्रतिजायते सा प्रतिजा तावत् न सक्व्यते अनुष्ठातुम् । किं कारणम् । कर्मणो हि निर्वृत्तात्मनः द्वाभ्यां प्रकाराभ्यां निवृत्तिः सम्भवति आरब्ध फलस्य उपभोगेन अनारब्ध फलस्य असुभस्य प्रायश्चित्तैः इति ।

The renunciation of actions prompted by desires and the prohibited actions, which has been advocated, is impossible of observance. What is the reason?

Actions that have already been performed cannot be given up in one of two ways. If the actions in question have already begun to produce their results, they are to be worked out by simply undergoing their results. If they have not begun to be operative in that fashion, they can be liquidated by expiatory rituals.

The *Achaaryaa* first talks about *kaamyaa prathishiddha karma thyaaga*: - renunciation of desire-based rituals and avoidance of prohibited actions. *Kaamyaa karmaas* produce *punyam*, and, are, therefore, associated with *punyam*. *Nishiddha karmaas* produce *paapam*, and, are, therefore, associated with *paapam*.

The *poorva pakshi* says: "Give up *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaas*".

Sureswarachaarya asks: "Are you referring to the already performed (i.e. past) *karmaas* or the future performable *karmaas*?" Already performed *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaas*, cannot obviously be "given up", since they have already been performed, similar to an arrow already shot.

- काम्यानां प्रतिषिद्धानां च त्यागः - Giving up of the *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha karmaas*
- योयम् प्रतिजायते - which you have suggested,
- सा प्रतिजा - such a suggestion,
- तावत् - as a first step
- न सक्व्यते अनुष्ठातुम् - is not possible of implementation.
- किं कारणम् - What is the reason / why do we say this?

The *poorva pakshi* had not talked about any distinction between past and future (*kaamyaa/nishiddha*) *karmaas*. But, to counter the *poorva pakshi*, the *Achaaryaa* uses the method of "*vikalpa*" - splitting the actions into "past" and "future".

- निवृत्तिः - The elimination
- निवृत्तात्मनः कर्मणः हि - of the *karmaas* of the nature of "already performed" (i.e. of past actions)

Nirvrtttham - already performed / *krutham* / *anushtitham*.

- द्वाभ्यां प्रकाराभ्यां संभवति - happens by only two other methods

Sureswaraachaarya divides the "past" *karmaas* also into two: (1) those past *karmaas*, which have started giving results and (2) those past *karmaas*, which have not yet matured / not yet ready for giving results / unfructified, (though already performed).

- आरम्भ फलस्य (निवृत्तिः) - (Elimination) of the fructifying performed *karmaa*,

- उपभोगेन - (is) by experiencing (the results).

There is no means by which one can remove or avoid the fructified *karmaas*; they have to be exhausted only by *sukha-dhu:kha anubhavam*.

- अनारब्ध फलस्य (निवृत्तिः) - (Elimination) of *karmaas* which have not started giving results,
- प्रायश्चित्तैः इति - (can be) by *prayaschittha karmaas*.

The *Achaaryaa's* contention is: "You cannot **remove** the past *karmaas*; you cannot stop the arrival of their results. Either experience them or neutralize them". But, there is a third method – the *Vedhaanthic* method, which the *Achaaryaa* talks about, next..

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

तृतीयः अपि त्यागप्रकार अकर्त्रात्म अवबोधात् स तु आत्मज्ञान अनभ्युपगमात् भवता न अभ्युगम्यते ।

A third way is also there and that is by the realization of the *aathman*, who is no agent of actions. But, this is not admitted by you, as you do not admit the knowledge in question.

The 3rd method of "removing" already performed *karma* is *jnaanam*. What *jnaanam*? The realization: "I am *akarthaa* and *abokthaa*".

- तृतीयः त्यागप्रकारः अपि - The third method of "giving up"

tṛtīya - third; *thyaagha* - "giving up"; *prakaara*: - method.

- अकर्त्रात्म अवबोधात् (भवति) - (is) by realization of the *aathmaa*, who is *akarthaa*.

But, the *poorva pakshi* cannot use this method, since he wants to avoid *jnaanam*; he wants to attain liberation, without *jnaanam*.

- स तु - But, that method,
- आत्मज्ञान अभ्युपगमात् - since you do not accept the concept of *Aathmajnaanam*,
- भवता न अभ्युपगम्यते - is not admitted by you

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

तत्र यानि अनुप भुक्त फलानि अनारब्धफलानि तानि इस्वरेण अपि केनचित् अपि न शक्यन्ते परित्यक्तुम्।

The actions, whose results are not yet experienced and which have not yet begun to produce the results, cannot be renounced even by *Ishvara*.

Sureswaraachaarya mentioned three options with regard to performed *punya-paapa karmaas*:

- (1) By going through them (*anubhavana*)
- (2) By neutralizing them (by *praayaschittha karmaas*) and
- (3) Through *jnaanam*.

But, the *poorva pakshi* does not want to use any one of the methods; he does not want to experience them or neutralize them. He does not recognize *jnaanam*. The *Achaaryaa* says: "A fourth method of removing past *punya-paapa karmaas*, is **not** available".

- तत्र - In the context of
- यानि अनुपभुक्त फलानि - those *karmaas* whose *palan* is not experienced by us (yet),
- अनारब्धफलानि - since they are not ready for fructification,
- तानि परित्यक्तुम् न शक्यन्ते - there is no possibility of removing these *Karmaas*,
- इस्वरेण अपि केनचित् - by any one, including *Ishvara*.

Any past *karma* can fructify at any time; irrespective of an individual being virtuous in this *janma*, a past bad *karma* can create problems. The *Achaaryaa* warns: "Even *Ishvara* cannot avoid it". You cannot "write off" the unfructified past *karma*.

What about fructified *karma*?

***Sambhandha gadhyam* (further) to Verse 81:**

अथ आरब्ध फलानि त्यज्यन्ते तानि अपि न शक्यन्ते त्यक्तुम् ।

If it be said, that, actions which have begun to be productive of their results, are to be renounced, that is also impossible.

- अथ - On the other hand,
- आरब्ध फलानि - the *karmaas* which have started fructification
- त्यज्यन्ते - are to be renounced,
- तानि अपि त्यक्तुम् - to renounce them also,
- न शक्यन्ते - is impossible.

***Sambhanda gadhyam* (further) to Verse 81:**

किं कारणम् । अनिवृत्तेः । अनिवृत्तं हि चिकीर्षितं कर्म शक्यते त्यक्तुं प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्ती प्रति कर्तुः स्वातन्त्र्यात् ।

What is the reason? When once the actions have been performed, there can be no termination of them, except by going through their results or by expiation. What can be renounced are the actions not yet performed, but contemplated, for, in relation to them, the agent is free either to do them or abstain from them.

- किं कारणम् - What is the reason?
- अनिवृत्तेः - Since they have been already performed. (Therefore, you cannot escape your responsibility).

“Nirvratthe:” is a better reading, in the place of “anivratthe:”, for easier understanding, meaning the same.

Future actions can be given up; but, past ones cannot be disowned.

- अनिवृत्तम् कर्म हि - As for the *karma* which is not yet performed,
- चिकीर्षितं - but, which is being planned,
- त्यक्तुम् शक्यते - is capable of being renounced,

You have a choice with regard to future actions; but, not with past ones.

- कर्तुः स्वातन्त्र्यात्- since the *kartha* has the free-will,
- प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्ती प्रति - towards performing or non-performing.

This shows that Sureswaraachaarya accepts “freewill” with regard to future actions. “Future *karmaas* can be renounced” is important.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

निवृत्तेः तु कर्मणि तदसंभवात् दुरनुष्ठेयः प्रतिजातार्थः ।

In the case of actions already performed, the renunciation advocated is impossible.

- निवृत्तेः तु कर्मणि - With regard to past *karmaas*,
- तदसंभवात् - because of the impossibility (of calling them back)

(An incidental moral: Do not feel guilty about the past. But, resolve not to repeat the regretted action in the future. Guilt and regret are useless, since past is past.)

- प्रतिजात अर्थः - what you have suggested,

- **दुर् अनुष्ठेयः** - is impossible of being implemented.

Past cannot be removed. Accept the past. But, what about the future? Sureswaraachaarya says: "Even the proposition to give up future actions, on closer scrutiny, is not possible", though, he seemed to concede the possibility of giving up future actions, in the previous portion.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

अशक्य प्रतिजानाः च न च शक्यते प्रतिजातुं यावत् जीवं काम्यानि प्रतिषिद्धानि च कर्माणि न करिष्यामि इति सुनिपुणानाम् अपि सूक्ष्म अपराध दर्शनात्।

Further, the maxim recommends the impracticable. It is impossible to fulfill the resolve, that, one will abstain from desire-prompted and prohibited actions, all through his life; subtle failures are noted even in the wisest of men.

Sureswaraachaarya temporarily suspends the discussion on past *punya-paapa karmaas*. (He will take up this topic, later, again.) Now, he talks of future *punya-paapa karmaas*.

The *poorva pakshi* says: "We will avoid *kaamya* and *nishiddha karmaas*".

The *Achaaryaa* responds: "The human being has limited power and limited knowledge. So, wrong actions **can** result. Only *Isvara* can avoid wrong actions. The human being will continue to do mistakes; past mistakes may not be repeated, but, new mistakes may be performed. As long as desires are there, you cannot avoid *kaamya karmaas*. Hence, with regard to the future also, your proposal will not work."

43. Chapter I, Verses 81 to 83 (17-02-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya has come back to the 1st *poorva pakshi* once again, after completing the refutation of the 3rd *poorva pakshi*, in verses 54 to 79. Earlier, in verses 23 to 53, he had already put forth some arguments against the 1st *poorva pakshi* and now, in verses 80 to 84, he adds some more arguments.

The theory of the 1st *poorva pakshi*, presented by the *Achaaryaa*, in verses 9 to 13, is as follows: "You can attain *mokshaa*, without *jnaanam*, if you manage your *karma* skillfully, since it is only the *karma* balance, which is responsible for *punarjanmam*. The management consists in (1) avoiding performance of any *kaamyaa karma*, and therefore, the resulting *punyam*; (2) keeping away from *nishiddha karmaas*, and, therefore, the resulting *paapam*; and (3) performing the *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* diligently, without failure and thus avoiding *prathyavaaya paapam*. Fresh *punya-paapam* is, thus, carefully avoided. As for whatever *karmaas* that have already been accrued, exhaust them by 'experiencing' their results. Thus, at the time of death, the balance of *karma*, in your account, would be made 'nil', and, as a consequence, there will be no *punarjanma*".

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this systematically. First, he pointed out: "You can never disown past *karmaas*. Unperformed *karmaas* may possibly be given up. But, past *karmaas*, since they have already been performed, already stand in your credit. Past *karmaas* are also of two types: (1) Fructifying and (2) Non-fructifying. You cannot give up either of them."

The *Achaaryaa* discusses, in detail, the topics of *parihaaraa* for and experiencing of past *karmaas*, in a later context. In this portion, he only makes a statement, that past *karmaas* cannot be disclaimed, since they have been already performed.

Next, he takes up the future *karmaas* – he uses the words *kaamyaa* and *nishidda*, instead of *punya* and *paapa karmaas*. The *poorva pakshi* had said: "Avoid *kaamyaa karmaas* and the resulting *punyam*. Avoid *nishidda karmaas* and the resulting *paapam*"; Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Neither is possible".

- **अशक्य प्रतिजानाःच** - The proposals are impossible of implementation (meaning, that, nobody can undertake a *prathingyaa* not to do any *kaamyaa karma* or *nishidda karmaa*)

This is a brief reply – *samskshepa uttharam*. He elaborates: "You can never avoid *nishiddha* or *kaamyaa karmaas*, because, unknowingly some mistake or other **will** take place, since no human being is perfect. Even the most intelligent man may resort to *nishiddha karma*, bringing *paapam*."

- प्रतिजातुं न शक्यते - It is impossible to make (or fulfill) a resolution
- यावत् जीवं काम्यानि प्रतिषिद्धानि च कर्माणि न करिष्यामि इति – that “I shall not perform anykaamya or nishiddha karma, as long as I live”,
- सुनिपुणानाम् अपि - even by the most intelligent persons,
- सूक्ष्म अपराध दर्शनात् – since human knowledge is limited.

Adi Sankara also discusses the “avoidance of *kaamya karmaas*” elsewhere. He points out, that, as long as ignorance is there, *kaamya karmaa* cannot be avoided. Ignorance leads to *apournathvam*, which, in turn leads to desires – *kaamaa* and therefore, to *kaamya karma*, to achieve the desires. *Ahankaara* and *mamakaara* attitudes will certainly lead to *kaamya karmaas*, resulting in *punyam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

प्रमाण अभावाः च । न च प्रमाणम् अस्ति मोक्षकामः नित्यनैमित्तिके कर्मणी कुर्यात् काम्य प्रतिषिद्धे च वर्जयेत् आरब्धफले च उपभोगेन क्षपयेत् इति ।

Again, there is no authority for this position. There is no scriptural statement to the effect, that, ‘an aspirant, after liberation, must perform obligatory actions perpetual and occasional, must give up desire-prompted and prohibited actions, and must exhaust the actions already productive of results, by undergoing those results’.

Sureswaraachaarya tells the *poorva pakshi*: “This method to *mokshaa* is your own invention. We do not have any *saasthra pramaanam* for your view”. Whenever *apoureshaya* matters are discussed, *saasthra* support is needed. *Mokshaa* means ‘freedom from *punarjanma*’; and, *punarjanma* is not logically provable or disprovable. One has to go only by *saasthra pramaanam*. **After** obtaining *saasthra pramaanam*, one can discuss the (*apourusheya*) subject logically; but, **not without** *saasthra pramaanam*. The *Achaaryaa* asks the *poorva pakshi*: “Show me the *saasthric support* for your view”. On the other hand, *saasthraas* say “*jnaath eva kaivalyam*”, rejecting all other *saadhanaas*.

- प्रमाण अभावाः च - There is no authority (for the *poorva pakshi's* views).

This is another *samskshepa uttharam* – brief reply. The *Achaaryaa* accuses that there is *pramaana abhaava dosha*: (defect, because of lack of *saasthric* support) in the *poorva pakshi's* arguments. There is no *saasthra pramaanam*. Mere speculation cannot be a valid source of knowledge.

- मोक्ष कामः - “One who desires to attain *mokshaa*
- नित्य नैमित्तिक कर्माणि कुर्यात् - should perform *nithya-naimitthika karmaani*,

- काम्य प्रतिषिद्धे च वर्जयेत् - should give up *kaamyaa* and *prathishiddha karmaas*,
- आरब्ध फले च उपभोगेन क्षपयेत् - should exhaust the past *karmaas*, which have started fructifying, by experiencing their results"

Upto this, is the *poorva pakshi's* arguments. Sureswaraachaarya refutes this, saying, that there is no *saasthric* support for this view.

- इति - For these statements
- न च प्रमाणम् अस्ति - there is no *pramaanam* .

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

आनन्त्याः च । न च उपचितानां कर्मणां इयत्ता अस्ति संसारस्य अनादित्वात् ।

Moreover, there are infinite actions. There is no limit to the actions awaiting fructification, for the empirical life of transmigration has been there without a beginning.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "For argument's sake, let us assume that the individual avoids all future *karmaas* – *kaamyaa* and *nishiddha*, and therefore, manages to clear the future. But, what about his past *karmaas*?"

The *poorva pakshi* will reply: "I have already told you. Exhaust them, by experiencing their results".

The *Achaaryaa* responds: "If it is one *janma karma palan*, you may probably be able to exhaust them by experiencing them; but, not of the innumerable *janmaas*, you have gone through".

- आनन्त्याः च - The actions are numerous (another *samskshepa uttharam*).
- उपचितानां कर्मणाम् इयत्ता न च अस्ति - There is no limit to the results of actions acquired,

Apachitha is equivalent to *sanchitha*. Sureswaraachaarya does not use the word *sanchitha*, since the *poorva meemaamsakaa* does not recognize *sanchitha karmaa*. *Iyathha* - limit. (The number of past actions and their results cannot be computed).

- संसारस्य अनादित्वात् - since *janmaas* are *anaadhi*.

Why cannot I do *praayaschittha*? The *Achaaryaa* does not specifically talk about this. But, we can draw the reply: "Since the *karmaas* are infinite, one will never be capable of exhausting them, by performance of *praayaschittha karmaas*".

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 81:

न च काम्यैः प्रतिषिद्धैः वा तेषां निवृत्तिः अस्ति शुद्धिः अशुद्धिः साम्ये सति अविरोधात् इति आह।

They are not to be put an end to by desire-prompted or prohibited actions, for, in the matter of purity and impurity, there is equality between the actions of the past and new ones to be resorted to and, hence, there is no opposition between them as required. So, it is stated:

Another question may be asked: "Why should not some *kaamyas* be used, to wipe out past *punya karmaas* and some *nishiddha karmaas* to negate past *paapa karmaas* (i.e. use the same type of *karmaas* for destroying the past *karmaas* - similar to using a thorn, for removal of a thorn in the foot)?"

- काम्यैः प्रतिषिद्धैः वा - By *kaamyas* and *prathishiddha karmaas*,
- तेषां निवृत्तिः न अस्ति - their elimination is not possible,
- शुद्धिः साम्ये सति अविरोधात् - since, in the matter of past and future *punya karmaas*,
- there is no enmity between them
- अशुद्धिः (साम्ये सति अविरोधात्) - since, in the matter of past and future *paapa karmaas*, there is no enmity between them.

Destruction is possible only if there is enmity. But, there is no *paraspara virodham*, between past and future *punya karmaas* and similarly, between past and future *paapa karmaas*, and, therefore, the suggested destruction is not possible.

Then, why should not one eliminate *punya karmaas* by *paapa karmaas* and *paapa karmaas* by *punya karmaas*? This question is not raised by Sureswaraachaarya; but, is a valid question. The answers to this doubt : (1) The past *karmaas* are infinite in number; you cannot, therefore, physically exhaust them (similar to the explanation given, in the case of *praayaschittha karmaas*. (2) There is no *saasthra pramaanam* to the suggestion to do *paapa karmaas* to wipe out *punya karma palan*.

The *poorva pakshi's* arguments have all been negated.

- इति आह - So, I am stating this (in the verse that follows):

Chapter I: Verse 81 –

न कृत्स्न काम्य संत्यागः अनन्तत्वात् कर्तुं इष्यते ।

निषिद्धकर्मणः चेत् तु व्यतीत अनन्त जन्मसु ॥ ८१ ॥

There is no possibility of throwing out in their entirety the numberless desire-prompted and prohibited actions performed through numberless lives of the past.

Sureswaraachaarya repeats the same idea in the verse.

कृत्स्न काम्य संत्यागः न कर्तुं इष्यते – Past karmaas cannot be destroyed in entirety.

Why?

अनन्तत्वात्- Since they are infinite.

No *praayaschittham* can wipe out all past *karmaas* totally. Only *jnaanam* can. The reference "*Sanchitha paapa vinaasana lingam*", in the sacred prayer *Lingaashtakam*, can be understood only to indicate that the prayer will help the devotee to take to *jnaanaa khaandaa*; because of the prayer, the *sanchitha paapam* might get wiped out, whereas, for *sanchitha punyam* there is no *praayaschiththa* prescribed. You cannot get rid of *sanchitha punyam* and the consequent *punarjanmaam*, except by *jnaanam*.

- **व्यतीत अनन्तजन्मसु निषिद्धकर्मणः चेत् तु** - If *nishiddha karmaas*, acquired in infinite *janmaas* are talked about,

Vyatheetha – acquired; *anantha janmasu* - in infinite *janmaas*.

- **(संत्यागः कर्तुं न इष्यते अनन्तत्वात्)** - they (also) cannot be destroyed totally, since they
- are (also) infinite)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 82:

स्यात् मतम् व्यतीत अनन्त जन्म उपात्तानाम् कर्मणाम् ।

It may be suggested that the actions performed in our numberless past lives,

The *Achaaryaa* says that the *poorva meemaasakaa* may come out with another solution, (which he gives in the verse that follows).

- व्यतीत अनन्त जन्म कर्मणाम् उपात्तां - For the elimination of the actions performed in our numerous past lives,
- स्यात् मतम् - if the (following) theory is extended:

Chapter I: Verse 82 –

क्षयो नित्येन तेषाम् चेत् प्रायश्चित्तैः यथा एनसः ।

निष्फल्त्वात् न नित्येन काम्यादेः विनिवारणाम् ॥ ८२ ॥

can be exhausted through the observance of obligatory duties, just as sins are removed through expiatory rites. But, as the obligatory duties do not produce any fruits, the actions like the desire-prompted ones cannot be nullified by them.

Earlier, the absurdity in the possible suggestion that "*punyam* and *paapam* can be neutralized by *kaamyas* and *nishiddha karmaas* respectively" was pointed out, by referring to the *saamyam* and *avirodham* between past *punya karmaas* and proposed *kaamyas karmaas* and similarly, between past *paapa karmaas* and proposed *nishiddha karmaas*.

Now, the *poorva pakshi* may suggest: "*Nithya naimithika karmaas* are *karmaas* prescribed by the *saasthraas*. Innumerable purifying, positive and good *nithya naimithika karmaas* have been prescribed. Then, why should not all the past *karmaas* be wiped out, by performing *nithya naimithika karmaas*? For wiping out past *paapa karmaas*, *praayaschittha karmaas* can be used; for past *punya karmaas*, why not use *nithya naimithika karmaas*?"

The aim of the *poorva meemaasaka* is to avoid *jnaanam* and, hence, such weak, and, sometimes absurd suggestions.

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "You have already said that *nithya naimithika karmaas* will not give you any *punyam* and that, their non-performance only will result in *paapam*. Then, how can you claim that performance of *nithya-naimithika karmaas* will give the result of destruction of *past karmaas*?"

The *poorva meemaasakaa's* stand is "*nithya-naimithika karmaani nishpalaani*";

The *advaitin* accepts *punya palan* for *nithya-naimithika karmaas*, both material (in the form of *sukham*) and spiritual (in the form of *chittha suddhi*).

Since the *poorva meemaasakaa* does not accept this, the *Achaaryaa* questions: "Since, according to you, *nithya naimithika karmaani* are *nishpalaani*, how can you say, that, they will neutralize past *karmaas*?" And, if the *nithya-naimithika karmaas* do neutralize past *karmaas*, they will have to be considered *praayaschittha karmaas*. But, since the *poorva meemaasakaa* prohibits performance of *kaamyas karmaas*, if he takes this stand, that, *nithya-naimithika karmaas* can be performed to neutralize past *karmaas*, "*svamatha kandana dosham*" will result.

- यथा येनसः क्षयः - "Just as elimination of *paapam*
- प्रायश्चित्तैः (भवति) - happens by *praayaschittha karmas*,
- (तथा) तेषाम् क्षयः - similarly, elimination of *punyam*
- नित्येन (भवति) - results by performance of *nithya-naimithika karmaas*"

This is the claim of the *poorva pakshi*, which the *Achaaryaa* proceeds to refute.

- **काम्येदे: विनिवारणाम्** - Elimination of past *punyam* is not possible
- **नित्येन** - by performance of *nithya-naimitthika karmaas*,
- **निष्फलत्वात्**—because, (according to you) *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* do not give results.

They cannot be used to neutralize *sanchitha punya karmaas*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 83:

प्रमाण अभावा: च । कथम् ।

There is no scriptural support for this position; for:

Sureswaraachaarya gives another argument, in support of his stand, against the *poorva pakshi's* view, that, *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* will neutralise *sanchitha punyam*. He says: "*karma palan* is *adrishtam* and *apourusheyam*. You cannot prove the results of your actions satisfactorily. You go only by *saasthraas*. '*Vachanaath pravrutthi: vachanaath nivrutthi:*' is an established maxim (*vachanam*, in this context, means *saasthraa*.) 'Do *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* give any *palan*?' is a question to be answered only by *saasthraas*. There is no mention anywhere, in *saasthraas* about this; according to *saasthraas*, *praayaschittha karmaas* can and do give *palan*; but, there is no *pramaanam* to prove that *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* will remove *sanchitha punyam*".

Punyam, although good, maintains the *samsaaraa*, the cycle of births and deaths. For *mokshaa* (i.e. avoidance of *punar janma*), *sanchitha punyam* also has to be destroyed. This is possible only by *jnaanam*. That is why the *Mundaka Upanishad* declares (verse 3– Sec.I– Ch.III) "*Yadhaa pasya: pasyathe rukmavarnam karthaaram eesam brahmayonim thadhaa vidvaan vidhooya punyapaape niranjana: upaithi paramam saamyam*" – "When the seer sees the *Brahman* which is ever effulgent like gold, which is the creator, which is the Lord and which is the cause of *Hiranyagarbha*, then, **the wise gives up all *punyaa* and *paapaa***. Free from impurities, he attains total identity with *Brahman*."

44. Chapter I, Verses 83 to 85 (24-02-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is dealing with the *poorva meemaamsaka matham*, which claims that *mokshaa* can be attained without using *jnaanam*. A particular scheme was presented by them in the verses 9 to 13. According to this scheme of the *poorva pakshin*: "You can bring down *karma* account to zero level, if you know how to 'manage' *karma*. The 'management' consists in (1) avoiding performance of *kaamyas* and therefore, the resulting *punyam* (2) keeping away from *nishiddha karmas* and therefore, the *paapam* resulting from them and (3) performing the prescribed *nithya-naimittika karmas* diligently, without fail, and thus avoiding the *prathyavaaya paapam* resulting from non-performance of *nithya-naimittika karmas*. Accrual of fresh *punya-paapam* is thus averted. As for the *palan* of past *karmas*, exhaust them by going through *sukha-dhu:kha* experiences. By this method of averting future *karma palan* and exhausting past *karma palan*, your *karma* account will be zero, at the time of your death. Since *punar janma* is the result of *karma palan*, in the absence of *karma palan*, *punar janma* is avoided. Avoidance of *punar janma* is only *mokshaa* and therefore, you attain *moksha*, by this skillful management of *karma*".

This scheme is analysed in the verses 80 to 84, by Sureswaraachaarya, who, first, pointed out: "You cannot avoid *kaamyas*, since, as long as self-ignorance (*aathma ajnaanam*) is there, *apoornathvam* will be there; desires will be there. *Kaamyas* will be undertaken to fulfill the desires, resulting in *punyam*. In short, avoidance of *punyam* is impossible, as long as there is self-ignorance. Likewise, *paapam* also cannot be avoided, since human knowledge is limited and a *jeeva* cannot avoid mistakes totally (at best, he may be able to reduce them). *Nishiddha karmas* cannot be **totally** avoided and, therefore, *paapam* also will accrue".

Then, the *Achaaryaa* moved on to the topic of past *karmas*. He asked: "For argument's sake, suppose (it is only a supposition – not a possibility) future *karmas* are avoided, then, what about the past *karmas*?"

The *poorva pakshi* had said "exhaust past *karmas*, by experiencing them".

Sureswaraachaarya replied: "Past *karmas* are too numerous to be exhausted in one *janma*".

(There is also another objection, which, the *Achaaryaa* does not talk about; the objection, nevertheless, is valid: "Different bodies are required to exhaust different types of past *karmas*. One human birth or one human body cannot exhaust all *sanchitha karmas*").

The *poorva pakshi* replied: "All right. I will exhaust as many *karmaas* as possible. Whatever *karmaas* cannot be exhausted, I will neutralize them by some other appropriate *karmaas*".

The *Achaaryaa* asked: "How?".

The *poorva pakshi* replied: "There are numerous *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* prescribed by the scriptures. I will make use of them to neutralize the past *karmaas*".

Sureswaraachaarya responded: "There are many problems with this theory. *Nithya-naimitthika karmaas* may neutralize the past *paapam*; but, how can they neutralize past *punyam*? Since, *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* are *punyam*, they can never neutralize past *punyam*, as there is no *virodham* – but, there is only *saamyam* – between *punyam* and *punyam*."

The *Achaaryaa* continued: "*Nithya-naimitthika karmaas* negating past *paapam* is **also** not possible, since, *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* performed in one *janma* can be only **limited** *punyam*, whereas past *paapam* has been accumulated during infinite number of *janmaas*. How can **one** *janma punyam* neutralize **many** *janma paapam*? Numerically, they are unbalanced."

Now, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 83, he presents another objection: "There is no *Vedic pramaanam* for your view, that, *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* can neutralize *past karmaas*".

- **प्रमाण अभावाः च** - There is no *Vedic pramaanam* to your statement (that *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* of this one *janma* will neutralize all past *karmaas* of all past *janmaas*)
- **कथम्** - how? (Why do I say this?)

Chapter I: Verse 83 –

पाप अपनुत्तये वाक्यात् प्रायश्चित्तम् यथा तथा ।

गम्यते काम्यहानार्थम् नित्यं कर्म न वाक्यथः ॥ ८३ ॥

Scripture lays down that sin is to be removed by expiatory rites. There is no scriptural statement to the effect that the desire-prompted actions are to be nullified by obligatory actions.

- **पाप अपनुत्तये** - "For the elimination of past *paapa karma palan*
- **प्रायश्चित्तं** – *praayaschittha karmaas* (can help)"
- **वाक्यात्** - (this fact is known) by *Vedic injunctions*.
- **यथा तथा** - on the same line,

- काम्य हानार्थ - "For elimination of past *punyam*
- नित्यम् कर्म गम्यते – *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* are known to work"
- न वाक्यतः - (for this view) there is no *Vedic pramaanam*.

Gamyathe – (*avagamyathe*)/known.

Nithya-naimitthika karmaas do help in neutralizing *paapam*, as the *sankalpam* before any ritual ("*Mama upaatha samastha dhuritha kshayadhvaaraa*" - "By destroying all sins that have accrued to me") would show. *Praayaschittha karmaas*, of course, also neutralize past *paapam*. *Nithya-naimithika karmaas*, can, therefore, be considered as *saamaanya praayaschittha karmaas*, while, the rituals associated with the *Shasti abda poorthy*, and *adhi-rudraa* and *mahaa-rudraa* chantings may be termed *visesha praayaschittha karmaani*.

In this context, it may be noted that it is essential, for any *vaidhika*, to perform his *shashti abda poorthi*. The *vaanaprastha aasramaa* and spiritual *saadhanaas* are supposed to start on completion of the age of 60. The *praayaschittha* rituals associated with the *shashti abda poorthi* contribute to the performer's achieving *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi* and thus to a successful spiritual life. Therefore, while the 'celebrations' and social get-togethers, if considered ostentations, may be skipped, the religious rituals, prescribed for the *shashti abda poorthy*, have to be performed.

Sureswaraachaarya says (in this verse) that *praayaschittha karmaas* can neutralize past *paapam*, for which fact, there is *Vedic pramaanam*, whereas, there is no such *pramaanam*, that, *nithya-naimitthika karmaas* will neutralize past *punyam*.

Though the *Achaarya* does not refer to this, it is relevant to note, that , as pointed out earlier, with regard to past *paapam*, it will not be possible to exhaust past *punyam* also totally in this *manushya janma*, since, certain types of *punyam* can be exhausted only through a *deva sareeram*; *manushya sareeram* will not be sufficient.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 84:

अथ अपि स्यात् काम्यैः एव काम्यानां पूर्वजन्म उपचितानाम् क्षयः भविष्यति इति । तत् न यतः ।

It may be said that the performance of desire-prompted actions themselves in the present life, will neutralize the desire-prompted actions of the past lives. This is inadmissible; for:

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* may suggest a solution to handle past *punyam*. Sureswaraachaarya had already mentioned this in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 81.

The *poorva pakshi* may say: "We have seen that 'similar' counters 'similar'. A thorn removes another thorn. Similarly, why not we perform *kaamyas*, to eliminate *punyam*? New *punyam* will eliminate old *punyam*".

- अथापि स्यात् इति - Suppose you give the following argument
- पूर्व जन्म उपचितानाम् काम्यानाम् क्षयः - "Neutralisation of *punyam* accumulated over the past *janmaas*
- काम्यैः एव भविष्यति - happens by performance of fresh *punya karmas* themselves".
- तत् न - No; it is not so.
- यतः - Because of the following reason.

Chapter I: Verse 84 –

पाप्मनाम् पाप्मभिः नास्ति यथा एव इह निराक्रिया ।

काम्यैः अपि तथा एव अस्तु काम्यानां अविरोधतः ॥ ८४ ॥

Just as sins cannot destroy sins, even so desire-prompted actions cannot destroy desire-prompted actions, for there is no opposition between the two sets of the said actions.

Two reasons are given by Sureswaraachaarya to negate this statement of the *poorva pakshin*, that, fresh *punyam* can neutralize past *punyam*:

- (1) *Pramaana abhaava*: - *punyam* and *paapam* are *apourusheyam*. *Pramaanams*, other than *saasthraas*, such as *prathyaksham*, *anumaanam* etc. cannot be depended on, to establish any truth regarding *aporusheya* subjects. Only *saasthraas* have to be referred to. *Saasthraas* do not specify that fresh *kaamyas* can wipe out past *punyam*. In the previous verse, it was pointed out, that, there is no *pramaanam* to the view that *nithya-naimittika karmas* will eliminate past *punyam*. Likewise, there is no *saasthra pramaanam* for this view also, that, fresh *punya karmaa* will eliminate past *punya karmas*. The *loukika* example, of a thorn removing another, given by the *poorva pakshi*, cannot be accepted, since the subject is *aloukikam* (supersensory) and, hence, only *saasthraas* have to be depended on, for guidance.
- (2) Secondly, "*paapam* cannot eliminate *paapam*" is very logical. Extending the same principle "*punyam* cannot eliminate *punyam*".

- पाप्मनाम् निराक्रिया - The elimination of *paapam*
- पाप्मभिः इह नास्ति - is not possible through *paapam*, in this *manushya janma*.
- यथैव तथैव - In a like manner,
- काम्यानाम् (निराक्रिया) - the elimination of past *punya karmas*
- काम्यैः अपि (नास्ति) - is not possible through fresh *punya karmas*.
Why not?

- **अविरोधतः** - Because of lack of enmity / absence of enmity.

Paapam and *paapam* do not have mutual contradictions. They are not inimical to each other. Where enmity is not there, elimination / destruction is not possible. *Paapam* cannot destroy *paapam*. The same logic is extended to *punyam* also.

Then, how can you say that *jnaanam* can eliminate *punyam*? Is not *jnaanam* also *punyam* (or result of *punyam*)? The answer: *Jnaanam* does not come under *punyam* or *paapam*. *Jnaanam* is *punya-paapa ubhaya virodhi*.

Q.: How do you say that *jnaanam* is *punya-paapa virodhi*? A.: *Punya paapam* are results of *kaamaa* – desire; desire is born out of *karthruthvam*; which, in turn is born of ignorance. So, *punya-paapam* come under 'ignorance' category and therefore, *jnaanam* is *punya-paapa virodhi*.

The well-known beginning phrase of the *Brahma Soothraas* – "*Athatho Brahma Jignyaasaa*"- is a pointer that *jnaanam* can be sought, only after achieving *vairaaghyam*. *Vairaaghyam* includes 'rejection' of *punyam* also. The *prakaranam*, "*Thathva bodha:*", defines *vairaaghyam* as "*Iha amuthra artha pala bogha viraagha:*", - "dispassion for the enjoyment of objects which are the fruit of actions here, in this world, and there, in heavens".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 85:

एवम् तावत् "मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात्" इति निराकृतम् । अथ आत्मज्ञानस्य सद्भावे प्रमाणसंभव उक्तः तत्परिहाराय आह ।

Thus far, that "release is attained through actions" (verse 9), was refuted. It was said by the *poorva pakshi* that there is no scriptural evidence, in favour of the knowledge of the Self. That is going to be criticized now:

With verse 84, Sureswaraachaarya concludes the refutation of the *poorva meemaamsaka* scheme for attainment of *mokshaa*, which scheme was presented in verses 9 to 13. In verses 85 to 97, the *Achaaryaa* discusses the next topic.

To understand the next topic, a revision, at this stage, of the topics covered so far, is essential. This approach is termed "*simha avalokanam nyaayaa*" – "revising what has been covered so far", so that, we can understand the future topics better – as, otherwise all topics would appear the same:

- (1) Verses 9 to 13 covered the viewpoints of the 1st type of *poorva pakshin* – *abhyupedhya karma vaadhin*.
- (2) Verses 14 to 19 covered the viewpoints of the 2nd type of *poorva pakshin* – *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*.
- (3) Verses 20 to 22 covered the viewpoints of the 3rd type of *poorva pakshin* – *jnaanakarma samucchaya vaadhin*.
- (4) In verses 23 to 53, the negation of the theories of the 1st type of *poorva pakshin* was done.
- (5) In verses 54 to 79, the negation of the theories of the 3rd type of *poorva pakshin* was done.
- (6) In verses 80 to 84, Sureswaraachaarya went back to the 1st *poorva pakshin*, adding some more objections, thus negating the 1st *poorva pakshin*, in two stretches.

Till now, the 2nd type of *poorva pakshin* had not been negated. Now, in verses 85 to 97, the *Achaaryaa* negates the views of the 2nd type of *poorva pakshin*.

The 2nd type of *poorva pakshin* also, the *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, maintains that, *karma alone* will give liberation and that *aathma jnaanam* cannot; he goes a step further than the *abhyupedhya karma vaadhi* and says that, there is no subject at all, as *aathma jnaanam*, in *saasthraas*. He holds, that, the entire *Veda* teaches *karma alone* as *moksha saadhanaa* and, that, *jnaanam* is taught only as a means to perform *karma*, because, performance of any *karma* requires the knowledge as to when to perform *karma*, how to perform *karma*, how much *karma* to perform etc. According to this *karma vaadhin*, *jnaanam* is only an *angam* for *karma*, whether *kaayika*, *vaachika* or *maanasa*. "The central teaching of *Vedhaanthaa* is only *karma*; *jnaane thaathparyam naasthi*" he declares. This *poorva paksha vaadham* is being refuted by the *Achaaryaa*, in this portion, from verse 85.

- एवम् तावत् - Until now,
- निराकृतम् - I have refuted
- "मुक्तेः क्रियाभिः सिद्धत्वात्" इति - the *poorva paksham* presented in verses 9 to 13, starting with the phrase "*mukthe: kriyaabhi: siddhathvaath*"
- अथ - Hereafter,
- आत्म जानस्य सद्भावे प्रमाण अस्भवः - "(there is) absence of *Saasthric* support, with regard to *aathma jnaanam*"
- उक्तः - the person who states this
- तत् परिहाराय - for the negation of that person (the 2nd type of *poorvapakshin-abhyupedhya karma vaadhin*)
- आह – is being said now.

Chapter I: Verse 85 –

श्रुतयः स्मृतिभिः साकम् आनन्त्यात् कामिनाम् इह ।

विदधति उरुयत्नेन कर्मातः बहुकामदम् ॥ ८५ ॥

It is true that the *sruthis* along with the *smrithis*, enjoin elaborately, actions productive of manifold satisfaction of desires. That is because the world abounds in men of desire.

The *poorva pakshin* (2) says: "All scriptures – *sruthi*, *smrithi*, *ithihaasa*, *puraanaas* etc. - are taking lots of pains **only** to prescribe varieties of activities for the *vaidhikaas* – *kaayika*, *vaachika* and *maanasa karmaas*".

Sureswaraachaarya disagrees: "**Not all** scriptures. I accept that a bulky part / a big chunk of scriptures talk about *karma* only. I also accept that *karma* portion is predominant, while *jnaana* portion is smaller. But, certainly **not all** portions talk of *karma*". He adds: "*Karma* portion has to be bulky, because there are infinite 'finite' goals sought by human beings. Even a single individual has got numerous desires and the world is full of such humans. Therefore, the total number of desires and 'finite' goals of the entire humanity will, necessarily, be 'infinite'. *Karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaas*, the divine guide for performance of *karmaas*, has to be, therefore, bulky. But, do not say that *aathma jnaanam* is not there at all, in scriptures".

- श्रुतयः स्मृतिभिः साकम् - *Vedas* along with *smruthis*

Saakam - along with

- विदधति - prescribes
- बहुकामदम् कर्म - *karmaas* for fulfillment of varieties of desires,
- उरुयत्नेन - taking great pains / *bahu prayathnena*.

What is the reason for the *uruyathnam* or *bahuprayathnam*, in the *karma kaandaa* teaching?

कामिनाम् आनन्त्यात् - Because, desires are plenty.

45. Chapter I, Verses 85 to 88 (03-03-2007)

In this final portion of the 1st chapter, beginning from verse 85, Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the remaining *poorva pakshin*, among the three types mentioned – the *jnaanana anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*. This *poorva pakshin* was introduced in verses 14 to 19 and he is being refuted from verse 85 onwards.

In verse 85, the *Achaaryaa* is refuting the idea given in verse 14. The *poorva pakshin* had said: "When I look at the entire *Vedaa*, both *poorva* and *antha baaghaas*, I see only *karma vidhi* - varieties of injunctions dealing with varieties of *karma*. I do not see *jnaanam* as a primary part of *Vedas*". The *poorva pakshin* accepts that *jnaanam* is talked about, in some portions of the *Vedas*; "but", he contends "it does not have a primary value and has to be utilized only for performing *karma*. You cannot say that *jnaanam* is the theme of *Vedas*; *karma* is the theme. *Jnaanam* is only an *angam* of *karma* – *karmanaa angathvam*. *Jnaanam* cannot be said to be the *thaathparyam* of *Veda*; on the other hand, entire *Veda* has only *karma* as *thaathparyam*".

In reply, Sureswaraachaarya while conceding, that, *Vedas* are mostly dealing with *karma*, insists that *Vedas* deal with *jnaanam* as **the** prime topic. He says: "If the *karma* portion of the *Vedas* is bulky, it is understandable. Even a single human being has a number of 'finite' desires and, therefore, the sum total of the desires of the entire human race would naturally be huge. Hence, the *karma kaandaa* prescribing specifications for *maanasa*, *kaayika* and *vaachika karmaani* for fulfillment of desires pertaining to this world, as well as other worlds, will have to be large. On the other hand, *jnaanam* leading to the **only** 'Infinite' goal, does not vary from individual to individual. This is the reason why *that* portion of the *Vedas* which deals with *jnaanam*, is small, while, the *karma* portions dealing with the **numerous** 'finite' goals of the **numerous** humans is bulky. This cannot and should not lead to the conclusion that *Vedas* do not teach *jnaanam*".

The same idea is continued in the next verse also.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 86:

न च बाहुल्यं प्रामाण्ये कारणभावं प्रतिपद्यते । अत आह ।

But quantity is no criterion of truth.

The *poorva pakshin* may argue: "You accept that *Vedas* are predominantly talking about *karma* and much less about *jnaanam*. That means *karma* has more *veda pramaana vaakyaani* – *pramaana baahulyam* (the word *baahulyam* means "in abundance"); and, therefore, has more *pramaanam* than *jnaanam*, with respect to which, there is no

baahulyam, but, only *alpathvam*. *Karma*, having *pramaanam baahulyam*, is, therefore, **the** theme of *Vedas*. Therefore, there is no such thing as *aathma jnaanam*".

Sureswaraachaarya gives a technical answer. He says: "No knowledge can have greater *pramaanam* or lesser *pramaanam*, as suggested by you. Any knowledge will have only one *pramaanam* as support." Why? Because, any *pramaanam* has got only one field for its functioning. Other *pramaanams* do not have access to that particular field and, therefore, cannot function in that field and, therefore, cannot support that particular knowledge. An example is the functioning of the *pancha jnaana indriyaas*. Each one of the *indriyaas* functions only in its respective field. When an individual observes a flower, his eyes function in the field of the colour and form of the flower, his nose functions in the field of the smell of the flower and his skin or touch, in the field of the texture of the flower. What the eyes see, the nose cannot support or reject. One *indriyaa* cannot validate or invalidate another *indriyaa*. The individual gets the different components of the observed object, through the *pancha jnaana indriyaas* and 'integrates' them by his mind. The conclusion to be drawn from this, is, that, many *pramaanams* cannot or need not support 'one' knowledge, since, all of them do not function in one field.

An objection may be raised by the *poorva pakshin*, through an example. Suppose a person infers 'fire' from 'smoke' i.e. the 'fire knowledge' is got through 'inference'. Then, if the person goes out and *sees* the fire, he gets the knowledge of fire, through 'perception'. In this case, two *pramaanams* – *anumaanam* and *prathyaksham* deal with one knowledge – 'existence of fire'. The *poorva pakshin* may quote this and ask: "How can you, then, say that many *pramaanams* cannot deal with one knowledge?" The answer: "Scriptures do not agree (that different *pramaanams* can deal with one knowledge). In this particular instance, though two *pramaanams* indicate fire, they deal with different aspects of the fire. When the person 'saw' the fire, the 'perception' did not give him 'knowledge of the existence of the fire', which knowledge he already had, because of *anumaanam*. But, the 'knowledge' he received on 'perception', was the size and extent of fire; i.e. the two *pramaanams* – inference and perception, did not deal with 'one' knowledge, but two **different** aspects of the subject 'fire'"

"Therefore" Sureswaraachaarya says "you cannot say that *karma* has more *pramaanam* and *jnaanam* has less *pramaanam*, since any *pramaanam* gives only a particular knowledge".

- प्रामाण्ये - In the matter of validity,
- बाहुल्यं - abundance
- कारणभावं - as the reason / support,
- न प्रतिपद्यते - cannot be claimed.
- अत आह - Therefore, the author says:

Verse 86 – Chapter I:

प्रामाण्याय न बाहुल्यं न हि एकत्र प्रमाणताम् ।

वस्तुनि अटन्ति मानानि तु एकत्र एकस्य मानता ॥ ८६ ॥

Preponderance is no test of validity. The several modes of valid knowledge do not all converge to establish any one truth. Each mode of valid knowledge is confined to its specific subject-matter.

- **बाहुल्यम् प्रामाण्याय न (भवति)** - (Mere) abundance is no test of validity. (the implication, in this context: greater number of veda vaakyaani cannot prove validity of karma , as central theme of Veda.)
- **हि** - Why?
- **मानानि** - (pramaani) different instruments of knowledge (like prathyaksham, anumaana etc. and even within prathyaksham, the different indriyaas)
- **प्रमाणताम् न अटन्ति** - do not attain the position of pramaanam
- **एकत्र वस्तुनि** - in one common field.
- **एकत्र एकस्य मानता** - In one particular field, only one pramaanam has validity.

eg. 1: 'Ears' are incapable of supporting the 'eyes' in the field of form or colour.

eg. 2: Scriptures deal with religion and imperceptible entities, whereas, science deals with perceptible entities; in other words, each one of them operates in a different field. You cannot use science to justify or disprove *saasthraas*.

(This second example, incidentally, throws opens another topic. It is a great blunder to do scientific study to justify rituals, though, well-intentioned. "Benefits of rituals" are *adrishtam* – unseen and *apourusheyam* – not subjects for the human brain. Do not look for scientific benefit from rituals. The reason: *maanaani ekathra vasthuni pramaanathaam na atanthi*)

Similar to the examples quoted above, *karma* comes from *karma vaakyaani* in the *Vedas* and *jnaanam*, from the *jnaana vaakyaani*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 87 :

यत् उक्तम् "यत्नतः वीक्षमाणः अपि" इति - तत्र अपि भवतः एव अपराधः। कस्मात् । यतः ।

Your not finding, as you had said (in verse 15), any injunction with reference to knowledge, in spite of looking for it a great deal, is due to your own fault. For:

In the previous two verses (85 and 86), Sureswaraachaarya refuted the *poorva pakshin's* views stated in verse 14. In this verse (87), he is refuting the contents of verse 15.

- यत् उक्तम् - What you had said
- "यत्नतः वीक्षमाणः अपि" इति - in verse 15, starting with this phrase,

The *poorva pakshin* had said "When I study the *Vedas* deeply, I find that they talk about varieties of *karma* to be performed. Even application of knowledge is only for performance of activities- mental, physical etc. Mere knowledge, without application, is useless. Nor do I find *jnaanam* prescribed, in the *Vedas*".

- भवतः एव अपराधः - is your own flaw.

The *Achaaryaa* implies that the *poorva pakshin* has not studied the *Vedas* properly.

- कस्मात् - Why do I say so?
- यतः - I am giving the reason (in the following verse)

Verse 87 – Chapter I :

"परीक्ष्य लोकान्" इत्याध्या आत्मज्ञानविधायिनीः ।

नैष्कर्म्यप्रवाणाः साध्वीः श्रुतीः किम् न श्रुणोषि ताः ॥ ८७ ॥

Do you not hear the excellent *sruthi* texts, enjoining knowledge of the Self and oriented to freedom from *karma*, like the one which says 'after examining the worlds secured by merit, a *brahmana* should cultivate dispassion, as the eternal is not gained by the transitory works. and let him approach a preceptor for enlightenment etc.' ? (M.U. I.ii.12)

Sureswaraachaarya asks the *poorva pakshin*: "Have you not observed the predominant *sruthi vaakyaani*, such as the *Mundaka Upanishad* injunction (verse 12 – Section II – Chapter I), which says '*pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath na asthi akrutha: kruthena yadh vijnaartham sa gurum eva abhighachcheth samithpaani: srothriyam brahmanishtam*' – 'having examined the worlds which are achieved through *Karma*, a *Brahmin* should come to dispassion. The unproduced (*mokshaa*) is not possible through *Karma*. Therefore, to attain knowledge, he must necessarily approach, with *samith* in hand, a teacher who is learned in scriptures and established in *Brahmar?*'"

This *Upanishadic* injunction does not present *karma*, but, recommends withdrawal from *karma*.

- "परीक्ष्य लोकान्" इत्याध्या - Statements such as "pareekshya lokaan" etc.
- नैष्कर्म्य प्रवाणाः - that recommend withdrawal from karma
- आत्मज्ञान विधायिनीः - (and) prescribe only self-knowledge,
- किम् न श्रुणोषि - have you not heard

- ताः साध्वीः श्रुतीः- such valid sruthi statements?

Thaa: - Those (such); *saadhvee:* - valid /excellent / wonderful; *sruthee:* - *vedic* statements.

"*Jnaana pradhaana vaakyaani* **are** found in the *Vedas*. The *poorva pakshin* has not studied the *Vedas* properly" is the *Achaaryaa's* contention.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 88:

ननु" आत्मा इत्येव उपासीत" "आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः" इति अपूर्व विधि श्रुते :पुरुषस्य आत्मदर्शन क्रियायां नियोग अवसीयते इति । न एवम् । अपुरुषतन्त्रत्वात् वस्तुयाथात्म्यवज्ज्ञानस्य सकल अनर्थ बीज आत्म अनवबोध उत्सारिण :मुक्तिहेतो :इति। विधि अभ्युपगमे अपि न अपूर्व विधि :अयम् । अत आह ।

But, passages like "Let *Brahman* be meditated upon as *aathman*" (B.U. I .IV. 7) and "*Aathman* is to be seen" (B.U.II .IV .5) embody injunctions of what is not a matter of ordinary life and thus they inculcate action of the character of meditation. It is not so. The knowledge of Reality, which destroys the ignorance of the Self, the root-cause of all evil, and which is the means of release, is not dependent on human effort to be the theme of injunction. Even if it is admitted that we have an injunction here, it is not an injunction of something novel.

The *poorva pakshin* replies: "I have seen the *aathma jnaana vaakyaani*. But, they are not *karma thyaagha vaakyaani*. On the other hand, they also prescribe only *karma*, since *aathma jnaanam* itself is a type of *karma*. '*Mandavya: srothavya:*,' is a *Vedic* injunction, meaning 'the *mandha adhikaari* shall listen'. 'Listening', 'meditation' etc. are prescriptions for *karma* only".

- ननु - But, (the *poorva pakshin* says)
- "आत्मा इत्येव उपासीत" - the *Veda vaakyam* "may you meditate upon the *aathmaa*" (B.U.I. iv.7), "आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः" इति - (and) the *Veda vaakyam* "*aathmaa* has to be seen" (B.U. II.iv.5) etc.
- अपूर्व विधि श्रुतेः - are *Vedic* commandments to do **actions**.

"*Apoorva vidhi*" is the name of a statement giving a commandment to do an action.

The *poorva pakshin* contends that, the *vaakyam* "*aathmaa ithyeva upaaseetha*" prescribes *Upaasana Kriyaa* and the *vaakyam* "*aathmaa vaa arey dhrashtavya:*" prescribes *Darsana Kriyaa*. Self-awareness, *aathma darsanam*, is also looked upon by him only as an action. The *poorva pakshin* holds that *sruthi* injunctions, thus, prescribe only new "actions" as *saadhanaas*. He concludes that *Vedas* talk only of *karma* and not of *jnaanam*.

46. Chapter I, Verses 88 and 89 (10-03-2007)

(Sureswaraachaarya is in the process of refuting the views of the *poorva pakshin*, introduced in verses 14 to 19, from verse 85.)

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 88, the *Achaaryaa* takes up a possible argument of the *poorva pakshin*. The *poorva pakshin* might quote two phrases from the *Brahadhaaranayaka Upanishad* – "*Upaaseetha*" and "*drashtavya:*", as *vidhis*, i.e. commandments to "actions to be done". He will hold that *aathma dhyaanam* and *aathma jnaanam* also are only injunctions and will come under *karma* only. *Jnaanakaandam*, according to him, will come under *Jnaanakriyaa*. The *Vedic* exhortation "*Srothavya: mandhavya:*", he will consider, as prescribing only *kriyaa* of "listening", "contemplating" etc. He considers such statements as *apoorva vidhis* – statements giving commandments to do new actions. All those new action-prescribing statements/commandments are called *apoorva vidhis*. An example is the injunction to do *prokshanam* before *naivedhyam*. "Likewise" says the *poorva pakshin* "*aathma jnaanam* is also a 'new' action prescribed by *Vedas*. 'Knowing' is only *karma*".

- ननु - "But,
- पुरुषस्य - for the individual,
- आत्मदर्शनक्रियायाम् नियोगः - the undertaking of the "actions" of "self- knowledge" etc.,
- अपूर्व विधि श्रुतेः अवसीयते – is inculcated by the injunctions of the Vedas,
- "आत्मा इत्येव उपासीत" "आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्यः" – similar to passages "let Brahman be meditated upon as aathman" and "aathma is to be seen"
- इति - Thus, the *poorva pakshin* says.

Up to this is the *poorva pakshin's* statement.

The *Achaaryaa* is refuting this, using a few technical methods.

He first argues, that, *jnaanam* will not come under 'action'; not only *aathma jnaanam*, but, knowledge of **any** type, cannot come under 'action'.

It is true, that, the "bringing together" of the *pramaanam* (the relevant instrument) and *prameyam* (the object to be known), **is** *karma*; for instance, during *sravanam*, the "bringing together" of the mind and the subject listened to, is 'action'. Of course, the *pramaathaa* is also there; "bringing together" this *thriputi* – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* - **is** *karma*. But, **only upto this**, it is 'action', over which the *pramaathaa* has a choice. Beyond this, the 'knowledge' that 'results', because of this bringing-together of the *thriputi*, is not under the control of the *pramaathaa* and is, therefore, not 'action'.

Karma is done by the choice of the *kartha*, whereas *jnaanam* 'happens' without the choice of the *pramaathaa*. Expressing in a different manner, *karmendriya* function is the individual's choice; but the *jnaanedriya* function is **not**.

Your voluntary 'action', the *pramathru-pramaana-prameya* combination, results in 'knowledge', **which** is not based on your choice or wish.

- अपुरुषतन्त्रत्वात् - Because of non-dependence on human effort,
- वस्तु यातात्म्यक् जानस्य - in the matter of the rise of knowledge of the true nature of the Self, (i.e. in the matter of *aatma jnaanam*)
- सकल अनर्थ बीज आत्म अनवबोध उत्सारिणः - (which knowledge/ *jnaanam* is) the destroyer of self-ignorance, the root cause of all evil

sakala – all ; *anartha* - evil ; *bheeja* – seed / root cause ; *aatma anvabodham* – self-ignorance; *uthssari* – destroyer.

- मुक्ति हेतोः - and (which knowledge / *jnaanam* is) the means of liberation,
- नैवम् - what you have said (that, *aatma jnaanam* is an 'action' pursued by the seeker) is not right

The rise of *aatma jnaanam* and the destruction of *aatma ajnaanam* will **automatically** result, when the *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* are brought together, and, hence the use of the phrase *apurushathanthrathvaath*.

(The *pramaathaa*, referred to, here, of course, is the qualified 'knower', the *saadhana chathushtaya sampanna vidhyaarthi*, which explains why *all* seekers do not get *jnaanam*.)

"Since, therefore, *jnaanam* does not come under *karma*, no 'commandment' is possible, with regard to *jnaanam*. In other words, *jnaanam* is not subject to any sort of *vidhi*. Therefore, your view that it is a *vidhi*, is wrong" says the *Achaaryaa*.

This is the first part of the answer given by Sureswaraachaarya. He proceeds:

- विधि अभ्युगमे अपि – Even if it is accepted that a commandment is possible with regard to *jnaanam*, (This is only an assumption – not a fact).
- अयम् न अपूर्वविधिः - these *vidhivaakyaani* quoted from *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* will not come under *apoorvavidhi* (but, it may come under some other *vidhi*)

In *poorva meemaamsaa*, a commandment can come under any one of three types of *vidhis*: (1) *apoorva* (2) *niyama* and (3) *parisankhya*. Sureswaraachaarya says that the *Upanishad*

vaakyaani quoted by the *poorva pakshin* may come under *niyama vidhi* or *parisankhya vidhi* – but, **not** under *apoorva vidhi*.

Atha: aaha - Therefore, it is clarified:

Chapter I: Verse 88 –

नियमः परिसंख्या वा विध्यर्थोपि भवेध्यतः ।

अनात्मदर्शनेन एव परात्मानम् उपास्महे ॥ ८८ ॥

The injunction may be for completing an action being done without an injunction or for the exclusive specification of an alternative. We meditate upon the higher Self, by the exclusion of the perception of the non-Self.

Apoorva vidhi is “prescription of a new, unknown activity”. A *niyama* or *parisankhya vidhi*, in the *Vedas*, does not deal with unknown activities; but, with two or more ‘known’ activities.

The *Vedas* want to restrict the individual to some ‘known’ activities and exclude certain other ‘known’ activities from being performed; i.e. the *Vedic* injunction (*vidhi*) can command both ‘exclusion’ and ‘inclusion’ of ‘known’ activities.

When the emphasis of the injunction is on ‘inclusion’ of some known activity, with the ‘exclusion’ of another known activity ‘implied’, the injunction is *niyama vidhi*. For instance, the injunction “take bath in the early morning”, where the emphasis is on ‘inclusion’, (the ‘exclusion’ of ‘a late bath’ being only implied), is a *niyama vidhi*.

Conversely, when the emphasis of an injunction is on ‘exclusion’, the injunction is termed *parisankhya vidhi*. ‘Pari’ means ‘*parivarjanam*’ - ‘exclusion’, and ‘*sankhya*’ means ‘*jnaanam*’. The injunction imparting “Knowledge of the thing to be excluded” is *parisankhya vidhi*. To cite an example, in the injunction ‘*sathyam vadha*’, the emphasis is not on ‘speaking truth’ (though seemingly so) but on ‘**not** speaking untruth’. Such a *vidhi* is *parisankhya vidhi*.

On the basis of the above explanations of the three types of *vidhis*, what *vidhi* does *jnaanam* come under? *Aathma darsanam* and *anaathma darsanam* are both known to the student. Between the two activities, *Veda* wants to ‘include’ one (the *aathmadarsanam*) and ‘exclude’ the other (the *anaathma darsanam*). The *Bhagavadh Githaa* exhorts (verse 8 – Chapter V) – “*Pasyan srnvan sparsan jighran asnan gacchan svapan svasan, thathvavith yuktha: kinchith naiva karomi ithi manyetha*” - “while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing etc., the disciplined knower of Truth should understand ‘I do not do anything at all’”. Again in verse 18 – Chapter V, the *Bhagavadh Githa* states “*pandithaa: samadarsina:*”- “the Wise see the same *Brahmar*”, indicating, that, even when a

Vedhaanthin sees varieties of things, he should not forget the inherent *aathmaa*. The two injunctions are typical examples of *niyama vidhi*. Likewise, the *Upanishadic* quotation "*aathmaa vaa arey dhrashtavya:*" is also only a *niyama vidhi*.

Some *aacharyaas* consider that this injunction is a *parisankhya vidhi*. They argue that, a *niyama vidhi* is needed only when there is a chance of losing sight of *aathmaa*. For a sincere seeker, who is a *saadhana chathushtaya sampanna:*, the *aathma darsanam* is only natural (as natural as a *grihasthaa* worrying about his family). For such a student, the teaching has created such an impact, that, only *Vedhaanthic* thinking dominates. The injunction "*aatmaa vaa arey dhrashtavya:*", for such a person, is intended to recommend "*anaathma varjanam*" i.e. giving up or reduction of possessions, obligations, relationships and transactions. When viewed from this angle, the injunction is *parisankhya vidhi*. When the *vidhi* is considered as stressing "*aathma darsanam*" it is *niyama vidhi*. But, why this difficulty? The explanation is, that, the difference in classification under the two categories depends on the *adhikaari-* for *mandha adhikaaris* (beginners), it is a *niyama vidhi* and for *madhyama adhikaaris* (advanced students), it is a *parisankhya vidhi*.

"In any case, this is not an *apoorva vidhi*", Sureswaraacharya says.

- **विध्यर्थः अपि** - Even if the two statements (quoted by the poorva pakshin) are taken as commandments,
- **नियमः परिसंख्या वा भवेत्** - they will come under either *niyama vidhi* or *parisankhya vidhi* only.

"(Na **apoorva vidhi**: - **not** a new prescription)" is implied.

Self-awareness is not a new action; no teacher can prescribe it as a new action.

- **यथः** - Therefore,
- **अनात्मदर्शनेन एव** – by excluding *anaathma darsanam* (without getting carried away by worldly *vyavahaaraa*),
- **परात्मानम् उपास्महे** - let us remain in the field of meditation on the higher Self.

The perception should be of the *aathma-anaathma* binary mode and not of the triad mode of *jeeva-jagath-Iswara*.

Sambhanda gadhyam (part) to Verse 89:

यत् च उक्तम् "विश्वासः न अन्यतः अस्ति नः" इति - तदपि निद्रा आतुर चेत् त्वया स्वप्नायमानेन प्रलपितम् ।

Your statement "we have no faith in anything else" (15) is like the talk of one in dream, while asleep.

After refuting in verses 85 and 86, what was stated in verse 14, by the *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, Sureswaraachaarya is now refuting the views expressed in verse 15, from verse 87.

"नः विश्वासः अन्यतः अस्ति" - "For us, there is no faith in anything else (other than sruthi and smrithi)"

The *poorva pakshin* said that there is no proof for "*aham brahma asmi jnaanam*", in the *Vedas*. He further said: "'*Apourusha vishaye veda maathra pramaanam*' is an accepted maxim. '*aham brahma asmi*' statement or knowledge or conviction, is also an *apourusheya vishayam*, similar to *lokaas* like *svarga, naraka, pithruloka* etc. and rituals like *sraardha* etc. This being so, you have to resort only to *Vedas*, for information on the subject. Other instruments of knowledge, such as *prathyakshaa, arthaapatthi, anumaanam, upamaanam* etc. cannot prove or disprove it. Science also cannot establish this. *Vedas* talk only about *karma*; they do not give the knowledge '*aham brahma asmi*'. And, you (the *Vedhaanthin*) yourself say *karma* does not reveal *Brahman*. *Veda* is **not** proof of '*aham brahma asmi*'. Under these circumstances, how can I accept '*aham brahma asmi*'?"

(Mystic experiences also cannot be accepted by a traditional *Achaaryaa*.)

- इति यत् च उक्तम् - This statement of yours,
- तदपि - that statement also,
- त्वया प्रलपितम् - (is) your prattle,
- निद्रा आतुर चेतसा – made with the mind under the influence of sleep.

47. Chapter I, Verses 89 and 90 (17-03-2007)

In these verses, from 85 to 97, Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the second *poorva paksham*, which was introduced in verses 14 to 19. The *Achaaryaa* is taking up the verses of the *poorva pakshin*, one by one, for refutation. In verses 87 to 89, he is refuting the contents of verse 15.

The 2nd type of *poorva pakshin* is called the *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, who does not accept the very existence of *aathma jnaanam* or *brahma jnaanam*. He argues: "Vedas talk only of *karma*, of one type or another and not of *jnaanam*. To put it differently, *thaathparyam* of *Vedas* is only *karma* and not *jnaanam*. The subject of *aathmaa* or *brahman* is *apourusheyam* and not available for any *pourusheya pramaanam*. *Apourusheya veda alone* has to be depended on for guidance on the subject. Since *Vedic pramaanam* is not there, how can you ever believe in the existence of *brahma jnaanam* or *aathma jnaanam*; in fact, even in the existence of *brahman* or *aathmaa*? There is no such thing as *Brahman*. The very idea is only a *bhrama* (delusion)".

In the 2nd line of verse 15, the *poorva pakshin* declared "*na: anyatha: viswaasa: na asthy*" – "we have no faith in any *pramaanam* other than *Veda*". (He had already said, in the first part of the verse: "*yathnatha: veekshamaana: api jnaanasya vidhim sruthau smruthau vaa kvachith na pasyaami*" – "Either in *sruthi* or *smruthi*, do I see anywhere, injunction with reference to knowledge, in spite of looking for it, a great deal").

Sureswaraachaarya refers to this declaration ("*Yath cha uktham*" – "what you have said") as the prattle (*pralapitham*) of one, whose mind is overpowered by sleep (*nidra aathura chethasaa*), talking as though in a dream (*svapnaayamaanena*).

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 89:

किम् कारणम् न हि वयम् प्रमाणबलेन ऐकात्म्यम् प्रतिपद्यामहे ऐकात्म्यस्य स्वत एव अनुभवमात्रात्मकत्वात् । अत एव सर्वप्रमाणावतारासंभवं वक्ष्यति । प्रमाण व्यवस्थायाः च अनुभवमात्राश्रयत्वात् । अत आह ।

Why? We do not uphold the unity of Self on the strength of authorities, for it is a matter of intrinsic and immediate experience. That is the reason it is going to be shown that it is beyond all proofs and the order of proofs is itself solely dependent on immediate experience. Therefore, the text proceeds: (TEXT MEANING)

The *Achaaryaa* continues.

- **किम् कारणम्** - Why should we say that the *poorva pakshin's* statement (that 'I have no belief in *brahman* or *aathmaa*, since there is no proof for the existence of *brahman* or *aathmaa*') is 'prattle'?

Sureswaraachaarya explains the reason, as to why he considers the *poorva pakshin's* statement as 'prattle': "*Vedas* define *Brahman* as *jnaanasvaroopam* and *chaithanyasvaroopam* (of the nature of Consciousness). '*Sathyam-jnaanam-anantham brahma*' is the *vaakyam* in *Brahmaanandavalli* and '*Vijnaanam aanandam Brahma*' is a statement from *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*. In the *Veda antha bhaghaas*, *brahman* is revealed as *chaithanyam* or 'Consciousness'. Asking for the proof of *Brahman*, is, therefore, asking for the proof of *chaithanyam* or 'Consciousness'. But, it is 'Consciousness', **which** is the proof for the existence of everything in creation, in fact, even of the proofs that are being talked about. Then how can you talk of a proof **for** 'Consciousness'? 'Consciousness' is the unproved and unproveable **proof** for the existence of everything, including the very *pramaanams* you are talking about, *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa* etc. Have you not heard the *Vedic* declaration '*Yan manassa na manuthey yena aahur manomatham yath chakchushaa na pasyathi yena chakshoogumshi pasyathi thadeva brahma thvam viddhi*'- '*Brahman* is that very consciousness, which people do not know with the mind, but, by which the mind is known; *Brahman* is that very consciousness, which one does not perceive with the eye but, by which one perceives the eyes. Thus you understand' (*Kena upanishad* – verses 6 and 7 of Chap.I)? "

- न हि वयम् ऐकात्म्यम् प्रतिपद्यामहे- We do not uphold the unity of the Self,
- प्रमाण बलेन - with the help of Saasthraas/ on the strength of authorities.

Saasthra pramaanam need not and cannot reveal *brahman*, since the *saasthraas* themselves are revealed only by *brahma chaithanyam*. "*Yatho vaacho nivarthanthey apraapya manasaa saha*" – " Words, along with the mind, return without reaching that *Brahman*" - Verse 9 of *Brahmavalli* of *Thaithreeya Upanishad*.

There is also another reason for not depending on *pramaana balam*.

- ऐकात्म्यस्य स्वत एव अनुभवमात्रात्मकत्वात् - Since the experience of the Unity of the Self, is only intrinsic and natural.

Eikaathmyam – Unity of Self; *svatha eva* – only intrinsic / by itself; *anubhavam* – experience; *maathra* – only; *aathmakathvam* – nature.

Veda only negates duality; it does not reveal *chaithanyam* or non-duality. *Abrahmathva nivrithi eva saasthrasya prayojanam*.

- अत एव - Because of this only,

- **सर्व प्रमाण अवतार असंभवं वक्ष्यति** - the author is going to talk about the impossibility of revealing *Brahman*, by the employment of any *pramaanam*- any one of the *pramaanams*.

Brahman cannot, not only, be revealed by any *pramaanam*; It need not be revealed also, since It is always available.

Mahaavaakya vichaaraa is the subject to be discussed.

The *Achaaryaa* uses a term '*Pramaana Vyavasthaa*' in the next sentence, which term needs some explanation. The term means 'field of proving anything by the science of knowledge (epistemology) '.

Varieties of instruments of knowledge are used for the proof of the existence of a substance. The 'operation of a *pramaanam*' leads to 'generation of knowledge', which, in turn, gives the 'proof for the existence of an object'. This entire field is called epistemology - *pramaana vyavasthaa*.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "the very existence of this field presupposes the existence of a factor or medium – the Consciousness principle. We can talk of *pramaatha/ pramaanam/ prameyam* only in the presence of *chaithanya thathvam*".

An example is 'light', which is the medium for perception of objects. Should you prove the 'light' by using a perceptual operation? The very perception of objects, presupposes the presence of light. Then why do you require any other proof, for the existence of light?

Extending this example, all 'knowledge operations' (science of epistemology) or *pramaana vyavasthaa*, is possible **only** in the presence of Consciousness; And the *Vedas* declare that this Consciousness is *Brahman*.

- **प्रमाण व्यवस्थायाः च अनुभव मात्र आश्रयत्वात्** - since the dependence/ basis for all 'knowledge operations' is only Consciousness.

Pramaana vyavasthaayaa: - of all 'knowledge operations'; *Anubhavam* – in this context, means 'Consciousness'; *aasrayathvam* – dependence / basis.

No *pramaanam* is needed for the existence of *chaithanyam*, because, it is proved even before the start of consideration of any *pramaanam*.

- **अत आह** - Therefore, it is said:

Chapter I: Verse 89 –

वाक्य एकगम्यं यद्वस्तु न अन्यस्मात् तत्र विश्वसेत् ।

ना अप्रमेये स्वतः सिद्धे अविश्वासः कथम् आत्मनि ॥ ८९ ॥

What is solely ascertainable through the words of the scripture is not such that it calls for faith on other grounds. How can one refuse to believe in the Self, which is beyond all proof and is self-evident?

Sureswaraachaarya says: "You can talk about the necessity of proof with regard to *dharma/adharma*, *svargaa/narakaa* etc., since they are not available by *pourusheya pramaanam*. You need *Veda pramaanam* to prove them; expressing the same idea differently, '*veda vaakyam* alone is *pramaanam* for such objects. But, you cannot say the same thing about *aathmaa / brahman*, which **does not** require *saasthric* support, since *aathmaa/brahman* are only other words for *chaithanyam*, which is self-evident".

- यद्वस्तु वाक्य एकगम्यम् - In the objects, where only Veda is the support,
- तत्र - in such cases,
- विश्वसेत् - for believing / for ascertaining,
- न अन्यः - there is no other proof.

Science has not established the existence of a *sookshma sareeram* or the fact that, it is different from the *sthoola sareeram*. Then how do you know that the mind survives the body, travels to another body etc.? Only *saasthraas* are the *pramaanam*.

But, *aathmaa/brahman*, in other words, Consciousness, is different. It is self-evident.

- ना - For the humans,
- आत्मनि अविश्वासः कथम् – how can faithlessness in the Self be possible?

Aathmani – in the Self; *aviswaasa*: - faithlessness; *katham* - how.

How can a human being be without faith in *aathmaa*? Why?

- स्वतः सिद्धे: - Because the *aathmaa* is self-proven.

Once again, the example of light should be remembered. Light is 'taken for granted'. *Vedas* say the Consciousness is 'taken for granted', in the same manner.

- अप्रमेय - In the subject (the Self, in this context) which can never be revealed /objectified by any *pramaanam*.

In fact, *pramaanams* are revealed by Consciousness; the 'revealed' need not reveal the 'revealer'. With regard to such an *aathmaa*, how can there be non-belief?

This raises a question, not discussed by Sureswaraachaarya here, but relevant: "If *aathmaa* is self-evident, why should scriptures talk of *aathma jnaanam*"? The answer is, that, *Vedaantha* is not meant to reveal the existence of *aathmaa* (Consciousness); but, is meant to reveal the **nature** of Consciousness, that, Consciousness (1) is not a part / property / product of the body (2) is an entity independent of the body, pervading the body and lending it sentiency (3) is not limited by the boundaries of the body; but, exists beyond the body – thus not limited by space (4) continues to survive even after the fall of the body and thus, not limited by Time also and (5) though (Consciousness) continues to survive the fall of the body, it is not available for transactions, in the absence of the medium – the body.

An example (for easier understanding of this fact): When an individual looks into a mirror, is his object to prove the existence of his face? The individual has no doubt with regard to the existence of his face; he uses the mirror only to know the 'nature' of his face. Likewise, *chaitanyam* is *svatha: siddham*; the scriptures only reveal the 'nature' of Consciousness. Therefore, how can you doubt the existence of the Consciousness Principle?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 90:

यदपि उक्तम् "अन्तरेण विधिम्" इति - तदपि अबुद्धिपूर्वकम् इव नः प्रतिभाति । यस्मात् कालान्तर फलदायिषु कर्मः एतद् घटते। आत्मलाभकाल एव फलदायिनि तु आत्मज्ञाने न एतत् समञ्जसम् इति आह ।

The statement 'anything undertaken independent of injunction, for securing spiritual objectives, is like pouring oblations into ashes' (16) seems to us to be due to lack of understanding. That would apply only to actions productive of their fruits at a future date. It would not apply to knowledge of the Self, which produces its result simultaneous with itself.

Sureswaraachaarya goes to the next verse (16) of the *poorva pakshin*, in which, the *poorva pakshin* had raised a new question.

With regard to any *Vedic* injunction, the result of observing the injunction, is known based on the twofold *vaakyam* – *vidhi vaakyam* (prescriptions) or *nishedha vaakyam* (prohibitions). The direct result is not obvious to the follower of the injunction. For instance, the ritual *prokshanam* is *vidhi* and is supposed to produce *punyam*. Similarly, the *nishedha vaakyam* "*suraam na pibeth*", totally prohibits the consumption of intoxicants. Science does not *totally* prohibit intoxicants; but, *saasthraas* do, with the warning that such *nishiddha karmaas* (prohibited actions) produce *paapam*. But, the *punyam* resulting from observing the *vidhi*

vaakyam or the *paapam* resulting from the prohibited actions is not visible; only the *veda vaakyas* are the authorities for such *adrishta palan*.

As for *jnaanam*, Sureswaraachaarya had said (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 88) that there need be no *vidhi* or *nishedha* with regard to *jnaanam*. The *poorva pakshin*, therefore, asked: "If *brahma jnaanam* does not come under any *vidhi vaakyaa* or *nishedha vaakyaa*, you cannot talk of any positive or negative results for *brahma jnaanam*. So, even if there is something like *brahma jnaanam*, it will not give any result. It is *nishpalam*". The *poorva pakshin* likened this (in verse 16) to 'pouring oblations into ashes'. It may also be likened to offering a non-prescribed oblation into the *Homa*, say, an apple. Such oblations do not produce any result, since *Vedas* do not talk about them. Such actions (without *Vedic* prescription) is *nishpalam*.

Sureswaraachaarya counters this statement of the *poorva pakshin*, in these portions.

- यदपि युक्तम् - Another argument given by the *poorva pakshin*,
- "अन्तरेण विधिम्" इति – that ran "he who undertakes anything through delusion, independent of scriptural injunction, for securing spiritual objectives, gains no help thereby. His work is futile like pouring oblations into ashes",
- तदपि - that statement also,
- अबुद्धि पूर्वकम् इव - is one made without application of mind.
- नः प्रतिभाति - So it appears to us.
Na: - for us.
- यस्मात् - Why?
- कालान्तर फलदायिषु कर्मसु - In actions which produce results after a long time,
- एतत् घटते - this rule is applicable.

With regard to *brahma jnaanam*, one does not require any such *vidhi*, to talk about the *palan*, because, even without any *saasthra vaakyam*, *jnaana palan* (result of knowledge) is known to us. It is a *dhrushta palan* – visible result.

What is the result? When *jnaanam* comes, *ajnaanam* goes. That 'when light is switched on, darkness goes away' is obvious. It does not require *saasthra vaakyam*. What is the further benefit of removal of darkness? With the removal of darkness, darkness-caused problems also go away.

Likewise, when *aathma jnaanam* comes, *aathma ajnaanam* goes away and the consequences of (i.e. problems caused by) *aathma ajnaanam* also go away. This is a *dhrushta palan*.

48. Chapter I, Verses 90 and 91 (24-03-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, (whose views were presented in verses 14 to 19), in these verses starting from 85 up to 97.

This 2nd *poorva pakshin* is called *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, who says that there is no such thing as *aathma jnaanam* teaching at all, in the *Saasthraas*. "Even if there is any mention of *aathma jnaanam*, it is a not a primary teaching; but, is to be utilized only as an *anga* of *karma*. *Karma* being the *angi*, the *thaathparyam* of the *Vedas* goes to *karma* only. *Aathma jnaanam* is **not** the central theme of *Vedas*. There are only *vidhi nishedha vaakyaas* in the *Vedas*, prescribing or prohibiting *karma* - but not *jnaanam* " maintains this *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this. He says: "In *Jnaana kaandaa*, there are several sentences, which prescribe *jnaanam* as the end in itself, and talk only of *jnaanam*, like '*pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath na asthi akrutha: kruthena thadh vijnaanaartham sa gurum eva abhigaccheth samithpaani: srothriya brahma nishtam*' (*Mundakopanishad* – I. ii . 12); therefore, *jnaanam* is **the** *thaathparyam* of the *Vedas*. The portions on *jnaanam* may not be voluminous; but, *jnaanam* **is** the central theme of the *Vedas*. Of course, there can be no *vidhi* with regard to *jnaanam*, since *jnaanam* is not subject to one's will and where will is not possible, *vidhi* also is not possible. To repeat: while *jnaanam* **is** the central subject of the *Vedas*, since *jnaanam* is not subject to any *vidhi*, *Vedas* do not and need not contain any *vidhi*, with regard to *jnaanam*".

The *poorva pakshin* responds: "If there is no *vidhi* with regard to *jnaanam*, it would mean that there can be no *palan* also for *jnaanam*. *Vidhivaakya karmaas* produce positive results, in the form of *punyam*, while *nishiddha karmaas* produce negative results, in the form of *paapam*. If *jnaanam* does not have *vidhi vaakyaas* or *nisheda vaakyaas* talking about it, it can have no positive or negative results and the portions covering *jnaanam* are equivalent to *artha vaadha baaghaas*, which have neither *vidhi* nor *nisheda* and which produce no results. When such is the case, how can you claim any *palan* for *jnaanam*?"

Sureswaraachaarya answers this in verse 90. In the introduction to the verse, he says: "You do not require *vidhi* (positive statement) or *nishedaa* (prohibiting statement) to know what is *jnaana palan*, because *jnaana palan* is already known to every one, by experience. *Jnaana palan* is not *adhrishta palan* – but always *dhrishta palan*, experienced by every one, every day."

What is the *palan* of *jnaanam*? Ans: *Ajnaana nivritthi*.

Any *jnaanam* removes the relevant *ajnaanam*. "Yadh vishayaka jnaanam labhyathey thena jnaanena thadvishayaka ajnaanam apagacchathi ithi drishtam palam. Thadhartham kimartham vidhi: nishedha: vaa apekshathey?" - "When knowledge about any subject is acquired, then, because of that knowledge, the ignorance about that subject goes away' is a commonly experienced fact. In that case, why do you have to seek *vidhi* or *nishedham*?. Neither will be required.

Sureswaraachaarya, therefore, says: "Kaalanthara paladhaayishu karmasu ethath gatathe" - "What you say will apply only with respect to the *adrishta palan* of the *karmaas*, which give results much later, either in this life or even in subsequent births". And continues:

- त – Whereas,
- आत्मज्ञाने - in the matter of aathma jnaanam
- आत्मलाभकाले एव फलदायिनि - which gives it result, even at the time of uthpatthi:(adjective to aathma jnaanam)

Aathma laabha: - *Janma* or *uthpatthi*; *paladhaayini* – which gives results.

- एतत् न समञ्जसम् - this rule (that *vidhi* or *nishedhaa* is required for knowing the result) is not applicable .
- इत्याह- This is being said (in the verse that follows)

Aathma jnaanam produces its result (*ajnaana nivritthi*), instantaneously on its very rise, similar to darkness going away instantaneously, when light is switched on. And, similar to one's physical actions becoming easy because of the removal of darkness, the moment *aathma jnaanam* arises, that very moment, there is mental relaxation; stress and tension are got rid of. This is the subsequent and obviously, more important result of *aathma jnaanam*.

Verse 90 – Chapter I:

जानात्पले हि अवाप्ते अस्मिन् प्रथ्यक्षे भवघातिनि।

उपकाराय तन्नेति न न्याय्यम् भाति नः वचः ॥ ९० ॥

When this consummation of knowledge, destructive of bondage, can be attained as a matter of immediate perception, to speak of knowledge as 'being of no help as it is without any supporting injunction' (16), does not seem to us to be in accordance with any reason.

- जानात् प्रथ्यक्षे फले अस्मिन् अवाप्ते- When visible result can be attained instantaneously from acquisition of aathma jnaanam,

Jnaanaath – from *athma jnaanam*; *prathyakshe pale* - instantaneous visible result; *avaapthe* – when attained.

What *prathyaksha palan*? Ans: Destruction of *samsaaraa*.

- **भवघातिनि** - Destroyer of *samsaaraa* (adjective to *jnaana palan*)

How can you say that *jnaana palan* is *prathyaksham* (instantaneously perceived)?

Ans: The *jnaani* becomes free from *sareerathrayam*, immediately on acquiring *jnaanam*. *Jnaana kale eva*, the *jnaani* becomes a *nithya videha aathmaa*. He is not obsessed with the future of his *sthoola* or *sookshma sareeram*. Concern for *sthoola* and/or *sookshma sareeram* is *deha abhimaanam*, which leads to *punar janmam*. *Jnaanam*, thus, rids the *jnaani* of the *deha abhimaanam* instantaneously and *punarjanma* later.

Therefore:

- "तत् उपकाराय न" इति वचः - the (poorva pakshin's) statement that "jnaanam will not benefit the jnaani",
- न न्याय्यम्- (is) not at all proper
- नः भाति - (so) it appears to us.

"Your statement does not appear to be correct to us" says the *Achaarya*, to the *poorva pakshin*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 91:

यदपि जैमिनीयम् वचनम् उद्धाटयसि- तदपि तद्विवक्षापरिजानात् एव उद्भावयते । किं कारणम् । यतः न जैमिनेः अयम् अभिप्रायः आम्नायः सर्व एव क्रियार्थः इति । यदि हि अयम् अभिप्रायः अभविष्यत् "अथातो ब्रह्मजिजासा । जन्माध्यस्य यथः" इत्येवमादि ब्रह्म वस्थु स्वरूप मात्र याथात्म्यप्रकासनपरम् गम्भीर न्याय सम्द्रुढम् सर्व वेदान्तार्थमीमांसनम् श्रीमच्छारीरकम् न असूत्रयिष्यत् । असूत्रयः च ।

The reference to Jaimini's statement appears to be due to not comprehending his intention (17). To Explain: it cannot be the opinion of Jaimini that the entire Veda subserves action. If this were his opinion, he would not have composed the sacred *saareeraka soothraas* beginning with the aphorisms, 'Then, therefore, inquiry into *Brahman*', '*Brahman* is that from which the origin etc. of this world proceed', which embody inquiry into the import of the whole of *Vedhaanthaa*, enshrine a profound logic and which aim at setting forth the essential nature of the *Brahman*-reality. But, he has composed that treatise.

Sureswaraachaarya takes up verse 17, for refutation. In this verse 17, the *poorva pakshin* referred to a *soothraa* by Jaimini Maharishi, who was a disciple of Vyaasaachaarya, in his *Poorva Meemaamsaa Saasthram*, which text is in the form of *soothraas*. The *soothra* referred to, is: "*Aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*", which means "since the entire *Veda* is dealing with *kriyaa (karmaa)*, any statement, presenting only facts and not presenting *karma* is useless (redundant)". "*Athadhartha vaakyam*" is a "factual statement - a non-commandment statement".

"Commandment statements are fruitful statements. Factual statements are not fruitful statements" is the *poorva pakshin's* stand, based on Jaimini. An example (already cited, in another context) is the factual statement "there is water in the container". The *poorva pakshin* holds, that, the mere **knowledge** that, there is water in the container, does not give any result. But, if a commandment "access and drink the water" is given, followed by the **action** of accessing the water and drinking it, the result of 'quenching the thirst' is achieved. "Likewise, "*thathvam asi*" is also only a factual statement and not a commandment. There is no use of repeating the statement *thathvam asi*" says the *poorva pakshin*.

Some philosophers recommend meditation on *mahaa vaakyaa* as a *karma* to be practiced; and, hold, that, the *punyam* resulting from the meditation will give *mokshaa*. Yet another group of philosophers converts *mahaa vaakyaa japa* into a *karma*, which *japa*, according to them will give *punyam*, in turn, giving *mokshaa*.

But, *Vedhaanthins* believe that "*soham*" is meant neither for meditation nor *japa*; but, is intended for *vichaaraa* and assimilation.

The *poorva pakshin*, on the other hand, considers the statement "*thathvam asi*" itself, as redundant, based on his interpretation of Jaimini. This is being referred to, here.

- *यद् जैमिनीयम् वचनम् उद्धृत्यसि* - That statement of Jaimini, being presented by you,
- *तदपि* - that reference also ,
- *उद्भावयते* - is made (by you),
- *तद् विवक्षा अपरिज्ञानात् एव* - because of ignorance (on your part) of the implied intention / significance of Jaimini's statement.

Vivakshaa – 'implied' (not explicitly stated) intention; *aparijnaanam* – ignorance.

The *Achaaryaa* tells the *poorva pakshin*: "Behind Jaimini's *soothra*, there is an implied idea, not understood by you".

- *किम् कारणम्*- Why do I say so ?

Meemaamsaa is *Vedic* analysis - analysis of *Vedic manthraas*. Jaimini's *soothraas* are called *Poorva Meemaamsa Soothraas* i.e. those who analyze the *Poorva Baaghaa* (i.e. *karma kaandaa*) of the *Vedas*. Jaimini's *guru*, *Vyaasaachaarya*, on the other hand, has authored *Utthara Meemaamsaa*, the analysis of the latter part of the *Vedas* – the *Jnaana Kaandaa*. The very titles indicate that, Jaimini has limited himself to the analysis of the *karma kaandaa*, while, *Vyaasaachaarya* has analysed only the *Jnaana kaandaa*. *Sureswaraachaarya* points out, that, when, therefore, Jaimini uses the word '*aamnaaya*:', he has referred only to the *poorva baaghaa* of the *Vedas*- not to the *poorna Vedas* or the *utthara baaghaa* of the *Vedas*.

A simple example: The word 'day' has two different meanings, in the two statements 'a day consists of 24 hours' and 'he works day and night'. The contexts, in which the word is used, make the difference. This 'contextually curtailed meaning' is termed '*samkuchitha artha*:'.

Similarly, "though the general meaning of the word *aamnaaya*: is *Veda*, in the context of the use by Jaimini Maharishi, the word would mean only the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedas* and not the *poorna veda*. In the *karma kaandaa*, *vidhi* alone has significance; factual statements are redundant. But, in *jnaana kaandaa*, *vidhi* is **not** required, factual statements are *not* redundant and therefore, the statement '*thathvam asi*' is meaningful" holds *Sureswaraachaarya*.

- यतः- Because,
- जैमिनेः अभिप्रायः न - (when writing this soothra) Jaimini's opinion is **not**
- "आम्नायः सर्व एव क्रियार्थः" इति- that the **entire** *Veda* is meant only for *karma*.

While using the word *aamnaaya*:, Jaimini has not intended the word to mean the entire *Veda*, but only the *Veda Poorva Baaghaa*. This intention of his, is very clear, because, if Jaimini had intended the word to mean both *Veda Poorvam* (*karma kaandaa*) and *Veda antham* (*jnaana kaandaa*), then he would have made *Vyaasaachaarya's Utthara Meemaamsa Soothraas* redundant. But, how can the devoted *sishtyaa* make his revered *guru's* teachings redundant or meaningless? He would certainly not dare to enter the territory of his *guru*. Therefore, *Sureswaraachaarya* says:

- यदि हि अयम् अभिप्रायः अभविष्यत्- If Jaimini's intention were to cover the entire *Veda*, through his *Poorva Meemamsa Soothraas*,
- श्रीमाच्छारीरकम्- the holy *Utthara Meemaamsaa* (of *Vyaasaachaarya*)
- न असूत्रयिष्यत् - would be meaningless.

Very powerful descriptions are given by Sureswaraachaarya for the *Uttthara Meemaamsaa* (i.e. for *Sreemath saareerakam*.)

The first description is about the purpose of the *Brahma soothraas*.

- "अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा" - "Then, therefore, inquiry into Brahman" (the first soothraa of the Brahma Soothraas),
- "जन्माध्यस्य यतः"- "Brahman is that from which the origin etc. of this world proceed" (the second soothraa of Brahma Soothraas),
- इत्येवमादि- with such soothraas,
- ब्रह्म वस्तु स्वरूप मात्र याथात्म्य प्रकासनपरम् - that reveal the fact about the Reality-nature of the Paaramaarthika sathya Brahman,

Vasthu – *paaramaarthika sathyam*; *svaroopam* – nature; *yaathaathmyam* – fact; *prakaasanaparam* - revealing.

The *soothraas* reveal *paaramaarthikam*. By dwelling on the *paaramaarthikam* itself, the resulting clarity of knowledge will make all the *saadhanaas* redundant. The 'clear knowledge' should not encourage the seeker to do *saadhanaas*; but, should make all *saadhanaas* redundant, because *saadhanaas* are meant for *future mokshaa*, whereas, the 'clear knowledge' has already made *mokshaa*, the very, very real nature of the seeker. The more the clarity of knowledge, the less the tendency to resort to *saadhanaas*. "I have clear knowledge; I am doing *nidhidhyaasanam* to remove *vipareetha bhaavana*" is also a wrong statement, since, 'clear knowledge' includes understanding *vipareetha bhavanaa* as *mithyaa* and there is no question of removing *mithyaa*.

While *sruthis* reveal the true nature of *Brahman*; it is supported by 'reasoning' also.

गम्भीर न्याय सन्दुब्धम् - well reinforced by deep reasoning.

Gambheera – deep; *nyaaaya* – reasoning / logic; *samdrubdam* - well reinforced / well corroborated/ well substantiated / well clarified.

The first chapter of the *Brahma Soothraas* is *sruthi pradhaanam*, while, the 2nd chapter is *yukthi pradhaanam*.

Clear understanding is the only requirement, completing the process of liberation. Nothing else need be done. The understanding is: "I was free; I am free; I will ever be free".

सर्व वेदान्तार्थ मीमांसनम्— the result of the analysis of the entire Vedhaanthaa (another adjective to *sreemath saareerakam*)

Meemaamsanam - analysis. *Brahma soothraas* of Vyaasaachaarya, the *Achaaryaa* points out, is the result of the analysis of the *Veda Antha* portions.

"The *sreemath saareerakam* of such glory would become meaningless, if Jaimini had used the word *aamnaaya*: to indicate the entire *Veda*" is the *Achaaryaa's* objection.

Saareerakam – *sareerey bhavam* / residing in the body as *chaithanyam*.

The *Brahma Soothraas* deal with *brahman* and hence, are referred to as '*sreemath saareerakam*', here.

- असूत्रयः च – But, separate Utthara Meemaamsa soothraas have been composed (making it clear, that, Jaimini has not covered the entire Veda, in his soothraas)

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 90:

तस्मात् जैमिनेः एव अयम् अभिप्रायः यथैव विधिवाक्यानाम् स्वार्थमात्रे प्रामाण्यम् एवम् ऐकात्म्यवाक्यानाम् अपि अनधिगतवस्तु परिच्छेद साम्यात् इति । अथ इदम् अभिधीयते ।

Therefore, the idea of Jaimini, must have been, that, just as Vedic injunctions have validity in their sphere of application, the passages of Vedhaanthaa, speaking of the unity of the aathman, must be recognized as valid in their sphere, for, there is similarity between the two, in so far as both propound what transcends other modes of knowledge. Therefore, the following is stated:

Therefore, we have to receive the rules properly. The rules are: (1) In *karma kaandaa*, all commandment statements are fruitful, while factual statements are redundant. (2) In *Jnaana kaandaa*, there are no commandment statements; there are only factual statements and the factual statements in *jnaana kaandaa* are fruitful. You have to only clearly **understand** the statements; you have nothing to **do**.

49. Chapter I, Verses 91 and 92 (31-03-2007)

In these verses, beginning from verse 85 and up to verse 97, Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, the *anabhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, who does not even accept *aathma jnaanam* and whose views were presented in verses 14 to 19. The *Aachaaryaa* is analyzing these verses (14 to 19) and refuting them, one by one.

From verse 91, the 17th verse is being refuted. Verse 17 is a 'technical' verse, wherein, the *poorva pakshin* quoting a *Jaimini Soothram* – "*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*", argued that Jaimini had said that the *Veda* is dealing with only *karma* as its main theme, and, therefore, even if *aathma jnaanam* is mentioned anywhere in the *Veda*, it does not have any importance; nor is it of any use, by itself. "Knowledge has to be utilized for some *karma*; i.e., knowledge can only be an *angam* of *karma*. Ultimately, *karma alone* has to give one *purushaartha* or other. All *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* (of the *Vedas*) which produce knowledge in the mind, are useless by themselves. If they are to be useful, they have to be linked to *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani* i.e. to statements prescribing one activity or another. Ultimately, *karma alone* will give benefits" is the stand of the *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraachaarya refuted this. He first points out: "Jaimini had not written about the entire *Veda*. Jaimini's *meemaamsaa* is not called *Veda Meemaamsaa*- but, *Poorva Meemaamsaa*, which means 'analysis of the *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* (or *Karma Kaandaa*'. It is *Vyaasaachaarya* who has analyzed the *Veda antha*, through his *Utthara Meemaamsa Soothraas* i.e. *Brahma soothraas*. Since Jaimini has limited himself to the *karma kaandaa*, whenever he uses the word *Veda*, it can mean only the *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* or *karma kaandaa* "

The *Aachaaryaa* proceeding further, tells the *poorva pakshin*: "In *karma kaandaa*, your rule, that '*siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* and knowledge derived from them, are useless by themselves; they have to be connected to *karma*, is acceptable."

The well known example, is the description of *svargam* – which is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, giving detailed descriptions of heaven. This information, by itself, the *svarga jnaanam*, is useless; it has to be connected to the *vidhi vaakyam* "*jyothistomena svarga kamo yajetha*", indicating that an aspirer for heaven, should do the *Jyothistoma Yaagam*, to achieve his purpose.

But, then, this rule is not applicable to all cases. There **are** situations where knowledge, **by itself**, is fruitful, without the need for any *karma*. *Kevala jnanam* **does** give benefits often. Several examples are there: one is the well-known *rajju jnaanam*, which, instantaneously on

its rise, removes the misconception of snake, the consequent fear etc. Another example, that may be cited, is the situation when an individual suspected to be ailing from a serious physical disorder, is subjected to medical tests. Till the results are known, the individual undergoes mental agony; but, once the results reveal that he is free of the suspected disorder, the very knowledge removes the agony and stress, without any follow-up action.

The *Achaaryaa* continues: "As opposed to the *karma kaandaa*, the *jnaanam* given by *jnaana kaandaa*, is not governed by any *vidhi*. Nor has it to be followed by any *karma* or *kaaryaa*. The *jnaanam* **itself directly** gives benefits; the benefits being *adhyasa nivritthi* and the consequent freedom."

- तस्मात्- Therefore,
- जैमिनेः अयम् एव अभिप्रायः - Jaimini's intention is only this much.

What intention?

- यथैव - In the manner similar to
- विधिवाक्यानाम् स्वार्थमात्रे प्रामाण्यम्- the Vedic injunctions having validity in their sphere of application,

Vidhivaakyaani – Vedic injunctions for *karma*; *svarthamaathre* – in their own sphere of field of application/ i.e. in the sphere of *karma*; *praamaanyam* – validity.

In the *karma kaandaa*, if there is a *siddhabodhaka vaakyam*, it will be considered *apramaanam* (invalid) i.e. *kevala jnaana janaka vaakyam* in the *karma kaandaa* is useless. But, this is **only** in *karma kaandaa*.

- एवम् ऐक्यात्म्यवाक्यानाम् अपि (स्वार्थमात्रे प्रामाण्यम्) - in the *jnaana kaandaa*, the *siddha*

bodhaka vaakyaani, the statements that reveal the fact that there is only one *aathmaa* in reality, have validity in *their* sphere.

Eikaathmya vaakyaani – means "statements that declare 'there is only one *aatmaa*; everything else is *mithyaa*'". *Eikaathmyam* means *Aathma ekathvam* i.e. *jeevathma-paramaathma eiykam* **and** *jeevaathma-jeevaathma aiykyam*.

The term "*Svaarthamaathre praamaanyam*" – "valid in their own sphere" is to be re-used, to draw the meaning properly. "In the *jnaana kaandaa*" is also supplied.

The essence is that "*vidhi vaakyaani* are valid in the field of action and, likewise, *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are valid in the field of *jnaanam*". How can one come to this conclusion?

- अनधिगत वस्तु परिच्छेद साम्यात् - Since there is similarity between the two in so far as they reveal subjects, which transcend other modes of knowledge

Anadhigatha – Unknown; *vasthu* – subject; *paricchedha* – revealing; *saamyam* – similarity.

Karma kaandaa teaches “unknown” (*apoorva*) rituals. *Jnaana kaandaa* teaches “unknown” (*apoorva*) facts (about *aathmaa*). Both are dealing with *apoorva vishaya*-unknown facts. In the aspect of “teaching of *apoorva vishaya*”, the two *kaandaas* have similarity (*saamyam*).

But, in the matter of ‘knowledge’, the knowledge received through *jnaana kaandaa*, is fruitful without any follow-up *karma*. Only in the *karma kaandaa*, the knowledge received should be followed up by corresponding action, if it has to be fruitful. The *poorva pakshin* has to restrict this rule to *karma kaandaa* and cannot extend it to *jnaana kaandaa*.

- इति - This should have been the intention of Jaimini.
- अतः इदम् अभिधीयथे - Therefore, it is said.

Verse 91 – Chapter I :

अधिचोदनम आमनायः तस्यैव स्यात्क्रियार्थता ।

तत्वमस्यादिवाक्यानाम् ब्रूत कर्मार्थता कथम् ॥ ९१ ॥

Whatever is affirmed as supplementary to injunctions subserves the purpose of action. How can statements like ‘That thou art’, which do not belong to this category, be construed as contributory to action?

All problems have resulted because of the ‘misunderstanding’ of Jaimini’s *soothram*. Sureswaraachaarya says that the word ‘*aamnaaya*.’ should be understood properly.

- आमनायः - The word ‘*aamnaaya*.’, appearing in Jaimini’s *soothram*,
- अधिचोदनम् - is connected only with *karma kaandaa*.

Chodhanam – *vidhi* (denotes *karma kaandaa*, in this context).

Why so? Because, Jaimini has analyzed only the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedas*, since, his *guru* has already analyzed the *jnaana kaandaa*. Jaimini will not enter his *guru’s* territory.

- तस्यैव - Only with respect to *karma kaandaa*,

- क्रियार्थता स्यात् - there is the possibility of teaching karma.

Karma can be taught only in *karma kaandaa*. In *jnaana kaandaa*, no new *karma* is taught. In fact, *Upanishads* even talk of the futility of *karma* – as in the well-known *manthraa* – “*na karmanaa na prajaya dhanena thyaagena eke amruthathvam aanasu:*” – “It is through renunciation (*karma thyaaga:*) that a few seekers have attained immortality – not through ritual, not through progeny nor wealth”.

Jnaana kaandaa reveals the fact “I am a *nithya akarthaa*”. How can such a *jnaanam* induce me to act?

- तत्वमस्यादिवाक्यानाम् - For *jnaana kaandaa* statements, such as “That thou art”
- कथम् कर्मार्थता - how can karma be the teaching?
- ब्रूत - Tell me (addressed to the *poorva pakshin*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 92 :

अपि च । ऐकाग्र्यपक्ष इव अद्रिष्टार्थ कर्मसु भवत्यक्षे अपि प्रवृत्तिः दुर्लक्ष्या । यतः । (TEXT)

And again, just as the theory of the unity of the Self precludes action, even on your theory, actions productive of unseen results become inconceivable, for: (TEXT MEANING).

Sureswaraachaarya takes up the *poorva pakshin's* arguments in verse 18, in which verse, the *poorva pakshin* had said that the *Veda* had talked about only *karma* and never of *aatma jnaanam*. “You have to continue to do *vaidhika karma* throughout your life. *Sanyaasaa* is not the teaching of *Veda*; it is not even acceptable to the *Veda*” the *poorva pakshin* held. In support, he quoted the 2nd *manthaa* of the *Isaavaasya Upanishad* – “*Kurvan eva karmaani jjeevisheth satham samaa:*” – “Doing actions, let him desire to live for a hundred years”. Since “one hundred years” is considered *poorna aayu:*, according to this *manthraa* and the *poorva pakshin* quoting this *manthraa*, life-long *karma* is essential.

Then what about the *sanyaasa aasramaa*? The *poorva pakshin* says, that, the *sanyaasa aasramaa* is prescribed only for those who cannot do *vaidhika karma*, because of physical or mental infirmities. “The entire *Veda* preaches **only karma**” is the *poorva pakshin's* view.

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this view of the *poorva pakshin*, in five verses, 92 to 96. The course of the refutation can be briefly summarised, as below:

Sureswaraachaarya asks the *poorva pakshin*: “You are talking about *vaidhika karmaas*. Varieties of *yaagaas* are prescribed in the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedas*. Many of the rituals are for attainment of higher *lokaas*, mainly *svarga*. At the time of the performance of such

rituals, what is your expectation? If you want to attain *svarga*, who are 'you' going to *svarga*? If you say, 'I want to go to *svarga*', what is the meaning of the 'I'? Generally the body is referred to, as 'I'. But, the body is cremated and reduced to ashes, on death. Then how do 'you' hope to go to *svarga*?"

The *poorva pakshin* replies: "I do not say I am the body. I claim to be the *dehavyathiriktha aathmaa*, the Self different from the body".

The *Achaaryaa* will question: "But, who is doing the rituals? Whoever does the *karma* alone will get the *palan*."

The *poorva pakshi* has to reply: "I, the *dehavyathiriktha aathmaa*, is the *kartha*, who will leave the body and go to *svarga*." (It follows that, the *aathmaa* becomes a *bokthaa* also).

Sureswaraachaarya's question: "Since, from what you say, the *aathmaa* is different from the body, what is the nature of that *aathmaa*?"

The *poorva pakshin's* answer is similar to that of an *advaitin*: "*Aathmaa nithya: sarvagatha: cha*" – eternal and all-pervading.

Later, the *poorva pakshin* says "there are **many** eternal, all-pervading *aathmaas*" – 'many' and 'all-pervading' being obvious contradictions. Even ignoring this claim of the *poorva pakshin*, the *poorva pakshin* is proved wrong, by the *Achaaryaa*, who asks "Can that eternal, all-pervading *aathmaa* be a *karthaa* or a *bokthaa*?"

The *aathmaa* cannot do any action, since the *aathmaa* does not have *karma adhikaaram* (i.e. *varnaasrama dharma*), *karthruthvam*, *karma pala sambhandham* or *bokthruthvam*. "*Veda* can never prescribe *karma* for you, since you are *akartha*, *anadhikaari* and *abokthaa*" says the *Achaaryaa*.

Till now, Sureswaraachaaryaa was saying that the *jnaana kaandaa* does not preach *karma*. Now, he goes a step further and says "not only *jnaana kaandaa*, but even *karma kaandaa* cannot prescribe *karma*, since you are *akartha*, incapable of *karma*. **No** part of the *Veda* is meant to prescribe *karma*; *Veda's* only aim is to teach you the fact that you are *akartha-anadhikaari-abokthaa aathmaa*. **Jnaanam alone** is the teaching of the entire *Veda*. There is no other teaching at all".

The *poorva pakshin* naturally questions: "If *Veda* does not prescribe *karma*, then what about all the *vidhivaakyaani* in the *Vedas*? "*Jyothistomena svarga kaama yajetha*", "*kurvan eva iha*

karmaani jiveevisheth”, “*ahar aha: sandhyaa upaaseetha*” are all *Vedic* exhortations. What about these statements?”

Sureswaraachaarya answers: “You should interpret *Vedas* properly. They are not meant to teach *karma*. Since *Vedas* know that you are *akartha-abokthaa*, they will **not** prescribe *karma* for you. In fact, *Vedas* want to teach you that you are *akartha-abokthaa*. But, before receiving the teaching, every individual has *abhimaanaa* for the body and because of the *abhimaanaa*, he also has the notion that he is *karthaa-bokthaa*. Because of this strong *deha-abhimaanaa* and the strong *karthruthva-bokthruthva* attitudes, the individual engages in *karma*. At this stage, because of his pre-occupation with *karma*, he does not even stop to listen to the *Vedic* teaching, that, he is the *akartha-aboktha-aathmaa*. Therefore, to create confidence in the people’s mind about *Veda*, *Veda* bears with the ‘ignorance’ of the people and temporarily accepts *karthruthvam* and *bokthruthvam*. *Vidhi vaakyaani* are called *anuvadha vaakyaani*. Such temporary acceptance by the *Veda*, because of its compassion for humanity, should not be misconstrued as ‘teaching’; nor should such statements be looked upon as *pramaanam*”.

The *Mundakopanishad* (verse 12 – Sec. II – Chap. I) exhorts: “*pareekshya lokan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath nas asthi akrutha: kruthena | Thadh vijnanaartham sa gurum eva abhigachcheth samithpaani: srothriyam brahma nishtam*” - “having examined the worlds, which are achieved through *karma*, a *brahmin* should come to dispassion. The unproduced *mokshaa* is not possible through *karma*. Therefore, to attain knowledge, he must necessarily approach, with *samith* in hand, a teacher who is learned in scriptures and established in *Brahmar*”. While this is a *pramaana vaakyam*, the *Isaavaasya manthram* “*kurven eva iha karmaani jiveevisheth*”, is **not** a *pramaana vaakyam*, but, only an *anuvadha vaakyam*, temporarily accepting the human ignorance. This fact is brought out by Adi Sankara, in his *Isaavaasya Upanishad Bhashyam* for this *manthraa*.

Veda says: “As long as you look upon yourself, as a human being, you are a *karthaa*. This is because of the *deha abhimaanam* of the human being. And, as long as you have the *deha abhimaanam*, you have to do *karma*. Once you realise the truth about *aathmaa*, *karma* is not necessary. The *jnaanam* liberates you”.

- भवत् पक्षे अपि - Even according to your view,
- प्रवृत्तिः - venturing
- अद्रिष्टार्थ कर्मसु— into vaidhika karmaas, that lead to adrishta palan,
- दुर्लक्ष्या – is not possible/ is inconceivable,
- ऐक्यात्म्यपक्ष इव - similar to the impossibility (or inconceivability) of engagement in Karma, in Jnaana kaandam.
- यतः - because,

In both systems, *karma* is not possible, since *aathmaa* is *akartha* /*anadhikaari*/ *aboktha*. “*Karma* is only for the ignorant; come out of *karma*; gain knowledge; be free” is the exhortation of Sureswaraachaarya, in the verses that follow.

50. Chapter I, Verses 92 to 94 (07-04-2007)

Chapter I: Verse 92 –

स्वर्गम् यियासुः जुहुयात् अग्निहोत्रम् यथाविधि ।

देहादि वित्थापितस्य एवम् कर्तृत्वम् जैमिनेः कथम् ॥ ९२ ॥

How can on Jaimini's theory, an agent of action of the kind enjoined in the passage, 'He who wants to reach heaven must perform *agnihotra* sacrifice, in the proper order', perform it when he transcends adjuncts like the body?

In these verses, from verse 85 to 97, Sureswaraacharya is refuting the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, who presented his views in verses 14 to 19. The *Acharya* is taking up each verse of the *poorva pakshin* and refutes the contents. The 2nd *poorva pakshin* is the *abhyupedhya karma vaadin*, who says that *aathma jnaanam* does not exist at all and that, it is *karma* alone that can give liberation and therefore, *Veda* is teaching *karma* alone, as *saadhanaa* for liberation.

Sureswaraacharya is refuting the contents of verse 18, in five verses, 92 to 96.

What was the *poorva pakshin's* contention in verse 18? He quoted the second *manthraa* from the *Isaavaasya Upanishad*, "*kurvan eva iha karmaani jijeevisheth satham samaa:*" – "a *vaidhika* should live the full span of a hundred years, performing the *vaidhika karmas* without fail". The *poorva pakshin* claims that, the emphasis of this *manthraa* is not only on compulsory performance of *karma*, as indicated by the use of the word *eva*: (the *Bhagavadh Githa* – verse 5 – Ch. XVIII, also states: "*yagnya dhana thapa: karma na thyaajyam thath kaaryam eva thath*" – "activity in the form of *jagnyaa*, charity and austerity should not be given up; it has to be performed necessarily") but, also that, this compulsory performance of the *vaidhika karma* is to be adhered to, for the individual's **full** life span of one hundred years. "*Karma* is compulsory; *karma* is universal; *karma* is life-long; therefore, *karma* is the primary teaching of *Veda*" is the *poorva pakshin's* argument.

Sureswaraacharya refutes this powerful argument, in five verses. Adi Sankara had also, earlier, negated this argument of the *poorva pakshin*, in his *Isaavaasya Upanishad Baashyam* for the 2nd *manthraa*, but briefly. Sureswaraacharya expands that brief negation in these verses and also explains how *Vedas* should be understood.

The *Acharya*, first, talks about the nature of *athmaa*. The *poorva pakshin's* understanding of the nature of *aathmaa*, is not different from that of the *Vedhaanthin*. According to the *poorva pakshin* also, as for the *Vedhaanthin*, the *aathmaa* is *akartha*,

abokthaa, asanga: and *varna aasrama rahitha:* The corollary of this fact, is, that, *aathmaa* cannot be associated with *karma*. This is the first stage of Sureswaraachaarya's arguments.

The 2nd stage: The *aathma jnaani* also cannot be associated with *karma*. How do you say this? *Aathma jnaani* is one who claims that he is the *aathmaa* i.e. he is equal to *aathmaa* and therefore, he is also *akarthaa, abokthaa, asanga:* and *varna aasrama rahitha:* The *aathma jnaani*, also, cannot, therefore be associated with *karma*.

The 3rd stage of the *Aachaaryaa's* arguments, is, that, since the *aathma jnaani* cannot be associated with *karma*, it follows that *karma* can be associated only with *aathma ajnaanis*. All *karmaas* are prescribed only for *ajnaanis*.

There are a few more stages of the argument, which will be taken up later.

These three stages (*aathma* has no association with *karma*, *aathma jnaani* has no association with *karma* and therefore, *karma* is meant only for *ajnaanis*) are based on the *poorva pakshin's* own philosophy on *aathmaa*; not only on the *Vedhaanthin's* philosophy.

These three stages are being dealt with the *Aachaaryaa*, in these five verses.

In verse 92, the *Aachaaryaa* questions as to how the *deha vyathriktha aathmaa* can perform rituals?

- **स्वर्गम् यियासुः जुहुयात् अग्निहोत्रम् यथाविधि** - One who desires svarga should perform the agnihothraa ritual, exactly as prescribed.

Yiyaasu: - (yaathum ichhu:) – the one who desires to attain; juhuyaath - should perform; yathaa vidhi - exactly as prescribed.

- **एवम** - Through this sruthi vaakyam,
- **देहादि वित्थापितस्य** - for the jeevathmaa who is separated from the three bodies – sthoola, sookshma and kaarana,

Viththaapitha: - extracted out (intellectually – not physically)

When the performer of the *agni hothraa* ritual desires to go to *svarga*, he obviously accepts that 'he' is different from his body, since, he is aware, that, his body will be cremated after his death and therefore, his body cannot go to *svarga*; i.e. the concept of *deha vyathiriktha aathmaa* is accepted by the *poorva meemaamsaka*, who is a staunch believer in rituals.

The *poorva meemaamsaka* also accepts that the *jeevaathmaa* is *nithya*: (eternal) and *sarvagatha*: (all-pervading), like *aakaasaa*. (This aspect is not mentioned in this verse.)

- कथम् कर्तृत्वम् (भवेत्) - how can there be karthruthvam?

Just as *aakaasaa* cannot do any *karma*, *aathmaa* also cannot do any *karma*.

In the *Baghavadh Githa*, *aathmaa* is considered *akartha-aboktha*, according to *Vedhaantha darsanam*. Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that the *aathmaa* is *akartha-aboktha*, even according to the *poorva meemaamsa darsanam* and asks the *poorva pakshin* "katham aathmana: karthruthvam?" and also,

- (कथम्) जैमिने: (कर्तृत्वम् भवेत्) - How can *karthruthvam* be there for Jaimini also, who is an *aathma jnaan*?

Aathmaa does not have *karthruthvam*. *Aathmajnaani* also does not have *karthruthvam*. These first two stages of the argument have been covered, in this verse.

The same idea is repeated in the following verses also.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 93:

न च प्रत्याख्यात असेषसरीरादि कर्मसाधन स्वभावस्य आत्ममात्रस्य कर्मसु अधिकारः । यस्मात् ।

And, surely the pure Self, which is devoid of all instruments of action like the body, cannot be the fit subject to undertake action. Further: (TEXT MEANING)

In this verse, Sureswaraachaarya wants to say that *aathmaa* does not have *varna aasramaa* – it is *varna aasrama atheetha*: He tells the *poorva pakshin*: "All *vaidhika karmas* are based on *varna* and *aasramaa* qualifications. But, even according to your own *poorva meemaamsaa*, the *nithya sarvagatha aathmaa* cannot have *varna* or *aasramaa*. Because of this, *karma adhikaaraa* is not there for *aathmaa* and therefore, *aathmaa* cannot perform any *karma*. It follows that, the *aathmajnaani* also cannot have *karma*, since he is also *varna-aasrama atheetha*."

A verse in Adi Sankara's *Nirvaana Dasakam* runs: "Na varnaa na varnaasrama achaaradharmaa: na me dhaarana dhyaanayogaaadhya: api anaathmaasroyaham mama adhyaasa: naasthi thadh eko vasishta: siva kevaloham", wherein, the *aathmajnaani* claims "I am *varna aasrama atheetha*;: what *karma* can I do?". The difference is, again, that, the *Nirvaana Dasakam* claim is based on *Vedhaantha darsanam*, while, in these verses, the *Achaaryaa* points out, that, the absence of *varna* and *aasramaa*, and, therefore the

ineligibility to do any *vaidhika karma*, of both *aathmaa* and *aathmajnaani*, are based on the *poorva meemaasaka darsanam*.

(An incidental topic: The injunction that every *vaidhika karma* requires the corresponding *varna* and *aasramaa* qualifications, is the reason why inter-caste weddings create problems, with regard to the *vaidhika* rituals to be followed to solemnize such a wedding.)

- **आत्म मात्रस्य** - For the pure *aathmaa*, (which has no association or contact with any of the three *sareerams* – similar to space that cannot have association with anything.)

Verse 33, Ch. XIII of the *Bhagavadh Githa* compares *aathmaa* to space: " *Yathaa sarvagatham saukshmyaath aakaasam na upalipyathey sarvathra avasthitha: dehe thathaa aathmaa na upalipyathey* " – " Just as the all-pervading space is not affected due to its subtlety, so also, the Self, which is present in every body, is not affected".

- **प्रत्याक्यात असेष सरीरादि कर्म साधन स्वभावस्य** - (which is) free from all the three *sareeraas*, (and, therefore) from all instruments required to perform *karma*.

Prathyaakyaatha – free from; *asesha* – without exception / all; *karma saadhana*-instruments for performance of *karma*.

All instruments for *karma*, such as *jnaanedriyaas*, *karmendriyaas*, *pancha praanaas* and *antha: karanam* belong to the *sookshma sareeram*. Since *aathmaa* is free from all the three *sareerams*, including *sookshma sareeram*, it is free from the instruments also. How can such an *aathmaa* perform any *karma*?

Na cha karmasu adhikaara: - there is no qualification / eligibility to perform *karma*.

And, therefore, an *aathma jnaani* also has no eligibility to perform *karma*.

Chapter I: Verse 93 –

सर्व प्रमाण असम्भाव्यः हि अहम्वृत्ति एक साधनः ।

युष्मदर्थम् अनादित्सुः जैमिनिः प्रेर्यते कथम् ॥ ९३ ॥

How can Jaimini, who (as pure self) is incomprehensible through the ordinary modes of valid knowledge, is to be approached only through ego-consciousness, and is separated from every non-Self, be enjoined to act by any injunction?

- **कथम् जैमिनिः प्रेर्यते** - How can Jaimini (an *aathma jnaani*) be compelled (to do any action)?

Why cannot Jaimini be persuaded to do *karma*? Because, he is an *aathma jnaani*, who claims to be *aathmaa*, whose nature is explained here.

- **सर्व प्रमाण असम्भाव्यः** - Inaccessible to all pramaanams.

Aathmaa = *aathma jnaani* and is therefore = Jaimini. Even *saasthra pramaanam* cannot address Jaimini, an *aathma jnaani*. *Manthra* 9 of the *Brahmavalli* (*Thaithreyopanishad*) runs: "Yatho vaacho nivarthanthe | apraapya manasaa saha" – "words, along with the mind, return without reaching that *Brahmar*".

- **युष्मदर्थम् अनादित्सुः** - Unassociated with anything (*sareerathrayam*)

"*Yushmath*" means "you" and "*artham*" means "object"; "*yushmadhartham*" means "objects of the word 'you'". In the *saasthraas*, the word *yushmadhartham* is used to mean "everything other than the 'seer' / everything *dhrusyam* / (ultimately meaning) all *anaathmaa*". *Asmadhartham* means "the 'seer' / *dhruk* / *aathmaa*."

"*Aadhitsu:*" means "capable of association with" and "*anaadhitsu:*" means "incapable of association with". *Aathmaa* is incapable of association with any *anaathmaa* and therefore has no relationship with the *sareerathrayam*. And, Jaimini is the *sareethraya vilakshana sarvapramaana agochara aathmaa*.

If *aathmaa* is not available for description, how can *Vedas* teach about *aathmaa*?

- **अहम् वृत्ति एक साधनः** - *Aatmaa* is not directly accessible; it is accessible only indirectly through the *ahamkaaraa*, otherwise called *thvampadhaartham*.

Saadhana: - in this context means *pramaanam*.

Such an *aathmaa* and such an *aathma jnaani* cannot be associated with *karma*. How can *Veda* prescribe *karma* for such a *jnaan!*? *Karma* prescriptions are only for *ajnaanis*? (A remark in lighter vein by Swami Suddhaananda is "Rules are only for fools"; while this may be applicable in worldly matters, only in a lighter vein, in *Vedhanthaa* it is a fact that *karma* injunctions are only for *ajnaanis*.)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 94:

प्रवृत्ति कारण अभावाः च । यस्मात् ।

And, again, there is no cause for action; for: (TEXT MEANING)

The same teaching is given in a different manner. In the previous *sloka*, (verse 93) Sureswaraachaaryaa said: "*aathmaa* is *varna aasrama rahitha:*", and, in the earlier verse (verse 92) "*aathmaa karthruthvarahitha:*".

In this verse, Sureswaraachaarya says "*aathmaa* is *bokthruthva rahitha:*". All *karmas* are performed only for *karma pala praapthi:* and *karma pala bogartham*, i.e. for the corresponding result of the *karma* and for enjoyment of the results of the *karma*. All *karthaas* are engaged in *karma*, only with the aim '*sukham*'.

Sureswaraachaarya asks: "Can *aathmaa* be associated with *sukha boghaa* or *sukha vishayaa*?" Since *aathmaa* is, like space, *asanga:*, it cannot be associated with any sense pleasures. If you are interested in *aathma aanandaa*, you should be free of sense pleasures.

Aathmaa cannot have *bokthruthvam*; *aathma jnaani* also cannot have *bokthruthvam*. When he cannot have *bokthruthvam*, why should he perform *karma*, at all? The motivation for *karma* is sense pleasures. When a *jnaani* does not have sense pleasures, he does not have the motivation for performance of *karma*. How, then can he engage in any *karma*?

In the Bhagavadh Githa, verse 55 –Chapter II, refers to the *sthitha pragnya:* as "*sarva kaamaan parijahaath*" – "gives up all the desires" , while , verse 17 – Chapter III declares: "*Ya: thu aathmarathi: eva syaadh aathmthruptha: cha maanava: aathmanyeva cha santhushta: thasya kaaryam na vidhyathe*" – "The man who loves the Self alone, who is happy with the Self alone, and who is contented with the Self alone, has no *karma* to be performed by him" . The *jnaani*, having given up all his desires, (*bokthruthva abhaavaath*) has no motivation to perform any *karma*.

- प्रवृत्ति कारण अभावाः च - The motivating reason for pravrutthi (karma) is not there (for a jnaani)
- यस्मात् - Because,

Verse 94 – Chapter I :

सुखदःखादिभिः योग आत्मनः न अहमा ईक्ष्यते।

पराक्त्वात् प्रत्यगात्मत्वात् जैमिनिः प्रेर्यते कथम्॥९४॥

Pleasures and pains are not associated with the Self. They affect the ego. As they are external and objective and as Jaimini is the inner self-luminous principle, how can be actuated to act?

Aathma does not have *bokthruthvam*.

आत्मनः सुखदःखादिभिः योगः न ईक्ष्यते – For aathmaa contact with sense pleasures is not seen.

Yoga: - in this context, means contact / relationship / *sambhandha*:

Aathmaa cannot be related with the pains and pleasures created by the senses, since it is *asanga*: (Though both pain and pleasure are mentioned in the verse, 'pain' is not important, in this context. '*Aathmaa* cannot be related with pleasures' is the more important fact.)

Then, who enjoys the sense pleasures, if it is not *aathmaa*?

- (सुखदःखादिभिः योगः) अहमा (ईक्ष्यते) - the pains and pleasures are connected with ahankaaraa only / i.e. mind only.

Why?

Sense pleasures are *anaathmaa* and therefore, can be associated with the *anaathmaa* mind only – only *anaathmaa* and *anaathmaa* can have relationship, with each other; *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* cannot. Expressing differently: 'Perceived attributes' can belong only to 'perceived objects' – never to the 'perceiver subject'.

- पराकत्वात् – (dhrusyathvaath) / because they are external and 'perceived'

No sense pleasure can belong to the 'perceiver' *aathmaa* - it can belong only to the perceived mind.

- प्रत्यक् आत्मत्वात् - and, because, aathmaa is the subject – the 'perceiver'.

Prathyak – dhruk / the subject.

When I perceive an orange coloured cloth, the orange colour belongs only to the cloth – not to the perceiver.

- जैमिनिः कथम् प्रेर्यते – (This being so) How can Jaimini be persuaded to act?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 95 and Verse 95:

किनच ।

न तावध्योग एवास्ति शरीरेण आत्मनः सदा ।

विषयैः दूरतः नास्ति स्वर्गादौ स्यात् कथम् सुखम् ॥९५॥

And again: In the first place, there is no association between the body and the Self. From the objects, the Self is further removed. Then, how can the Self undergo pleasure in conditions like heaven?

किन्च - Moreover.

The *Achaaryaa* reiterates the same idea that *aathmaa* / *aathma jnaani* cannot have motivation for *karma*, since sense pleasures are not for them, but, for the mind only.

One may argue: "I need not do *karma* for myself (*aathmaa*); but, I can do *karma*, for the sake of the pleasures of my mind".

Answer: "To say 'my' mind, it requires a connection. *Aathmaa* can claim something as 'mine', only if it has connection with the claimed object. But *aathmaa* is *asanga*: - it has no relationship with any *anaathmaa*. It cannot claim 'my' mind. Further, *aathmaa* being all-pervading, whose mind can it claim to be its own? "I' am the Consciousness Principle, in whom all minds are there" is the claim of the *aathma jnaani*. Therefore, *aathmaa* cannot work for the pleasure of any particular mind; so also the *aathma jnaani*, who claims to be the *aathmaa*. If I work for the pleasure of a particular mind, I am an *ajnaani*".

51. Chapter I, Verses 95 to 97 (14-04-2007)

In these verses, from verse 85 to 97, Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, who gave his views in verses 14 to 19. The 2nd *poorva pakshin* is the *anabhyupedyā karma vaadhin*, who does not at all accept *aathmajnaanam* as main teaching of the *Vedas* and claims that *karma* alone can give liberation.

Sureswaraachaarya is refuting this *poorva pakshin*, verse by verse. He had refuted verses 14 to 17, in verses 85 to 91. The 18th verse is being refuted in verses 92 to 96 (five verses). In these verses, Sureswaraachaarya points out that *karma* can never be the central teaching or central theme of the *Vedas* - not only of the *jnaana kaandaa*, but, even of the *karma kaandaa*. Earlier, it was said that *karma* is not the central theme of the *jnaana kaandaa*, and that, it may probably be a central theme of the *karma kaandaa*. Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that *karma* is not a central theme of the *karma kaandaa* **also**.

Then, how do you explain the 2nd verse of the *Isaavaasya Upanishad* – "*kurvan eva karmaani jjeevisheth satham samaa*:" – "Perform *karma* throughout the full life span of 100 years"? How do you account for this?

Sureswaraachaarya answers this, step by step.

First, he said, that, *karma* cannot be associated with *aathmaa* even according to the *poorva pakshin*, because, (1) *aathmaa* does not have *karthruthvam* (2) *aathmaa* does not have *varna* and *aasramaa* – i.e. *adhikaaraa* for *karma* and (3) *aathmaa* cannot enjoy the *palan* of *karma*. *Karthruthva abhaavaath*, *varna aasrama adhikaara abhaavaath* and *bokthruthva abhaavaath*, *aathmaa* is not associated with *karma*.

The next step – *aathma jnaani* also cannot have *karma*, since he claims to be *aathmaa*. Whatever is applicable to *aathmaa* is applicable to the *aathma jnaani* also – *thayo: aikyathvaath*.

The third step is, therefore, that, all *karmaas* are directed to *ajnaanis* only.

In verse 92, the *Achaaryaa* had said, that, *aathmaa* does not have *bokthruthvam* and therefore, cannot enjoy *karma palan*. If so, who enjoys the sense pleasures? It is the 'mind'. The *poorva pakshin*, in reply, may say: "All right! Then let me work for the enjoyment of my mind". In reply, Sureswaraachaarya points out (verse 95): "*Aathmaa* cannot work for its mind also, because, *aathmaa* being *asanga:*, it is not related to anything, including the mind, to claim anything, including the mind, as its own. The word 'my' can be used, only with a 'second' object, with which I have some relationship. But, *aathmaa* does not have any

relationship with anything – mind, body, sense organs included and, therefore, it has no connection with sense pleasures. *Bokthruhvam* is not possible directly or indirectly for *aathmaa* and *aathma jnaani*. How can *Vedas*, therefore, prescribe *karma* for a *jnaani*?" How can Jaimini say "*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam*"?

- **आत्मनः शरीरेण योगः एव तावत् न अस्ति** - In the first place, *aathmaa* does not have connection with the body itself

Thaavath - firstly / in the first place; *Yoga*: - *sambhandha*: /relationship.

When I have no connection with the body itself, how can I have connection with sense-objects, which are connected with the body?

- **विषयैः (योगः) दूरतः न अस्ति** - Association with sense objects is not there even indirectly.
- **स्वर्गादौ सुखम् कथम स्यात्** - How can *aathmaa* enjoy sense pleasures in heaven?

"Then, why should *aathmaa* / *aathma jnaani* perform any *vaidhika karma*?" is the implied question.

Conclusion: All prescriptions for *karmaa* are directed towards only *ajnaanīs*. If *ajnaanīs* are proud of *Vedic* rituals, they are only proclaiming their ignorance, as if it is a merit. It is amazing to note that, it is Sureswaraachaarya, a *mahaa-karma-kaandi* earlier, who makes this statement against *karma*. We can understand what a drastic change his thinking had undergone, because of the effective teachings of his *guru*, *Adi Sankaraachaarya*.

"All ritualists are embodiments of ignorance" is said in the next *sloka*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 96 & Verse 96"

यस्मात् अन्यथा न उपपद्यते ।

नराभिमानिनम् तस्मात् कारकाधि आत्मदर्शिनम्।

मन्त्र आह उररीकृत्य "कुर्वन्" इति न निर्द्वयम् ॥९६ ॥

As it is thus impossible of explanation otherwise: The hymn (I.U. 1.2. in verse 18), "Doing actions let him live for a hundred years" is addressed to one, who imagines himself to be a human being and sees factors involved in action as the Self itself and not to one who understands himself as the pure Self without a second

- **यस्मात् अन्यथा न उपपद्यते** - Therefore, there is no other way (other than ours) of interpreting this *sloka* (of the *Isaavaasya Upanishad*)

What is the interpretation? "That, the *manthraa* is addressed to *aathma ajnaanis*".

- तस्मात् - Therefore (since there is no other interpretation possible)
- मन्त्रः "कुर्वन्" इति – the manthraa (the 2nd verse of Isaavaasya Upanishad) starting with "kurvan ithi karmaani",

(The *manthra* had been quoted, by the *poorva pakshin*, in verse 18, in support of his views on *karma*.)

- आह – addresses,
- नर अभिमानिनम् - the one who claims "I am a human being" i.e. an *ajnaani*/ one with *deha adhyaasa*:

In *Vedhaanthic* vision, one who claims to be a human being, is an *ajnaani*. The person who claims to be *aathmaa* is, alone, a *jnaani*. Body-identification reveals self-ignorance.

But, how do you know that the *manthraa* is addressed to *nara abhimaan*? Answer: Look at the *manthraa* carefully. It uses the word 'narey' – i.e. a human being who considers himself as a human being, because of *deha abhimaanam*. *Sareera abhimaanam* means *varna aasrama abhimaanam*, resulting in the need to perform *vaidhika karma*.

- कारकाधि आत्मदर्शिनम् (आह) - (addresses) one who identifies himself with all accessories for *karma*.

Kaarakaani – various accessories for *karma*, such as *pancha jnaandriyaas*, *pancha karmendriyaas*, *mana:*, *buddhi:* etc.

Praana maya kosaa, *mano maya kosaa* are all *kaarakaas* – connected with *karma*. A *jnaani* claims "I am *akaaraka aathmaa*" and renounces all *karma*.

- उररीकृत्य (नर अभिमानिनम् कारकाधि आत्मदर्शिनम्) - Taking into account / considering (such *ajnaanis* - *nara abhimaani*, *kaarakaadhi aathma darsi* etc.)
- न (आह) निर्द्वयम् - (does) not (address) the one who understands himself as the pure Self without a second (i.e. an *aathma jnaani*)

Majority of the humans are *ajnaanis*.

(Verse 3 – Chapter VII, of the Bhagavadh Githa : "*Manushyaanaam sahasreshu kaschith yathathi siddhaye yathathaam api siddhaanaam kaschith maam vetthi thathvatha:*" – "Among thousands of human beings, a rare one strives for liberation and even among those seekers, who strive, a rare one knows Me in reality").

Sureswraachaarya says that the *Isvaasya manthra*, quoted by the *poorva pakshin*, has been given, out of consideration for such *ajnaanīs*.

[The following discussion, not in the text, but, analyzed by the *Achaaryaas* elsewhere, is relevant here:

Once you know that *karma kaandaa* is prescribed only for ignorant people, 'life-long *karma*', can never be the main teaching prescribed by the *Vedas*. Why not? Because, if you say, that, *Veda* is prescribing life-long *karma*, and, that, *karma* is meant for the *ajnaanīs*, it would mean that *Veda* expects you to be a life-long *ajnaani*. But, *Veda* cannot perpetuate ignorance. Can the aim of *Veda* be "perpetuation of ignorance"? *Veda* is considered a *pramaanam*; the definition of *pramaanam* itself is 'generator of knowledge' and the aim of any *pramaanam*, can, therefore, be only "destruction of knowledge". How can *Veda*, being a *pramaanam*, perpetuate ignorance? Therefore, *karma kaandaa's* central theme is not *karma*.

If it is so, what is the aim of *karma kaandaa*? The *Advaitin* believes that *karma kaandaa's* aim is to lead the seeker to *karma vairaaghyam*. By putting people through *karma*, it wants to generate *vairaaghyam* in the minds of the people. Once *vairaaghyam* develops, the *jnaana kaandaa* takes over and generates *jnaanaa*, **which** is the primary purpose of the *Vedas*. What knowledge is generated? That, I have no association with any *karma* at all. The *Mundaka Upanishad* (verse 9 – Sec II – Ch. II) declares: "*Ksheeyanthe cha asya karmaani thasmin dhrushte paraavare*" – "when that *Brahman* , which is in the form of cause and effect is seen, all his (such a *jnaani's*) *karmaas* wear out".

The next doubt is: How do you know that the aim of *karma kaandaa*, is not *karma*, but, *karma vairaaghyam*? Ans: Through the verses in the *Vedas*, similar to verse 12- Sec. II – Ch. I of the *Mundaka Upanishad*, "*Pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath'*"- which implies "having performed *karma* and having gone through the *karma palan*, which are full of *doshaas* (defects) such as *anithyathva dosha* (impermanent), *dhu:kha misrithathva dosha* (mixed with pain or misery) and *bhandhakathva dosha* (creating attachment or addiction) , one should give up *karma*, at the earliest and proceed to acquire *jnaanam*".

This is more explicitly stated in verses 7 to 9 – Sec. II – Ch. I , of *Mundaka Upanishad*: "*Plavaa: hi ethe adhrudaa: yagnyaroopaa: ashtaadhasoktham avaram yeshu karma yethath sreya: ye abhinandhanthi moodaa: jaraamruthyum they puna: eva yanthi | Avidhyaayaam antharey varthamaanaa: svayam dheeraa: panditham manyamaanaa: janghanyamaanaa: pariyanthi moodaa: andhena eva niyamanaa: yathaa andhaa: | Avidhyaayaam bahudhaa varthamaanaa: vayam kruthaarthaa: ithabhimanyanthi baalaa: yath karmina: na pravedhayanthi raaghaath thena aathuraa: ksheena lokaa: chyavanthe.*" - "Those eighteen

constituents of *Yagnyaa*, mentioned in the scriptures, upon which rests the inferior *Karma*, are fragile floats indeed. Those who acclaim this as a means for *mokshaa* are indiscriminate. They enter old age and death, again and again. Steeped in ignorance and considering themselves to be wise and learned, these indiscriminate ones, who are intensely afflicted, move about like the blind being led by the blind | Remaining variously in ignorance, these 'children' claim "we are contented", because these ritualists do not 'know', due to their attachment. Consequently, these unfortunate ones fall with their *punya* exhausted."

Similar *manthraas* pointing out the inadequacies of *karma* are to be found in abundance in the *Upanishads*. Therefore, one has to conclude, that, *karma* is not the aim of either the *Veda Poorvaa* or *Veda anthaa*; and that, *Karma vairaaghyam* is the aim of *Veda Poorva* and *Jnaanam* is the aim of *Veda anthaa*.

"Therefore, your view that *moksha* is attained by *karma*, is wrong. **Only** *jnaanam* and *jnaanam* **alone** can give *mokshaa*" Sureswaraachaarya tells the *poorva pakshin*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 97:

यत् च उक्तम् "विरह्य" इति तदपि न सम्यगेव । तथापि तु न या काचित् क्रिया यत्र क्व च अध्याहरणीया किम् तु या यत्र अभिप्रेत सम्बन्धम् घटयितुम् शक्नोति आकाङ्क्षाम् च वाक्यस्य पूरयति सा एव अध्याहरणीया ।

What has been further argued i.e. 'Words do not come together, independent of an action signified by a verb etc.' (19), is not right. Even admitting the contention, we are not to construe any verb indiscriminately. Only such a verb that can fit into the context of the meaning on hand and can answer the requirements of the sentence must be construed. (TEXT MEANING)

With verse 96, Sureswaraachaarya has completed the refutation of what was stated by the *poorva pakshin*, in verse 18. He now enters the final verse (verse 19) of the 2nd *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraachaarya tells the *poorva pakshin*: "Your argument in verse 19, is also not acceptable".

The arguments in this portion are very technical arguments. The *poorva pakshin* says: "Vedic teaching is in the form of *sabda pramaanam*; in the form of the spoken word, in the form of *veda vaakyani* – *vedic* sentences such as *sathyam vadha*, *dharmam chara*, *ahar ahar sandhyaam upaaseetha*, *agnihothram juhothi* etc."

The *poorva pakshin*, further, argues: "Any sentence is defined as a group of words, which are syntactically and grammatically connected. Every sentence should have a verb, without which, the nouns in the sentence will not be tied together".

For example, in the sentence "Rama performs *namaskaaraa* to Dasaratha, in the house", if the verb 'performs' is dropped, the sentence loses the meaning. The nouns are 'accessories', whose connection is known by the verb. There can be no sentence, without a verb – *kriyaa padam*.

The next point, stressed by the *poorva pakshin*: "The verb is named a *kriyaa padam* – i.e. 'a word indicating action'. That means any sentence is connected to action."

The *poorva pakshin* uses the above points, to hold, that, *Veda vaakyaani* have significance, only if they specify action – *karma*. Sureswaraachaarya is refuting this argument of the *poorva pakshin*.

- यत् च उक्तम् - What has been said (by the *poorva pakshin*)
- "विरहय्य" इति - (in verse 19) starting with the word *virahayya*,
- तदपि न सम्यगेव - that argument is also not correct / proper. (*samyak* – proper/correct)

The *poorva pakshin* had said that *Vedic thaathparyam* is only *karma*, based on this verse, starting with *virahayya* – "The words do not come together in a sentence independent of an action signified by a verb. There can be no sentence, other than the words integrated by the focal point of action, which could enjoin knowledge".

Sureswaraachaarya counters: "You *can* have sentences, without a verb also". Two examples can be considered – one a *loukika vaakyam* "*sa: ayam devadhattha:*" and the other, a *vaidhika vaakyam* "*sathyam jnaanam anantham brahma*". There are no verbs, in these sentences. "*Kriyaapada rahitha vaakyaani* may be there" is the *Achaaryaa's* contention.

The *poorva pakshi* replies: "No. Your contention is wrong. If a sentence does not have an explicit verb, you have to supply the implied verb. Explicit or implicit, a verb has to be there, in a sentence." In the example sentence "*sa: ayam devadhattha:*", you have to supply a verb, such as '*gacchathi*' etc., for the sentence to give a meaning.

The supply of the verb is called *adhyaahaaraa*.

(These arguments of the *poorva pakshin* are not given in the text. This probable course of his arguments is understood from Sureswaraachaarya's explanations.)

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "If you have to supply a verb, it has to be the appropriate verb – not any". What should be the verb? This is elaborately discussed in this paragraph.

A gist of the explanation of the *Achaaryaa*:

There are two types of verbs.

One type reveals 'action', *kaarya bhodhaka kriyaa padhaani* (action-revealing verbs.)

The second type does not reveal any action – but, reveals only facts already in existence-*siddha bodhaka kriyaa padhaani* (fact-revealing verbs.) For instance, in the sentence, "*Soyam devadhattha: asthi*", there is no action indicated by the verb – only 'information' is indicated.

Sureswaraachaarya asks: "What action is involved in such a sentence – for the speaker, or the listener or for Devadhattha?. 'Existence' is not an action done by somebody. It is only a fact i.e. the verb of 'being' does not reveal action – but, a fact, which does not prescribe any action. Likewise, *Vedic* sentences such as '*sathyam, jnaanam, anantham brahma*', '*thathvamasf*' etc. are sentences which do not prescribe any action at all."

52. Chapter I, Verses 97 to 100 (21-04-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is refuting the 2nd *poorva pakshin*, who presented his views in the verses 14 to 19. The refutation is done, by the *Achaaryaa*, verse by verse. He has now come to the final verse – verse 19.

In this verse, the *poorva pakshin* had mentioned: "Veda is in the form of *sabda pramaanam*; in the form of *vaakyaani*. A *vaakyam* is a group of words connected by the most important *kriyaapadam* – verb. If the verb is not there, the syntactic connection will not be there and the listener will not understand the subject, object, instrument etc. All sentences including *Vedic* sentences should have *kriyaapadam*. *Kriyaa* is 'action'. Therefore, *Veda* is dealing only with *karma* – "*aamnaayasya thaaathparyam karma eva*".

Sureswaraachaarya (in verse 97) is answering this.

- यत् च उक्तम् "विरहय्य" इति - What you had said, starting with "virahayya",
- तदपि न सम्यक् एव - is also not correct.

This is because, there *are* sentences without verb – the sentence '*sathyam jnaanam anantham brahma*', being an example.

Poorva pakshin, in reply, says, that in these contexts, where the verbs are not explicit, they have to be 'supplied'.

Sureswaraachaarya counters: "I concede that verbs have to be supplied, in certain contexts. But, verbs are of two types – *kaarya bodhaka kriyaapadhaani* (process revealing verbs) and *siddha bodhaka kriyaapadhaani* (fact revealing verbs). While, 'process revealing verbs' are connected with action, 'fact revealing verbs' are not connected with any action". An illustration : In the sentence 'there is water in the bottle', 'is' a *siddha bodhaka kriyaapadham*, while, in the sentences 'drink the water from the bottle', 'drink' is a *kaarya bodhaka kriyaapadham*.

Sureswaraachaarya says, that, when you supply a verb, you have to take into account, the contextual and grammatical requirements and supply the verb suitably.

In the context of *Brahman*, 'action revealing verb' will not apply at all; only 'fact revealing verbs' can be supplied, because *Brahman* is not an 'accessory for action' (a *kaaraka*) nor is an action (*kriyaa*) nor is the result of an action (*palam*); nor is *Brahman* connected with any accessory or action or result. *Kaaraka-kriyaa-pala vilakshanam* is

Brahman. *Kaaraka* is used for *kriyaa*; and *kriyaa* gives results. The *Vedic* sentences pertaining to *Brahman*, cannot reveal any *sambhandha* (relationships) also, since *Brahman* is *asanga*: | Therefore, the verb supplied (in the context of *Brahman*) can only be a 'fact revealing verb', such as *asthi*, *bhavathi*, *vidhyathe* etc.

The contextual requirement demands a verb of 'being' and the grammatical requirement demands a verb of suitable 'person' – 1st person (*aham brahma **asmi***), 2nd (*thath thvam **asi***) or 3rd (*pragnyaanam brahma **asthi***). The supplied verb should fulfill the contextual and grammatical requirements. You cannot use your flights of phantasy; you have to use the proper verb.

- **तथापि तु** - Even then (i.e. even when you have to supply the verb- yathaa api kriyaapadham adhyaaharaneeyam thathaa api)
- **या काचित्क्रिया यत्र क्व न अध्याहरणीया** - any kind of verb cannot be supplied in any kind of sentence.
- **किम् तु** - On the other hand,
- **या** - whichever verb
- **यत्र अभिप्रेतसम्बन्धम् घटयितुम् सक्नोति** - is able to bring
- about the intended relationship
- properly between the words in the sentence,

Abhipredham - intended; *sambhandham* – relationship; *ghatayithum* - to bring about/ to reveal; *saknothi* – is able to.

In the context of *Brahman*, between *Paramaathma* and *Jeevathmaa*, *aiykyam* only is there. Therefore, the verb should reveal only the *aikyasambhandham* between *paramaathma* and *jeevaathmaa*. It should be one of equation.

- **वाक्यस्य आकाङ्क्षाम् च पूरयति** - and also fulfills the grammatical requirement of the sentence
- **सा एव अध्याहरणीया** - that verb only has to be supplied.

(For the sentences *thathvam asi* and *aham brahma asmi*, you need not supply a verb, since the verbs are explicit in the sentences. But, for the sentences *pragnyaanam brahma* and *ayam aathma brahma*, you have to supply verbs.)

(Further) Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 97:

एवम् विसिष्ट च क्रिया अस्माभिः अभ्युपगता एव । सा तु उपादित्सत वाक्यार्थ अविरोधिनि एव न अभूतार्थप्रादुर्भावपलेति ।

Such a verb, we surely recognize. It does not contradict the meaning of the sentence in question and does not signify any action productive of something new.

- एवम् विसिष्ट क्रिया - Such an appropriate verb (which fulfills the contextual and grammatical requirements)
- अस्माभिः अभ्युपगता एव - have already been supplied by us.

The sentences, *pragnyaanam brahma* and *ayam aathmaa brahma*, have to be supplied with a verb of 'being' only, since you are already *brahman* and need not become *brahman*. *Brahman* being *nirvikaara*; cannot be the end product of a process. Therefore, I cannot say "You do *saadhanaa* and become *Brahman*"; I will say "you are already *brahman*".

- सा तु - Such an appropriate verb,
- उपादिस्त वाक्यार्थ अविरोधिनि एव- does not contradict the intended teaching of the sentence.
- Upaadithsatha – intended (adjective to 'teaching'); *vaakya artha* – teaching of the sentence; *avirodhini* – not contradictory to / appropriate.

'Eternal changeless *brahman* is you' is the teaching. *Brahman* and 'becoming' can never be connected.

- न अभूतार्थ प्रादुर् भाव पल इति - You cannot supply a verb which will reveal the emergence of a future event (*mokshaa*)

Na – you cannot use / supply; *aboothaatha* - future event; *pradhurbhaavam* – emergence ; *pala* – revealing. "*Aboothaatha praadhurbhaava pala*" (revealing the emergence of a future event) is an adjective to *kriyaa* (verb).

Why cannot such a verb (revealing the emergence of a future event – *mokshaa*) be used here? Because, by "knowing", you do **not become** free; by *medhaa*, you do **not become** free; you **are already** free.

(Further) *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 97 :

षड्भाव विकार रहित आत्मवस्तुनः निर्धूत असेष द्वैत अनर्थस्य अपराधीन प्रकाशस्य विजिजापयिषितत्वात् 'असि' 'अस्मि' इत्यादि क्रियापदम् स्व महिम सिद्धार्थ प्रति पादन समर्थम् अभ्युपगन्थव्यम् न विपरीत अर्थ प्रति पादनपरम् इति ।

As the subject to be understood is the *aathman* without the six-fold modifications, that is free from all evil constituted of duality and is self-revealing,

verbs like 'am' and 'art', that are capable of signifying self-accomplished actualities are to be admitted and not those of a contrary import.

The teacher is forced to teach in the manner: "You are free; you are free", even if the student is unable to accept it. Why? Because, that happens to be the nature of *brahman* / *aathman*.

- **विजिजापयिषितत्वात्** - Because the Upanishads intend to reveal,
- **षड् भाव विकार रहित आत्म वस्तुनः** - the aathmaa, which is free from the six-fold modifications (and, therefore, you cannot **become** aathmaa),
- **निर्धूत असेष द्वैत अनर्थस्य** - (which is) free from all problems resulting from duality,

Nirdhootha – free from; *asesha* – without balance / all ; *dvaita* – duality ; *anartham* - problems / evil.

Knowledge does not solve the problem ; 'knowledge' tells you, that, you have no problem.

- **अपराधीन प्रकाशस्य** - (which is) independently evident (not dependent on any *pramaanam*).

(Three adjectives or descriptions of *aathmaa* have been given, in this portion: (1) free from the six-fold modifications- *shadbhaava vikaara rahitha* (2) free from all problems resulting from duality – *nirdhootha asesha dvaita anartha* and (3) independently evident – *aparaadheena prakaasa*.)

No instrument is required to reveal *brahman*; verse 11- Sec. II – Ch. II, of *Mundakopanishad*, declares *brahman* as "*Thameva bhaantham thasya bhaasaa sarvam idham vibhaathi*" – "*Brahman* is self-effulgent. By *its* light, all this shines".

Knowing "action" is also not required; because, *aathmaa* is always available as *saakshi chaithanyam*.

- **'असि' 'अस्मि' इत्यादि क्रियापदम्**- Verbs like *asi, asmi, asthi* etc.,
- **स्व महिम सिद्धार्थ प्रति पादन समर्थम्** - which have the capacity to reveal the self-evident/ already evident,
- **अभ्युपगन्तव्यम्** - are to be supplied.

Conscience is self-experienced and already experienced. This fact is revealed by the verbs *asi, asmi, asthi* etc. (in the *vaakyaani* – *thathvam asi, aham brahma asmi* and *pragnyaanam brahma asthi* respectively.) In *karma kaandaa*, the verbs are full of 'doing' – action. Not in the *jnaana kaandaa*.

Therefore,

- न विपरीतार्थप्रतिपादनपरम् (अभ्युपगन्तव्यम्) - Verbs which will give the opposite meanings (cannot be supplied)
- इति - This is presented in the sloka (that follows).

Verse 97 – Chapter I:

धावेदिति न दानार्थं पदम् यद्वत्प्रयुज्यते ।

एधीत्यादि तथा न इच्छेत् स्वतः सिद्धार्थवाचिनि ॥ ९७ ॥

Just as an expression 'let him run', is not to be used to indicate the sense 'let him give' verbs like 'you flourish' are not to be used, in connection with the self-exiting reality.

The *sambhandha gadhyam* is consolidated in the verse.

- धावेत इति पदम् - The verb 'one should run',
- दान अर्थे न प्रयुज्यते - is not supplied to indicate 'giving';
- यद्वत् तथा - In the same manner / similarly,
- 'एधि' इत्यादि - (Verbs) such as 'become' / 'attain' etc.
- न इच्छेत् - (sruthi) will not desire to use,
- स्वतः सिद्धार्थवाचिनि - when it wants to convey 'you are already free'.

In short, inappropriate verbs are not used by the *sruthi*. The conclusion: *Mahaa vaakyaani* are *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* - not *karma bodhaka vaakyaani*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 98 :

न च यथोक्त वस्तु वृत्त प्रति पादन व्यतिरेकेण तत्वमस्यादिवाक्यम् वाक्यार्थ अन्तरम् वक्तीति सव्यम् अध्यवसानुम् इति आह ।

It is not possible to understand sentences like 'That thou art', as signifying the sense of some other sentence and as not signifying accomplished entities as pointed out.

The *poorva pakshin* makes a final attempt. He says: "I do agree that verbs which do not reveal 'action' , but reveal only 'facts' i.e. fact-revealing sentences (*siddha bodhaka vaakyaani*) **are** found in the *Vedas*. That's why my *soothra* says '*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*' – the word '*athadharthaanaam*' indicating that there **are** *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani*, in the *Vedas*. But, while I accept this fact, I also have to add, that, even if there are such statements, you cannot stop with the *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* alone; but, have to connect them with *vaakyaani* (statements) which lead to 'action'. For instance, the mere information in the *Vedas*, that, 'there is heaven', will not serve any purpose, unless it is followed up by the *Vedic* injunction 'perform

jyoyhistomaya yagnyam so that you can go to heaven. In the *loukika* example, the information 'there is water in the container' has to be followed up by the 'action' of getting hold of the container and drinking the water, for the information of the availability of water to be of any use. Likewise the *Vedic vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*' – a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*- is of no use by itself, unless connected with some other sentence, supplied, if necessary. The supplied *vaakyam* being '*thath thvam asi ithi upaaseetha*'. *Thaithreya Upanishad* – *Seekshaavalli* (verse 8) declares '*Om ithi brahma..om ithi brahmana: pravakshayan aaha brahma upaapravaani ithi brahma eva upaapnothi*' - 'one should meditate on *onkaaraa* as *brahman*.desiring to learn the *vedas*, the brahmin utters *onkaaraa*, with the intention 'let me attain knowledge, and he certainly attains knowledge'. Therefore, meditate on the *mahaavaakyam* to get the benefit".

Sureswaraachaarya replies.

- तत्वमस्यादि वाक्यम् - The sentences like 'that thou art'
- यथोक्तवस्तुवृत्तप्रतिपादनव्यतिरेकेण - other than revealing the above mentioned fact,

Yathoktha vasthuvruttha – the above mentioned fact ; *vyathirekena* – other than.

What fact? "*Jeevaathma – Paramaathma aikyam*".

- वाक्य अर्थान्तरम् वक्तृति अध्वसातुम् न सक्यम् - it is not possible to understand that they signify some other additional meaning,
- इति आह – This is being pointed out (in the following verse)

Vaakya arthaanthram – any other additional meaning (in this context, 'action'); *adhyavasaathum* - to understand; *na sakhyam* - is not possible.

The sentences (the *mahaavaakyaani*) only reveal the fact of the *jeevaathma-Paramaathma aikyam*; you cannot draw any other meaning or injunction for 'action', from the *mahaavaakyaani*.

Why not? Sureswaraachaarya does not give the reason here. But, it has been discussed and established elsewhere. In the case of *Svarga vaakyam*, that, 'there is heaven', you have to introduce 'action'- *jyothishtoma*, since mere 'knowledge of heaven' does not give you the result. Where 'knowledge' itself does not give results, 'action' has to be added. But, there are occasions, where, 'knowledge' itself produces results. This can be illustrated by a worldly example. Consider the case of an individual undergoing some medical tests, to find out, whether he suffers from a critical disorder. After the tests are done and before the results are received, the individual and those close to him, suffer trauma and mental agony. When the results are received, if the individual is found to suffer from the disorder, 'action' has to

follow, in the form of medication or similar 'treatment'. But, if the results show, that, the individual does not suffer from the disorder, what 'action' is needed to relieve him and his kin of the mental agony? Obviously, no action is needed. Likewise, '*aham brahma asmi*' is 'knowledge', which, by itself, gives result, without a need for any follow-up action. This is said, in the next verse.

Chapter I: Verse 98 –

तत्वमस्यादि वाक्यानाम् स्वतसिद्धार्थबोधनात् ।
अर्थान्तरम् न सन्द्रष्टुम् सक्व्यते त्रिदशैरपि ॥ ९८ ॥

Even the very gods cannot discern in sentences like 'That thou art', any import other than the revelation of an accomplished reality.

Therefore, the conclusion is, that, there is no action mentioned in *Jnaana kaandam*.

- तत्वमस्यादि वाक्यानाम् - In sentences like 'That thou art',
- अर्थान्तरम् सन्द्रष्टुम् न सक्व्यते - no other meaning can be seen,
- स्वत सिद्धार्थ बोधनात् - other than the revelation of an accomplished Reality,

Svatha siddhaartha - already available / accomplished Reality ; *bodhanaath* – other than the revelation.

- त्रिदशैरपि - even by the gods.

With this verse, all *poorva pakshins* have been negated.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 99 & Verse 99:

यस्मात् एवम् ।

अतः सर्वाश्रमाणाम् तु वाङ्मनःकाय कर्मभिः ।

स्व अनुष्ठितैः न मुक्तिः स्यात् जानात् एव हि सा यतः ॥ ९९ ॥

Such being the case - That release is attained by the proper performance through speech, body and mind, of duties pertaining to the agents' *aasramaa* etc. (21) is not true ; for it is to be attained only by knowledge.

- यस्मात् एवम् - Because of these reasons (this is my conclusion)
- सर्वाश्रमाणाम् - for the seekers belonging to different *aasramaas*,
- स्व अनुष्ठितैः - by (mere) observance of the prescribed
- वाङ् मनः काय कर्मभिः - duties performed through speech, body and mind,
- मुक्तिः न स्यात् – *mokshaa* is not possible.

Karma cannot give *mokshaa*. Then, what will give *mokshaa*?

- जानाथ् एव हि सा (स्यात्) यतः - for surely it (is to be attained) only by knowledge.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 100 & Verse 100:

- तस्मात् च कारणात् एतत् अप्युपपन्नम्।
- स्व मनोरथ सन्क्लुप्त प्रज आध्मात् धियामतः।
- श्रोत्रियेषु एव वाचः ताः शोभन्ते न आत्मवेदिषु ॥ १०० ॥

For this reason, the following is also sound: This argument advocated by those whose intellect is nourished by their own wishful ratiocination, becomes those who simply go by the Vedas. It does not become those who comprehend the aathman.

- तस्मात् च कारणात् एतत् अप्युपपन्नम् - Therefore, what I said (in the beginning of my argument in verse 22, that, all the observations of the poorvapakshins, given in verses 9 to 20, will be valid only in the yaaga saalaas) holds good.
- ताः वाचः - All those elaborate words of the poorva pakshins
- श्रोत्रियेषु एव सोभन्ते- are attractive and appealing only to Vedic ritualists committed to karma kaandaa.

What kind of ritualists?

- स्व मनोरथ सन्क्लुप्त प्रज आध्मात् धियामतः - whose intellects are bloated with misconceptions, imagined by their own fancy.

Sva manoratha sankluptha – imagined by their own fancy; *pragnya* – misconception (in this context); *aadhmaatha dhiyaamatha* - with bloated intellects. "Misguided ritualists" is the meaning, in essence.

- आत्म वेदिषु न (सोभन्ते) – (The elaborations of the poorva pakshins) will not (appeal to / be attractive to) the wise people who are students of Veda anthaa.

This is our conclusion. Therefore, *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* will be done, in the following chapters.

53. Summary of 1st Chapter (09-06-2007)

A Summary of the 1st Chapter

The 1st chapter, consisting of 100 verses, can be broadly classified into six topics:

- (1) *Avadhaarika* - Introduction.
- (2) *Poorvapaksha thrayam* – three types of objections to *Vedhaanthic* teaching.
- (3) *Prathama poorva paksha niraasa*: - Refutation of the 1st *poorva pakshin*.
- (4) *Dvitheeya poorva paksha niraasa*: - Refutation of the 2nd *poorva pakshin*.
- (5) *Thrutheeya poorva paksha niraasa*: - Refutation of the 3rd *poorva pakshin*.
- (6) *Upasamhaara*: - Conclusion.

Topic 1: Sureswaraachaarya commences his treatise with an '**Introduction**', in eight verses, verse 1 to verse 8.

In this introduction, after *Isvara Guru Namaskaara*: - salutations to Lord Vishnu and his *guru Adhi Sankaraachaarya* - Sureswaraachaarya points out: "I am writing this text, not because my *guru's* teaching is insufficient or incomplete; or because it is deficient or defective. Nor am I writing for name or fame. I venture into writing this treatise, to refine my own understanding".

Then he gives the *Vedhaantha Saaraa*, the essential features of *Vedhaantha*, consisting of four points:

- (1) *Ajnaanam* is *samsaara kaaranam* - self-ignorance is the cause of *samsaaraa*.
- (2) *Jnaanam* is *moksha kaaranam* – self-knowledge is the means to *mokshaa*.
- (3) *Mahaavaakyam moksha kaaranam* – *Vedic mahaa vaakyam* leads to *mokshaa* (by giving *jnaanam*)
- (4) *Karma na moksha kaaranam* – *Karma* can never be the (direct) means to *mokshaa*.

Of these four essential features, the 1st three are discussed in the later chapters (2, 3 and 4). The first chapter is dedicated to the 4th feature – *karma na moksha kaaranam* – *karma* (*vaidhika karma* also) cannot give *mokshaa*.

How '*ajnaanam* is the cause of *samsaaraa*' is given by the *Achaaryaa*, through a flow-chart:

- (1) Because of ignorance of *advaitam*, there is the (mis)perception of duality – *advaita aathma ajnaanaath dvaitha darsanam bhavathi*.

-
- (2) The duality perception leads to *sobhana asobhana adhyaasam* – misperception of the world as full of favourable and unfavourable circumstances.
 - (3) The *sobhana asobhana adhyaasam* leads to *raaghaa* and *dveshaa* – likes and dislikes – likes of favorables and dislikes of unfavourables.
 - (4) *Raghaa-dveshaa* leads to *dharma-adharma karmaani* – good and bad actions.
 - (5) *Dharma-adharma karmaani* lead to corresponding *punya-paapa palaani*-i.e. the good and bad actions result in *punyam* and *paapam*
 - (6) *Punya-paapa palaani* lead to *utthama-adhama deha praapthi*: - the *punyam* and *paapam* , lead to re-births, as superior or inferior beings, depending on the *punya-paapam* balance.
 - (7) *Deha-praapthi*: and *deha abimaanam* lead to varieties of problems – *janma, jaraa, mrithyu, dhu:kham* etc., which constitute *samsaaraa*.

In effect, *ajnaanam* is *samsaara kaaranam* and therefore, *jnaanam* is *moksha kaaranam*.

This 'Introduction' is from verse 1 to verse 8.

Topic II: Poorva paksha thrayam – presentation of the views of three types of *poorva pakshins* – opponents of *Vedhaanthic* teaching. The three types of views, based on *poorva meemaasaa* and allied philosophies, are presented elaborately, by the *Achaaryaa*, in the verses 9 to 22. The three theories presented are (with the order slightly changed):

- (1) *Abhyupedyaa karma vaadha*: - verses 9 to 13.
- (2) *Abhyupedyaa samucchaya vaadha*: - verses 20 to 22.
- (3) *Anabhyupedyaa karma vaadha*: - verses 14 to 19.

Topic III: Prathama poorva paksha niraasa: - Negation of the 1st objection – *abhyupedyaa karma vaadha*:. This refutation is done in two places – first, in verses 23 to 53 and later, in verses 80 to 84.

What is the *prathama poorva paksham* – the *abhyupedyaa karma vaadha*:? This *poorva pakshin* says: "I concede that *Aathma jnaanam* is discussed in the *Vedas*. But, even though it is talked about, in the *Vedas*, you do not have to utilise it for *mokshaa*. You do not require *aathma jnaanam* for attainment of *mokshaa*. You can get *mokshaa*, by *karma* itself and, since *karma*, by itself, is capable of giving *mokshaa*, why do you have to worry about *aathma jnaanam*?"

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this *poorva paksham*, through five points:

- (1) "*Karma na ajnaana nivarthakam*" – any number of *karmaas* (*loukika* or *vaidhika*) cannot remove self-ignorance.

Why not?

Because *karma* itself is a product of ignorance, *karma* will only protect its 'parent' – ignorance.

But, why do you say, that, *karma* is a product of ignorance?

The seven steps, given in the *avadhaarika*, give the answer.

Karma is not only a product of ignorance, but also perpetuates 'ignorance', by perpetuating the misconceptions, that, (1) I am a *kartha* (I have to claim *karthruthvam*, when I perform *karma*) and (2) I have *varnaa* and *assramaa* (which are basic qualifications, for any *vaidhika karma*). Self-ignorance is, therefore, nourished by the misconceptions, resulting from *karma*.

Since *karma* does not remove self-ignorance, *moksha* is not possible, because *mokshaa* happens to be the very nature of *aathmaa* and therefore, as long as self-ignorance (*aathma ajnaanam*) is there, *mokshaa* cannot be achieved.

(2) "*Karma is anithya pala-hethu*" – i.e. *karma* can produce only 'finite' results.

Why?

Karma is finite and, therefore, *karmapalan* can also be only finite.

Results of *karma* are of four types – *aapthi*: (reaching a place), *uthpatthi*: (production), *vikhaara*: (modification / change) and *samskaara*: (purification) - all types of results being only 'finite'.

Mokshaa, on the other hand, is 'infinite' / *nithyam*.

Since *karma* can produce only *anithya palan*, it cannot lead to *nithya mokshaa*.

(3) "*Karma moksha bhinna palan*" – *Karma* produces results, other than *mokshaa*.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "When you look at *Vedas*, you find that they talk of varieties of *karma* and of the *palans* of the *karmas*. But, all *karma palans* promised by the *Vedas*, are only in the form of *puthra* (progeny), *dhanam* (prosperity), *svargam* (heaven) etc. But, nowhere do the *Vedas* promise *mokshaa*, as *karmapalan*."

The *poorva pakshi* argues: "In the *Vedas*, for whatever *karma*, results are not specifically mentioned, you can assume, that, the *palan* for these *karmas*, is *mokshaa*".

"But", Sureswaraachaarya points out, "there is no *karma*, prescribed by the *Vedas*, for which the *palan* is not mentioned".

- (4) "*Karmaa is sruthi ninditham*" – *Karma* is criticized by the *Vedas*, as the cause of *samsaaraa*, *punar jananam* etc.

Mundakopanishad declares (1.2.7): "*Plavaa hi ethey adhrudaa yagnyaroopaa: ashtaadasoktham avaram yeshu karma ethacchreyo ye abhinandhanthi moodaa: jaraamruthyum they punareva apiyanthi*" – "Those eighteen constituents of *Yagnyaa* mentioned in the scriptures, upon which rests the inferior *karma*, are fragile floats indeed. Those who acclaim this as means for *mokshaa* are indiscriminate. They enter old age and death again and again".

Likewise, *Kaivalya Upanishad* states (verse 3) : "*Na karmanaa na prajaya dhanena thyaagena eke amruthathvam aanasu: |* " - "It is through renunciation, that, a few seekers have attained immortality – not through ritual, not through progeny, not through wealth".

How can, then, one say, that *karma* is *moksha kaaranam*?

- (5) "*Poorva paksha upaaya niraasa:*" - Negation of the suggestions given by the *poorva pakshin* on the utilization and management of *karma*, for attainment of *mokshaa*.

What was the suggestion of the *poorva pakshin*?

"Avoid *kaamya karmaani* - *punyam* will not accrue; avoid *nishiddha karmaani* - *paapam* will not accrue. All future *punya-paapam* are, thus, avoided by avoiding *kaamya* and *nishiddha karmaani*. As for past *punya-paapam*, 'exhaust' them, by going through the experiences resulting from the *punya-paapam*. At the time of death, your *karma* balance will , therefore, be nil. You will attain *mokshaa*".

Sureswaraachaarya refutes these suggestions, saying, that, it is impossible to implement any of the three suggestions: "You cannot avoid *kaamya karmaani* , since, as long as self-ignorance is there, desires will be there and the desires will motivate *kaamya karmaani*. Likewise, as long as *raagha-dveshaa* are there, *nishiddha-karmaani* also cannot be totally avoided. As for past *punya-paapam*, since they have been acquired during infinite number of *janmaas*, it is impossible to work them all out, in this one *janma*".

The *upaayam* of the *poorva pakshin*, therefore, is not possible of implementation.

But, while refuting the theory of the *abhyupedhya karma vaadhin*, the *Achaarya* makes a very important observation. He warns that *karma* is not totally useless. It cannot give direct liberation; but, it is extremely useful, in fact, essential, for acquisition of *chittha suddhi*. One should, therefore, follow *karma*, for some time, in the initial stages for *jnaana योगyathaa siddhi* and only thereafter, has to go to *jnaanam*. Do not rule out *karma* totally and do not permanently stick to *karma* also.

Up to this, is, *Prathama Poorva Paksha Niraasa: |*

Topic IV: *Dvitheeya poorva paksha niraasa:* - Negation of the 2nd objection – *abhyupedhya samucchaya vaadha:* - This is done between verses 54 and 79.

The 2nd type of *poorva pakshin* claims that a 'combination of *karma* and *jnaanam*' alone will help in attainment of *mokshaa*.

Five arguments are given by Sureswaraachaarya, against this *poorva paksha vaadham:*

(1) "*Jnaanam bhinna kaayikam*" – *Jnaanam* and *karma* do *not* exist at the same time – just as youth and old age cannot belong to the same time.

When *karma saadhanaa* is functioning, *jnaanam* is not functioning. When a person is performing *karma*, he is purifying his mind. When the mind is not purified, *jnaanam* cannot function.

Conversely, if *jnaanam* is functioning, the mind is already purified. At that stage, *karma* is not required.

Since, thus, *jnaanam* and *karma* cannot function at the same time, how can there be *samuccharam* between the two?

Expressing the same idea differently, *karma yoga* is *saadhanaa* and *jnaana yoga* is the *saadhyam* and, therefore, *samuchchayam* between them, is not possible.

(2) "*Jnaanam kaaraka nivarthakam*" – *Jnaanam* negates duality / plurality, which, on the other hand, is an 'accessory' to *karma*.

Karma requires subject, object, location, tools etc., called *kaarakaas*. Once *jnaanam* comes, all plurality goes; *kaarakaas* will go; *karma*, will have to, therefore, go. *Jnaanam*, thus, replaces *karma*. How can there be *samucchayam*, between the two? Light and darkness cannot have *samucchayam*.

- (3) "*Jnaanam karma adhikaara nivarthakam*" – *Jnaanam* negates all *varna*, *aasramaa* etc. *Varna aasrama abhimaanam*, on the other hand, are essential qualifications for any *vaidhika karma*. *Jnaanam* removes the *abhimaanam*. How, then, can there be *samucchayam* between *jnaanam* and *karma*?
- (4) "*Jnaanam mumukshuka nivarthakam*" – When *jnaanam* comes, I know that I am 'free', and, therefore, lose the desire for *mokshaa*. Because *jnaanam* has already given me the *mokshaa*, I do not have to combine my *jnaanam* with any *karma*, to attain *mokshaa*.
- (5) "*Eka saasthra vaadha niraasa:*" - One of the arguements of this *poorva pakshin* (*jnaam abhyupedhya samucchaya vaadhin*) is: "*Vedas* talk of *karma*, in the first portion and of *jnaanam* in the 2nd portion. Since, the entire *Veda* is one *saasthree* and since you have to respect both portions and obey both, you will have to combine *jnaanam* and *karma*".

Sureswaraachaarya answers: "We also respect both portions. We do not mind combining the two; but, not simultaneously, because, as shown earlier, they cannot co-exist. We accept only sequential combination – *karma*, in the initial stages, for purification of mind and *jnaanam* later, after acquiring *jnaana yogyatha*, through *karma*."

Topic V : Thrutheeya poorva paksha niraasa: - Negation of the 3rd type of *poorva paksham* – *anabhyupedha karma vaadha:*. The negation is covered from verses 85 to 97.

The *anabhyupedhya poorva pakshin*, as the term implies, does not even accept *jnaanam* as a primary topic of the *Vedas*.

The four arguements given by this *poorva pakshin*, in support of his views, are effectively countered by Sureswaraachaarya as below:

- (1) "*Jnaana prathi bhaadanaa asthi*" – The *anabhyupedhya poorva pakshin* had said "there is no such thing as *aatma jnaanam* discussed in the *Vedas*, as a primary topic. Where *jnaanam* is talked about, it is only an '*angam*' (part) of *karma*, because *jnaanam* will not give any benefit."

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "*Vedas* **do** talk about *aatma jnaanam*, as primary theme and as a means of liberation. In several places, *Vedas* present *jnaanam* as **the** independent

means to *mokshaa* – "*tharathi sokham aathmavith*", "*pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath naasthi akrutha: kruthena thadhvijnaartham sa gurum eva abhigaccheth*" being only a few examples.

- (2) "*Isaavaasya manthra thaathparyam*" – Quoting the *Isaavaasya manthraa* "*kurvan eva iha karmaani jijeevisheth satham samaa:*" – "Live a hundred years, engaged in *karmaa*", the *poorva pakshin* had said: "*karma* is always there, in the life of a person i.e. a person should engage in *karma* lifelong. Pure *jnaanam*, therefore, does not exist".

Sureswaraachaarya answers: "Your interpretation of the *manthraa* is not correct. Note that the *manthraa* also says '*na karma lipyathe nare*'. The implication is, that, "as long as desires are there, do *karma*". When *deha abhimaanam* is dropped, *karma* ceases to exist. This **is** the *thaathparyam* of the *manthraa*".

- (3) "*Jaimini soothra thaathparyam*" - Based on the *Jaimini Meemaamsa Soothraa* "*Aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam*", the *poorva pakshi* claimed " *Vedas* talk **only** about *karma*, as per this *soothra* of Jaimini. Your view, that, *Vedas* talk about *jnaanam*, is, therefore, not right".

Sureswaraachaarya counters: "Jaimini has talked of *Veda Poorva* only i.e. his subject is *Poorva Meemaamsaa*. His *guru*, *Vyaasaachaarya*, had already covered the topic of *jnaanam*, in his *Utthara Meemaasaa*. Jaimini's reference, '*amnaayasya*', therefore, applies only to the *Veda Poorva Baghaa*; do not apply his statement to the entire *Veda*".

- (4) "*Vaakya svabhaava thaathparyam*" - The *poorva pakshi* had said: "Any sentence is a group of words, but, in which a verb (a *kriyaapadam*) is compulsorily necessary. A sentence, without a verb, does not convey any information and is, therefore, impossible. The entire *Veda* is made up of *vaakyaani* – innumerable sentences, each sentence having a verb, which verbs **always** refer to action – *karma* of one kind or another, the name *kriyaapadam* itself, emphasising this. It, therefore, follows that *Vedas* talk only of *karma* and not *jnaanam*."

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "No doubt, sentences require verbs. But, not **all** verbs convey action. There are verbs which reveal 'facts' – 'is', the verb of 'being', is, but, an example. In the *mahaa vaakyam* "*thaththvam asi*", the verb "*asi*", is only a verb of 'being', conveying a fact – not a verb of 'action'. So also, in the verb "*asmi*" in the *mahaa vaakyam* "*aham brahma asmi*". Your contention, that, all verbs refer to action, is, therefore, wrong. *Vedas* use such verbs also, which reveal 'knowledge'. (In the popular *rajju sarpa* example, the *rajju jnaanam* itself is enough to be freed from the fear of the *sarpa*; no action is needed).

"*Aathma jnaanam* **is** the primary subject of the *Vedas* and can **itself** give you *mokshaa*".

Topic VI - *Upasamhaara* - Conclusion, in the three verses 98 to 100:

Sureswaraachaarya repeats the four points, which he mentioned in his Introduction:

- (1) *Ajnaanam* is the cause of *samsaaraa*.
- (2) Knowledge alone is the means of liberation
- (3) *Mahaavaakyaas* alone give the knowledge, and
- (4) *Karma* can never give liberation.

"And, therefore", Sureswaraachaarya concludes "for those purified (qualified) people, I want to give 'knowledge' through the *Vedic mahaa vaakyaani* and through the 'knowledge', 'liberation'".

The following three chapters deal with *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

54. Chapter II, Verse 1 (16-06-2007)

In verses 7 and 8, of the 1st Chapter, Sureswaraachaarya presented the *Vedhantha Saaram* – essence of *Vedhantha* – through four essential principles:

- (1) *Aathma ajnaanam* is *samsaara kaaranam* (which statement, he established by elaborating the seven steps through which self-ignorance leads to *samsaaram*)
- (2) *Aathma jnaanam* **alone** is *moksha kaaranam* (self-knowledge alone is the means to liberation)
- (3) *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyaani* **alone** can generate that self-knowledge.
- (4) *Karma*, whether *loukika* (worldly) or *vaidhika* (religious) cannot give knowledge and therefore, cannot give liberation also. *Karma*, independently, cannot give liberation and there is no question of its giving knowledge, jointly with *jnaanam* also. At the same time, *karma* is not totally useless; on the other hand, *karma* is extremely important to prepare the ground for the *mahaa vaakyaani* to give knowledge.

Of these four features, Sureswaraachaarya established the fourth feature, viz. “*karma* can never give liberation”, in the 1st Chapter.

In the 2nd Chapter, the *Aachaaryaa* is taking up the third principle: “*Mahaa vaakyaani* alone can generate self-knowledge; and *mahaa vaakyaani* are more than capable of generating self-knowledge - the *jeevaathma-paramaathma- aikyam*.”

We can never look upon *Vedic* sentences and worldly sentences on equal footing. There is a huge difference between *vaidhika vaakyaani* and *loukika vaakyaani*. *Vaidhika vaakyaani* are **primary** sources of knowledge, termed ‘*upajeevya pramaanaani*’, like a sense organ, whereas, a *loukika vaakyam* is termed ‘*upajeevi pramaanam*’ – a **secondary** source of knowledge.

To understand the difference clearly, consider a newspaper report; the report *generates* knowledge in my mind; but, the report is not the *producer* of the knowledge, since the knowledge has already been produced in the mind of the reporter, by *prathyaksha pramaanam*; i.e. the *sabda pramaanam* (the newspaper report) can be verified by the *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

In contrast, ‘knowledge’ generated by *Veda* is not attainable through any other source, including meditation. ‘Words’ of the *Veda* are the only source. *Vaidhika sabda* is **not** a ‘carrier’ of knowledge, as the newspaper report is; but a ‘producer’ of knowledge. This is very similar to a sense organ; when a particular sense organ produces the knowledge of a

particular fact, that fact cannot be proved or disproved by any other sense organ. (Colour/ form/ shape etc. can be perceived only by the eye; smell only by the nose; noise only by the ear and so on.) Likewise, for the 'knowledge' given by the *Vedic mahaa vaakyaani*, there is absolutely no other alternative source (*pramaanam*) nor proof. Also, other than 'understanding' the *mahavaakyaani*, there is no other 'knowledge'.

Sureswaraachaarya struggles to make the student understand that 'there is no other realisation other than clear understanding of the *mahavaakyaani*'. If even after listening to *mahavaakyaani*, 'realisation' and therefore 'moksha' has not been attained by the seeker, Sureswaraachaarya points out, that, it is the seeker, who has not studied the *mahavaakyaani* properly.

'Clear understanding of the *mahavaakyaani*' and the 'clear understanding of the fact, that, that clear understanding of the *mahavaakyaani* will do, for attaining knowledge; nothing else is required' should be realised by the student.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 1 – Chapter II:

प्रत्यक्षादीनां अनेवं विषयत्वात् तेषाम् स्वारम्भक विषय उपनिपातित्वात् आत्मनः च अशेषप्रमेयवैलक्षण्यात् सर्व अनर्थ एक हेतु अजान अपनोदि जान दिवाकर उदय हेतुत्वं वस्तु मात्र यातात्म्य प्रकाशन पटीयसः तत्वमस्यादेः वचसः एव इति बह्वीभिः उपपत्तिभिः प्रदर्शितम्

It has been demonstrated through much reasoning that only scriptural texts like 'That thou art', capable of revealing Reality as such, can be the source of knowledge, destructive of ignorance, which is the sole cause of all evil, because ordinary instruments of knowledge like perception do not pertain to this subject-matter, as they are capable of revealing only the elements, of which they are the products and also because the Self is altogether different from every object of knowledge.

- बह्वीभिः उपपत्तिभिः प्रदर्शितम् - It has been established by several arguments,

What has been established?

- तत्वमस्यादेः वचसः एव हेतुत्वं - (that) the Vedic sentences such as 'thathvamasi' alone can generate
- जान दिवाकरः - the sun of knowledge,

Knowledge can come only from mahaa vaakyaani.

- सर्व अनर्थ एक हेतु अजान अपनोदि - which (sun of knowledge) is the destroyer of the self-ignorance, which (self-ignorance) is the source of all miseries,

Sarva anartha - all miseries; eka hethu – only cause; ajaana – self-ignorance; apanodhi – destroyer.

'Ignorance' is not one of the causes of *samsaaraa*; it is the **only** cause; hence, the use of **eka hethu**.

- **वस्तु मात्र याथात्म्य प्रकाशन पटीयसः** - (that, which is) capable of revealing the true nature of 'Reality'

This adjective is for *vachasa*: - the Veda *vaakyaani*, while the earlier 'sarva anartha eka hethu ajnaana apanodhi' refers to *jnaana divaakara*:

Vasthu maathra – 'Reality'; *Yaathaathmya* – true nature ; *prakaasana* – revealing; *pateeyasa*: – capable of / has the power of .

Mahaavaakyaa is like a powerful torch light, which, switched on, will reveal *aatma svabhaavam*. This knowledge of *aathmaa*, given by the *mahaa vaakyam*, cannot be gained from any other alternative source (*pramaanam*), since, no other *pramaanam* (*prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapatthi, anupalabdhi, loukika sabda* etc.) deals with *aathmaa*. 'Meditation' is not even included in the list of *pramaanaas*; hence, the question of 'meditation giving knowledge' does not arise at all. So also 'intuition'. According to our scriptures 'doubtful source of knowledge' is not a source of knowledge at all.

Consistent, systematic study of *mahaa vaakyam* is, therefore, the only means to self-knowledge. Other *pramaanams* cannot be used, even for verification of the *mahaavaakya upadesam*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- **प्रत्यक्षादीनाम् अनेवं विषयत्वात्** - Since all other *pramaanams* like perception etc., deal with subject matters, different from *aathmaa*,

Evam vishaya; - 'this' matter; *anevam vishaya*: - matter different from 'this' matter.

- **तेषाम् स्वात्मभक्त विषय उपनिपातित्वात्** – (and) because they are capable of revealing only their causal elements,

Svaarambhaka vishayam – the 'causal' subject / that which is the cause; *nipaathithvam* – capability of revealing.

The five sense organs do different functions, presided over by the different *bhoothaas*, of which they were born; for example, the ears do the function of 'hearing', with the aid of *aakaasaa*, the skin does the function of 'touch', with the aid of *vaayu* etc. Every sense organ is born out of one particular element (cf. *Thathva Bodham*) and tends to preserve its causal element only. The *pancha bhoothaas* and the *paancha boudhika prapanchaa* (all *anaathmaa*) are perceived by the *pancha jnaanendriyaas*. The mind also is born of the *pancha bhoothaani* only and therefore, the mind also can perceive only *anaathmaa*. 'Improved' mind can experience extraordinary things; but, only extraordinary *anaathmaa*. *Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can generate self-knowledge.

Modern science also cannot reveal *aathmaa*, because, modern science functions on the data collected by the five *jnaandriyaas*, which deal with *anaathmaa* only.

If, therefore, one is keen on *mokshaa*, one has to come to the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* only. This was shown by several arguments - '*bahvee: upapatthibhi: pradarsitham*' |

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Ch. II:

अतः तदर्थाप्रतिपत्तौ यत्कारणं तदपनयनाय द्वितीयोध्यायः आरभ्यते ।

This second chapter is undertaken for removing the cause of the failure to understand the significance of the text.

If a person 'properly' studies the *mahaa vaakyam* and 'properly' understands it, the 'proper' understanding is 'self-knowledge'.

But, most people tend to say "I have understood *mahaa vaakyam*; but, I do not have self-knowledge – *akandaakaara vrutthi:*". This is a result of confused understanding or improper understanding.

'I have understood *mahaavaakyam* ; but, I have no self-knowledge'; 'I have understood *mahaavaakyam*; but I have no Realisation'; 'I have understood *mahaavaakyam*; but, I have no *prathyaksha anubhavam*'; 'I have understood *mahaavaakyam*; but, I have no *moksham* (liberation)' - are all confused thoughts. And, in all such cases, *mahaa vaakyam* has to be further enquired into, to remove these confusions.

'Understanding **alone** is knowledge; understanding **alone** is realisation; understanding **alone** is *anubhavam* ; understanding **alone** is *moksham*' – should be the firm conclusion.

This is *prathibandha nivritthi*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says "*atha: thadartham aprathipatthau yathkaaranam thath apanayanaaya dvidtheeya adhyaaya: aarabhyathe*".

अतः तदथं अप्रतिपत्तौ - Now, for not clearly understanding the mahaa vaakyam,
यत्कारणम् - whatever is the cause,

- तदपनयनाय - to remove that cause,
- द्वितीय अध्यायः आरभ्यते - the 2nd chapter is commenced.

Chapter II: Verse 1 –

श्रावितः वेत्ति वाक्यार्थं न चेत् तत्वमसि इत्यतः ।

त्वंपदार्थं अनभिज्ञत्वात् अतः तत्प्रक्रियः उच्यते ॥ १ ॥

If a person does not understand the import of the proposition 'That thou art', when it is imparted to him, it is because he has not grasped the meaning of 'Thou'. Therefore, we will now propound its meaning.

- श्रावितः - The student who is exposed to the Vedhaanthic teaching,
- वाक्यार्थम् वेत्ति - clearly grasps the meaning of the vaakyam,
- तत्वमसि इत्यतः - from the mahaa vaakyam like 'thathvamasai',

(The *vaakyartha*: of the *mahaa vaakyaani* is '*jeeevathma-paramaathma-aiykyam*')

Brahman is **not** a mysterious entity. It is the *chaithanyam*, which we are experiencing every moment. *Vedhanthaa* talks of this *chaithanyam* only.

We make the mistake of considering the *chaithnyam* as a part or product or property of the body. *Vedhaantha* makes it clear, that, it is not so.

Brahman is the ever available sentiency (can be interpreted as *உணர்வு* in Tamil), unconnected with the body, which lasts even after the body falls.

The proper understanding of this fact is 'knowledge'. We do not require any mysterious state to understand *Brahman*.

- न चेत् - But, if a student does not understand (this simple and directly available fact),

For this 'non-understanding', there is only one reason.

When the teacher states "That you are", 'you' is the reference to the non-tangible *aathmaa* - not to the tangible body. Nor is the reference to the mind or intellect. The reference is to the *chaitanya thathvam* only.

But, very often '*thvam*' or '*aham*' (in the *mahaa vaakyam*), is mistaken as the body-mind complex. And, the misunderstanding is due to lack of communication. The seeker, thereafter, looks for a mystic experience, which is another mistake. He has to, only, enquire into *Vedhaanthee* again.

Communication-gap is the main obstacle to liberation. 'Proper' listening and 'proper' understanding, in fact, complete the journey.

55. Chapter II, Verse 2 and 3 (23-06-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is introducing the subject matter of the 2nd chapter.

In the first chapter, he had enunciated four fundamental principles of *Vedhantic* teachings:

- (1) Self- ignorance **alone** is the cause of *samsaaraa*
- (2) Self-knowledge **alone**, therefore, is the only solution to *samsaaraa*
- (3) Vedic *Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** is the only means of acquiring self-knowledge
- (4) *Karma* can help us only in preparing our mind, to receive the knowledge; *karma* cannot contribute directly to liberation.

Having dealt with the fourth principle in the 1st chapter, Sureswaraacharya, is taking up "*Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** is the source of self-knowledge" as the subject of the 2nd chapter.

He firmly holds, that, there are only two primary sources of knowledge; one is *prathyaksha pramaanam* and the other is the *Vedic pramaanam*. Of these two primary sources of knowledge also, the *prathyaksha pramaanam* deals only with the objective world; *mahavaakya Vedaantha pramaanam* **alone** deals with the Subject. *Prathyaksha pramaanam* will not be useful for gaining self-knowledge.

There are many secondary sources of knowledge, like *upamaanam*, *anumaanam* etc., which sources, the modern sciences use. "But", Sureswaraachaarya points out, "the secondary sources of knowledge, are all dependent on the *prathyaksha pramaanam* and, therefore, they are also only object-centric. There **is only one** *pramaanam*, which deals with the Subject and that is the *mahaavaakya Vedaantha pramaanam*. Therefore, the seeker does not have any other choice apart from the *mahaa vaakya vichaaram*, to achieve knowledge."

This statement '*mahaa vaakyam* alone has to be resorted to, for acquiring self-knowledge, because, *mahaa vaakyam* alone deals with the Subject' can be explained with the analogy of the sense organs. If a person wants to know 'colours', he has to make use of only his eyes, since, the fact happens to be, that, 'eyes **alone**, among the five *jnaana indriyaas*, deal with colours'; this is a 'law of Creation'. "Likewise" Sureswaraachaarya says "in the entire Creation, there is only one source of knowledge, that deals with *aathmaa* and that source is the *Vedaantha mahaa vaakyam*".

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 1, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- **आत्मनः च असेष प्रमेय वैलक्षण्यात्** – Since Aathmaa is different from all other objects of knowledge,
- **वचसः एव ज्ञान दिवाकर उदय हेतुत्वं** – Vedaantha mahaa vaakyam alone is the cause for the rise of the 'sun of knowledge'.

Avesha – all other; *prameya* – object of knowledge; *vailakshanyam* - nature of 'being different'

Aathmaa is unique; *aathma jnaanam* is also unique. And, therefore, its source of knowledge also has to be unique.

What is the uniqueness of *aathmaa*? Ans: It is the 'Subject', while everything else, including all Sciences, Arts etc. are all 'objects'. Hence, Sureswaraachaarya says '*aathmana: chavesha prameya vailakshanyaath*' - 'because of the nature of *aathmaa* being different from all other objects of knowledge'.

Only one thing is **not** the object of observation – the 'Observer'. And, therefore, you cannot use any object-centric *pramaanam*, to achieve '*aathma jnaanam*' – only one *pramaanam* can be used and that *pramaanam* is *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam*. This fact is stressed by the *Achaaryaa*, by the statement '*vachasa: eva hethuthvam*' – 'only *vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam* being the cause'.

To repeat (for emphasis) : Sureswaraachaarya says "*Mahaa vaakyam* is the only valid *pramaanam* in the field of *aathmaa*, just as the eye is the only valid *pramaanam* in the field of colours , the ear is the only valid *pramaanam* in the field of sound and so on."

Further, a valid *pramaanam*, whether one likes it or not, **should** generate knowledge. Once again resorting to the example of the sense organs, the 'ear', another valid *pramaanam*, **will** report the sounds it hears, - i.e. the 'ear' will produce the 'knowledge'/ awareness of the noises around - whether the individual likes it or not.

Personal likes or dislikes will have nothing to do with a *pramaanam* generating the *pramaa* of the *prameyam*. "And, likewise", Sureswaraachaarya says " the valid *pramaanam*, *mahaa vaakyam*, **will** generate *aathma jnaanam*, since it is the nature of the *mahaa vaakyam*".

But, suppose a person says "I have studied the *mahaa vaakyam*; but the *mahaa vaakyam* has **not** produced 'knowledge' in me". Sureswaraachaarya says, that, in such cases, the *dosha* (deficiency) is not that of the *mahaa vaakyam*, but, that of the *srotha* (the listener). There is no *doshaa* in the *pramaanam*; there is no *doshaa* in the *prameyam* – the *doshaa* is only in the *pramaathaa*. So, what should the *pramaathaa* do? He cannot and should not change the *pramaanam*, as no other *pramaanam* can help in the field of *aathma jnaanam*.

He should recognise that the *mahaa vaakyam* has not produced 'knowledge', **only** because of his own deficiency. He should, therefore, take steps to correct his deficiencies and again go back to *mahaa vaakyaa*. This process may take time; may not be completed in his present *janma*; but, as the Lord assured in the *Bahagavdh Githa*, (verse 41 – Chapter VI) - "*Yoga brashta: sucheenaam sreemathaam gehe abhijayathe*" – "One who has fallen from *Yoga* is reborn in the family of the cultured and prosperous" (the implication being that, though he could not attain the 'final' goal in his present birth, such a sincere seeker will be reborn, as a reward for his efforts, in circumstances conducive to his further progress in the spiritual path).

There are several *pramaathru doshaas* – 'deficiencies in the listener'.

A very common problem is the 'understanding' of the word '*thvam*', in the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*'. The *mahaa vaakyas* say: "'You' are always free; 'you' are always secure; 'you' are the only source of *aananda*" etc. They do not even say "'you' have *aananda*"; but say "'you' **are** *aananda*". In all these statements, the *Upanishad* uses the word 'you', in which word, there is a communication gap, between the 'intended' meaning and the 'communicated' meaning i.e. between the 'intent' of the *Upanishad* / *guru* and the 'understanding' of the student. This is a major block – a *prathibhandham*. Sureswaraachaarya says (in verse 1) "I am going to address this problem".

- **श्रावितः** - The one who is made (by the guru) to listen to the mahaa vaakyam
- **वाक्यार्थं वेत्ति** - understands the meaning of the mahaa vaakyam.

Vaakyam, in this treatise '*Naishkarmya Siddhi*', is *mahaa vaakyam*.

Whence does the student get the *vaakyartham*?

- **तत्त्वमसीत्यतः** - from the mahaa vaakyams such as 'thathvam asi'.

The student gets the sentential meaning from the sentence. This is the normal condition.

- **न चेत्** - But, if this does not happen,

There must be a *prathibhandha*: - a block. What is this block?

- **त्वम् पद अर्थ अनभिज्ञत्वात्** - because of the misunderstanding or non- understanding of the meaning of the word 'thvam',

Anabhijnathvam (improper understanding) is the *prathibhandham*.

- **तत्प्रक्रियः** - (Therefore) the method of right and complete 'understanding' of the word 'thvam',
- **उच्यते** - is going to be dealt with (in the 2nd chapter, to avoid further communication gap)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 2 :

योयम् अहं ब्रह्मेति वाक्यार्थः तत्प्रतिपत्तिः वाक्यादेव इति प्रत्यक्षादीनाम् अनेवम् विषयत्वात् इत्यवादिषम् तस्य विशुद्ध्यर्थं अनैकान्तिकत्वं पूर्वपक्षत्वेन उपस्थाप्यते ।

We have declared that the import of the proposition 'I am *Brahman*', is to be gained from that proposition itself, because ordinary means of knowledge, like perception, do not apply to this sphere. With a view to establish that position clearly, a *prima facie* view, that, the proposition is not the necessary means of knowledge in the case, is set up for consideration:

Sureswaraachaarya wants to enter '*thvam padhaartha vichaara:*' – 'the analysis of the meaning of the word '*thvam*'. But, before doing so, he wants to deal with a possible objection of a *poorva pakshin*. What could be this objection?

The *poorva pakshin* might say: "You are assuming and asserting that *mahaa vaakyam* **alone** is the only valid source of knowledge and also that it is a **definite** source of knowledge. But, I am not convinced; because, from the scriptures, we come to know, that, in certain instances, self-knowledge has taken place without the aid of the *mahaa vaakyam* and also, that, in certain other instances, self-knowledge has not taken place, even with the *mahaa vaakyam*. Why do you, then, insist that *mahaa vaakyam* is the only valid source of self-knowledge and that it is also a definite source. I can quote several instances, to disprove both your statements". This perceived 'indefiniteness'/ 'uncertainty' of Sureswaraachaaryaa's claim is referred to, as '*anaikaanthikathvam*' - a '*dosham*'- in this portion.

- **अहं ब्रह्मेति वाक्यार्थः** - "The meaning of the statement 'I am Brahman',
- **तत् प्रतिपत्तिः** - the knowledge (of that meaning),
- **वाक्यात् एव** - (rises from) the mahaa vaakyaa only"
- **इति अवादिषम्** - Thus I have declared,

Avaadhisham – has been declared.

Where?

- प्रत्यक्षादीनाम् अनेवं विषयत्वात् - in the portion starting with 'prathyakshaadheenaamanaevam vishayathvaath' (i.e. in the sambhandha gadhyam to verse 1). तस्य विशुद्धर्थम् - To clarify this idea, (that the mahaa vaakyam is the only source of knowledge)

That 'the *mahaa vakyam* is the only source of self-knowledge' is not acceptable to many believers – sometimes, even to students of *Vedhaantha* - who refer to the lives of Meera, Buddha, Ramana Maharishi and the like and point out that many such people had not approached a *guru*, had not studied scriptures, had not done *Vedhaantha vichaaraa* - but, had gained knowledge, without the aid of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Such believers hold that *mahaa vaakyam* **can** be **one** source of self-knowledge; but, **not** the **only** source.

- पूर्व पक्षत्वेन – a poorva paksham is introduced;

What is the poorva paksham?

- अनैकान्तिकत्वं - the uncertainty (of the contention that the mahaa vaakyam is the only source of knowledge and a definite source of knowledge).

The Achaaryaa's contention (that the mahaa vaakyam is the only source of knowledge and a definite source of knowledge) is to be reinforced, by the mention and negation of the poorva paksham.

- उपस्थाप्यते – It (poorva paksham) is to be dealt with, in the following portion.

Chapter II: Verse 2 –

व्रत्सु अनात्म निवृत्तौ च कश्चित् आप्नोति निर्वृत्तिम् ।

श्रुत वाक्यस्मृतेः च अन्यः स्मार्यते च वचः अपरः ॥ २ ॥

A man of pure intellect gets satisfactory understanding when the whole realm of non-Self is eliminated through reasoning. Another person understands when he remembers the proposition. Still another person understands, when he is reminded by the preceptor of the proposition.

The *poorva pakshin* introduces four types of people, or four cases / situations. His intention is to show that the *mahaa vaakyam* is not the only source of knowledge.

First case: *Vaakya asravanam* – of a person gaining knowledge, even without listening to *mahaa vaakyam*.

Second case: *Vaakya sravanam* - of a person, like the conventional *Vedhaanthic* student, gaining knowledge, consequent to listening to *mahaa vaakyam*.

Third case: *Vaakya smaranam* - of a person, to whom knowledge did not result, at the time of listening, but the *smaranam* (remembering) of the *mahaa vaakyam* produces knowledge after a lapse of time (days or weeks or years)

Fourth case: *Vaakya smaanam* - of a student, who does not remember the *mahaa vaakyam*; but, to whom, the teacher keeps on repeating and reminding of, the *mahaa vaakyam* and because of the repeated teachings and reminders, knowledge takes place.

For each case, the *poorva pakshin* gives an example (or examples).

For the 1st case – *vaakya asravanam* – *Prajapathi*, from the *Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad* – *Purushavidhi Brahmanam* - (Ch. I – Sec 4), is cited. The *Upanishad* relates the episode of *Prajapathi* gaining the knowledge “I am secondless”, but, does not talk of *Prajapathi's* ‘listening to’ or ‘studying’ any *mahaa vaakyam*.

Vamadeva rishi, from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (1.4.10) and also in the *Aithreya Upanishad*, is cited as another example for the same situation – *vaakya asravanam*. *Vamadeva Rishi* is quoted to have gained self-knowledge, even while in his mother’s womb, without any *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

For the second case, *vaakya sravanaath jnaanam*, the student from *Kena Upanishad*, who gains knowledge, on listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, is cited.

For the third case, *vaakya smaranaath jnaanam*, the example quoted is *Bhrugu*, from the *Bhrugu Valli* of the *Thaithreeya Upanishad*. *Bhrugu*, as related in the *Upanishad*, does not gain knowledge immediately on listening to his father *Varuna*. Only on repeated reflections – ‘*sa: thapo athapyatha; thapas thapathvaa*’ - ‘he conducted enquiry; on conducting enquiry’ – he gained knowledge. “In his case, *vaakyam*” claims the *poorva pakshin* “is not the source of knowledge; but, *vaakya smaranam*”. There is a school of thought, which claims, that, mere ‘listening’ (*sravanam*) does not give knowledge; only ‘meditation’ (*dhyaanam*) on what has been heard, gives knowledge.

For the fourth case, *vaakya smaanamath jnaanam*, *Svethakethu*, from the 6th chapter of *Chandhoghya Upanishad* is cited as an example. *Svethakethu* was taught the *mahaa vaakyam* ‘*thath thvam asi*’ repeatedly – nine times, till he felt satisfied with the teaching.

The *poorva pakshin* says: “From these four cases, it is clear that *mahaa vaakyam* is not the only source of knowledge. Others are also there”.

- कश्चित् - Certain seekers
- निर्वृत्तिम् आप्नोति - attain mokshaa,
- क्लृप्त्वा अनात्मनिवृत्तौ – when the dvaitha is negated by their knowledge 'I am the non-dual Brahman'.

It may be recollected that, *Prajapathi (Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad)*, falls into this category.

- अन्यः - Certain others
- श्रुत वाक्यस्मृतेः - by mahaa vaakya smaranam,
- (निर्वृत्तिम् आप्नोति) – (attain mokshaa)
- अपरः वचः स्मार्यते – In certain other cases, mahaa vaakya is repeatedly taught.

(After several classes / reminders, this category of people attains liberation).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 3:

ऐतत्प्रसङ्गेन श्रोत्रन्तरौपन्यासं उभयत्रापि संभावनाय आह ।

In this connection, the case of the fourth person is brought forward, to show that the understanding may be either through or independent of the scriptural Proposition:

- ऐतत्प्रसङ्गेन - In this context itself,
- श्रोत्रन्तर उपन्यासम् आह - another type of student is introduced,
- संभावनाय - for presenting another possibility,
- उभयत्र अपि – that vaakya sravanam may also produce knowledge, in some cases.

The idea is: Sureswaraachaarya had said that *vaakya sravanam* **alone** produces knowledge. The *poorva pakshi* concedes that *vaakya sravanam* produces knowledge; but, his objection is to the use of '*vaakya sravanam* **alone**' by the *Achaarya*. He insists that, the word '**also**' only should be used instead of '**alone**'.

'*Ubhayathra api*' implies '*siddhaanthi abhyugamanaartham*' – 'for accepting the *Achaaryaa's* view partially, that *vaakya sravanam* (also) generates knowledge'.

Chapter II: Verse 3 –

वाक्यश्रवण मात्राः च पिशाचकवत् आप्नुयात् ।

त्रिषु याधुच्छिकी सिद्धिः स्मार्यमाणे तु निश्चिता ॥ ३ ॥

As in the case of *Pisaachaka*, merely hearing the proposition brings illumination to the fourth class of persons. In the other three cases, the result seem to be a

coincidence, but, in the case of a man being made to remember, the result is certain and sure.

Having introduced three possible methods of acquiring knowledge (in his opinion) in verse 2, the *poorva pakshin* introduces a fourth option, in this verse – *vaakya sravanam*, (which is the 2nd 'case' made out in our list earlier).

While Sureswraachaarya insists '*vaakya sravena maathrena jnaanam*', the *poorva pakshin* says '*vaakya sravana maathraa: cha*'.

- **वाक्यश्रवण मात्रा: च** - (In addition to the 3 methods given earlier) merely by *vaakya sravanam* also,
- **आप्तुयात्** - (the seeker) may gain (knowledge and mokshaa).

Who is the example? In our list, the student from *Kana Upanishad* was cited. The *poorva pakshin* gives the example of *Pisaachakaa*.

पिशाचकवत् - as i n t he case of Pi saachakaa.

This reference to *Pisaachakaa* has been commented upon, in two different manners. According to one Commentary (on *Naishkarmya Siddhi*), known as '*Chandrika*', authored by one *Jnaanoththamaa*, *Pisaachakaa* is a proper noun, the name of a person, who was an exceptional student, fully endowed with *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, because of which, he acquired *jnaanam* by *vaakya sravanam* – a typical example of '*sravana maathrena jnaana uthpatthi*'. Another Commentary, '*Klesa Apahaarin*', authored by *Sacchidaanendra Saraswathy*, explains *Pisaachakaa* thus: "In *puraanaas*, we find episodes of celestials sometimes being cursed by a sage to turn into a *pisaacha* or a *brahma rakshas*. On their pleading for *saapa vimochanaa*, the *rishi* concedes the plea, saying, that, after a particular time, a few years or decades, a *mahaathmaa* will release the celestial from the curse, reminding him that he was not a *pisaachaa* or *brahma raksha* – but, a *deva*. The mere reminder of the *mahaathmaa*, will give the celestial, *deva jnaanam*, that he is a *deva*. In the same manner, the *samsaari pisaachaa* drops his *jeevathvam*, because of *guru upadesam* and gains *brahmathvam*".

The text *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, very closely follows the *Upadesa Saahasri* of *Adi Sankaraa*, especially the 18th chapter "*Thathvamasi prakaranam*", in which, *Adi Sankara* gives the example of the *Rama Avathaaraa*. *Rama* forgets that He was an *avathaara* and towards the end of His sojourn on earth, a *rishi* is said to have reminded Him, that He was an *avathaaraa* of *Vishnu* and it was time that He returned to *Vaikuntaa*.

“In such cases, *vaakya sravanam*, by itself, has generated knowledge” concedes the *poorva pakshin*.

But, of these four cases,

- **त्रिषु सिद्धिः याधुच्छिकी** - In the three cases, *vaakya asravanam*, *vaakya sravanam* and *vaakya smaranam*, knowledge is possible- but not definite.
- **स्मार्यमाणे तु (सिद्धिः) निश्चिता** - (but) in *vaakya smaranam*, i.e. when *mahaa vaakyaa* is repeatedly taught, knowledge is certain to result.

This is the *poorva pakshin's* contention, Sureswaraacharaya's replies to which follow.

56. Chapter II, Verse 3 to 5 (30-06-2007)

In Chapter I, Sureswaraachaarya had mentioned the four basic principles of *Vedhaanthaa*. They are:

- (1) Self –ignorance **alone** is the cause of all problems
- (2) Self-knowledge **alone** is the solution to all the problems
- (3) *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam* **alone** is the source of self-knowledge, and (4) *Karma* can never give self-knowledge or liberation; however, it will prepare the mind, by purifying it.

Of these four principles, Sureswaraachaarya has taken up the third principle, "*maha vaakyam* **alone** is the source of self-knowledge- *vaakyam eva jnaana kaaranam*", in the beginning of the 2nd chapter, with the intention to establish this principle. (The *Achaaryaa* uses the word *vaakyam*, to refer to *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam*).

A *poorva pakshin* challenges this stand of the *Achaarayaa*, by a technical method.

Normally, when we prove that a particular thing is a cause of another particular thing, we use a logic known as '*anvaya-vyathirekha*' method, to prove the *kaarya-kaarana sambhandham* between the two. To prove that "*vaakyam eva jnanasya kaaranam*" – "*vaakyam* alone is the cause of *jnaanam*", by the use of *anvaya-vyathirekha* method, it has to be established that "*Vaakya sathve jnaana sathvam*" – "where *vaakyam* is present, *jnaanam* is present" (which is the *anvaya* part of the logic) and also that, "*vaakya abhaave jnaana abhaavam*" – "where *vaakyam* is absent, *jnaanam* is also absent" (which is the *vyathirekha* part of the logic).

Conversely, if the *poorva pakshi* is to refute the *Vedaanthin's* argument, he has to show that the *anvayaa* and *vyathirekha* do not work properly. This 'knocking off' is termed '*vyabhichara darsanam*' - 'showing the violation'. The *poorva pakshin* has to do either *anvaya vyabhichara darsanam* or *vyathireka vyabhichara darsanam* or both. If the *poorva pakshin* demolishes the *anvaya- vyathirekha* support of the *Vedaanthin*, he succeeds in demolishing the *kaarya-kaarana sambhandham* between *jnaanam* and *vaakyam*.

As already explained, using *anvayaa* to establish that *vaakyam* is *kaaranam* of *jnaanam*, is to show that "*yathra yathra vaakyam thathra thathra jnaanam, vaakya sathve jnaana sathvam*"- "wherever *vaakyam* is present, *jnaanam* is present". The *poorva pakshin* has to disprove this, if he wants to counter the *Vedhaanthin*.

The *vyathirekha* logic is the establishment of "*Vaakya abhaave jnaana abhaavam*"- "where *vaakyam* is absent, there *jnaanam* is also absent". The *poorva pakshin* has to disprove this contention also. For this purpose, the *poorva pakshin* refers to *Prajaapathi* and *Vaamadeva* in the *Upanishads*, who had gained knowledge without *vaakyam*. The *poorva pakshin* tells the *Vedhaanthin* "According to you, where *vaakyaa* is not there, *jnaanam* should not be there. But, in the cases of *Prajaapathi* and *Vaamdeva*, *jnaana bhaava*: is there, even though there is *vaakya abhaava*:. *Vaakya asravanaath api, prajaapathi vishaye, vaamadeba vishaye cha jnaana bhaava*:. You cannot, therefore, say that *vaakyam* is the cause of knowledge, since, in their cases, there was no *vaakyaa* at all".

The *anvaya vyabhicharaa* (the showing of the non-validity of the *anvaya* logic, as applied to the *kaarya-kaarana sambhandham* of *jnaanam* and *vaakyam*) is done by the *poorva pakshin*, quoting himself as an example. "I have been listening to the *vaakyam* for a length of time – but, I do not have the knowledge." He also gives another argument: "In the case of some people, they did not get *jnaanam* by listening to the *vaakyam* – but, they attained *jnaanam* by *dhyaanam* (on the *vaakyam*). *Vaakya sravanena jnaanam na theshaam, vaakya smaranena theshaam jnaanam bhaveth*. From the example of these people, it is clear that *jnaanam* was achieved through *smaranam* (*dhyaanam*) not *vaakyam*". These arguments of the *poorva pakshin* fall under *anvaya vyabhichara darsanam*.

Thus, through *anvaya vyabhicharaa* and *vyathirekha vyabhicharaa*, the *poorva pakshin* counters: "You cannot say that *vaakyam* alone is the source of knowledge".

And, as a part of this course of arguments, the *poorva pakshin* gives four instances:

- (1) *Vaakya asravanaath api jnaanam* – "rise of knowledge even without listening to *vaakyam*"
- (2) *Vaakya sravanaath jnaanam* – "In some rare cases, *jnaanam* results, by listening to *vaakyam*."
- (3) *Vaakya smaranam* generates *jnaanam*- "Knowledge is generated by meditation or remembrance"
- (4) *Vaakya smaaranaath jnaanam* – "the student does not get the knowledge, immediately on listening to the *vaakyam*; but, because of the *guru's* repeated assertions of the *vaakyam*, knowledge results".

"Because of these different instances, you cannot hold either that *vaakyam* **alone** is the source of knowledge or that *vaakyam* is a **definite** source of knowledge" says the *poorva pakshin*. Verses 2 and 3 gave the arguments of the *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this in the following verses.

Sambhanda gadhyam to Verse 4 (Chapter II):

न अयं अनैकान्तिकः हेतुः। यतः ।

It is urged in reply that the role of the proposition in giving rise to knowledge is not a mere coincidence.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "No. I do not accept your contention. There is no *vyabhicharaa*, either in *anvaya* or in *vyathirekhaa*. My *anvaya-vyathirekha* logic is sound. *Vaakyam* **alone** is the source of knowledge and *vaakyam* **is a definite** source of knowledge".

- अयम् - The mahaa vaakyam,
- हेतुः - being the cause/source (of knowledge)
- न अनैकान्तिकः - (is) not uncertain;

Anaikaanthika: - uncertain; not definite.

வாக்கியம் தான் ஞானத்தைக் கொடுக்கும்; வாக்கியம் ஞானத்தைக் கொடுக்கக்க தான் செய்யும்.

यतः - because of the following reasons.

Chapter II: Verse 4 –

सर्वोयम् महिमा जेयो वाक्यस्य एव यथा उदितः ।

वाक्यार्थं न हि रुते वाक्यात् कश्चित् जानाति तत्त्वतः ॥ ४ ॥

All this is the glory of the proposition itself. No one can really grasp the import of the proposition, independent of the proposition.

In this verse, Sureswaraachaarya only re-asserts what he had said earlier. He does not explain or substantiate. But, the commentators (of the text) have given the explanation.

अयम् सर्वः महिमा जेयो वाक्यस्य एव - In all the four instances you quote, vaakyam alone has generated knowledge.

Let us consider the 2nd case first: *vaakya sravanaath jnaanam* – the student gets the knowledge through *sravanam* and he gets liberation here and now, (on which the *Vedhaanthin* has no dispute).

Consider the 3rd case: *vaakya smaranaath jnaanam* – In the case of some students, the teaching is received by 'listening', but does not result in immediate knowledge; however, at

a later stage, by dwelling on the 'teaching', the students get the knowledge. This is the instance of '*vaakya dhyaanam* producing knowledge' (according to the *poorva pakshin*).

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "You say, that, *vaakya smaranam* produced knowledge. But, what really is the cause of the knowledge? Is it *vaakyam* or *smaranam*? It is **not** the *smaranam*, but, the remembered *vaakyam* **alone**, that has produced knowledge. Because the student's mind was not prepared earlier, the 'heard' statement did not produce knowledge; but, later, when the mind got cleansed of impurities, the 'remembered' statement gave the knowledge. But, even so, it was not 'remembrance' that produced the knowledge, but the remembered 'statement' only".

If the question "if it is the *vaakyaa* that produced knowledge, why did it not produce knowledge, at the time of hearing?" is raised, the answer is "it is not the deficiency of the *vaakyam*; only because of some block in the mind, the *vaakyaa* did not produce immediate knowledge. The problem is not of that of the *vaakyam*; but, that of the mind. When the mind gets purified, the *vaakyam* produces knowledge".

In short, *vaakya smaranam* did not produce the knowledge; *smrutha vaakyam* alone produced the knowledge.

Taking up the 4th case: *Vaakya smaaranam* producing knowledge. In this instance also, the *guru's* teaching '*thathvamasl*' did not produce knowledge, during the first session with the *guru*, only because of some block in the mind ; but, the repeated teachings, over the years, generated the knowledge, because of removal of the blocks, over the years. Again, it is the *vaakyam* **alone** that produced knowledge. Therefore, "*Vaakya sathve eva jnaana sathvam*"

Now, we come to the first case : *Vaakya asravanaath api jnaanam*.

"In the case of *Prajaapathi*, it is said in the *Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad* (4th *Braahmanaa* – 3rd *manthraa*), *Brahmaaji* was born from the navel of Lord *Vishnu*, he looked around and was frightened. But, suddenly he got the knowledge, without a *guru* or *guru vachanam*" ('*dveetheeyam vai bhayam bhavathl*' is the quotation) "Is it not a clear instance of *vaakya asravnaath api jnaanam*?" is the argument of the *poorva pakshin*.

The commentators explain thus: "It is not certain from the *Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad*, whether *Brahmaaji* got the knowledge at all. When you read the next *manthraa* of the *Upanishad*, it says that *Brahmaaji* started feeling 'lonely'. He needed companionship, and, therefore, by his *sankalpa sakthi*, he divided himself into two – *pathi* and *pathni* – *Manu* and *Satharopa*. If *Prajaapathi* had acquired *advaita jnaanam*, how can the *Upanishad manthraa* say that, he was feeling lonely?"

The *poorva pakshin* asks: "But, what about *Vaamadeva*, who got 'knowledge', even while in the womb of his mother and claimed '*aham brahma asmi!*' *Brahadaaranyaka* and *Eithreya Upanishads* relate this episode".

The *Vedhaanthin's* reply: "Even in this case, *vaakya* alone must have generated knowledge. *Vaama Deva* must have listened to the *vaakyam*, in his earlier birth; but, because of some obstacle - *prathibhandham* – he would not have got the clarity. He would have been an *Yoga Bhrashtaa*. The *Saasthraas* say, that, in the case of an *yoga bhrashtaa*, though the teachings of the *vaakyaa* might not have produced immediate 'knowledge', they would remain as '*vaasanaas*' in the *yoga bhrashtaa's* mind -*sookshma sareeram* - and when the *yoga bhrashtaa* is reborn, because of an *udhbodhakam* (a trigger), 'knowledge' will be born, from the *vaasanaas*. A spiritual genius remembers the *vaasanaa* and, at the appropriate time, because of some trigger, *jnaanam* will be achieved. Thus, it is only the *poorva janma vaakya sravanam* that has helped *Vaama Deva* also".

Therefore, *vaakyam* **alone** and *vaakyam* **definitely** will produce knowledge. (This is an assurance to the students of *Vedhaantha*.)

- अयम् सर्वः - All the four cases you quote,
- वाक्यस्य महिमा एव ज्ञेयः - should be understood as proving the glory of the maha vaakyam,
- यथा उदितः - as declared by me, earlier.
- वाक्यात् रुते - Without maha vaakyam,
- कश्चित् वाक्यार्थं न जानाति - nobody can get the 'knowledge' (jeevaathma paramaathma aiykya jnaanam),
- तत्त्वतः - in truth / certainly.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 5:

वाक्यं च प्रतिपादनाय प्रवृत्तं सत्प्रतिपादयति एव सर्वप्रमाणामपि एवम् वृत्तत्वात् ।

The proposition, purporting to convey knowledge, does so positively. Such is the nature of all means of knowledge.

Sureswaraachaarya says that the *maha vaakyam* has the power to generate knowledge. Therefore, it will **certainly** generate knowledge, in the mind of the equipped listener. Not only will the *vaakyam* generate knowledge – the knowledge will be the final, liberating knowledge, which will not require any further corroboration or validation, in the form of a mystic experience or a second source etc.

Why do we say so?

This knowledge cannot be confirmed by any other source, since no other source deals with *aathmaa*. How can sources which do not deal in the field / sphere of *aathmaa* validate the *aathma jnaanam* given by the *mahaa vaakyam*?

Your 'understanding' **is** the final knowledge. Do not look for further corroboration. *Vedhaantha vaakyam* is like a sense organ. What is received by the 'eye' in the field of colours or form, is final knowledge, that cannot be proved by the other sense organs – ears or tongue, since they do not function in the field of colours and forms.

When you get information from a secondary source, you may require further corroboration. For instance, existence of fire is known from the smoke by 'inference' – *anumaana pramaanam* and confirmed by physical perception – *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam, on the other hand, is a **primary** source of knowledge, and does not require any further proof. It is a primary source, giving primary knowledge.

There is no question of direct proof of *aathmaa*, since 'you' are '*aathmaa*'. 'Understanding' is literally 'knowledge'.

(This 'analysis of knowledge' – an analysis of the source, validity, proof for validity etc.- is called epistemology – *pramaana saasthram*).

There may be a further doubt. A student might ask: "OK. Other sources may not be able to corroborate the *Vedhaantha Vaakya* knowledge. But, other sources may contradict the *Vedhaanthic* statements. In fact, they do so. How can I, therefore, accept that *Vedhaanthic* knowledge is valid?"

How do they contradict? Because all other *pramaanams* – *prathyaksham*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa* etc. – reveal *dvaitham* and *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam* alone is revealing *advaitam*. "The *vaakya pramaanam* is, thus, contradicted by other *pramaanams*. One may accept *vaakya pramaanam*, even if there is absence of support from *anya pramaanam*; but, when there are positive contradictions from other *pramaanams* to *vaakya pramaanam*, how can you say that *vaakyam* gives valid knowledge?" is the question raised.

Sureswaraachaarya answers: "If you understand properly, no other *pramaanam* can contradict *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, the knowledge is valid, uncontradicted by any other source of knowledge, experiences etc."

- वाक्यं च - The mahaa vaakyam
- प्रतिपादनाय प्रवृत्तं सत् – being meant only for giving knowledge,

- Pravruttham - 'functioning'
- प्रतिपादयति एव - will certainly produce knowledge,
- सर्वप्रमाणानाम् अपि एवम् वृत्तत्वात् - since all pramaanams (sources of knowledge) are of such a nature.

Vrutthathvaath – because of being of such a nature.

But then, how do you solve the problem i.e. of *advaita pramaanam* revealed by *Vedhaanthaa*, being contradicted by all other *pramaanams*?

Sureswaraachaarya says 'there is no problem at all'.

Chapter II: Verse 5 –

न अहंग्राह्यो न तद्दीने न प्रत्यङ्नापि दुःखिनि ।

विरोधः सदसि इत्यस्मात् वाक्य अभिज्ञस्य जायते ॥ ५ ॥

There is no contradiction for one who understands the sentence 'thou are that being', in connection with either the ego or the factors other than ego, such as the senses or the pure Self or the individual subject to misery.

In the teaching "you are whole; you are *aananda svaroopaa*:", what is the meaning of 'you'? Four meanings can be taken. But, whatever is taken, Sureswaraachaarya says, there is no contradiction.

1st meaning of 'thou': *Sthoola Sareeram - ahamgraahya*: is the word used by the *Achaaryaa* for the *sthoola sareeram*, (in this verse).

2nd meaning of 'thou': The various sense organs – referred to, by the *Achaaryaa* as '*thadh heene'* – *thena heenam* is *thadh heenam* - since the sense organs are referred to as 'mine' and not as 'I' .

3rd meaning of 'thou': The mind – referred to as *dhu:khini* - since it is generally occupied by one worry or another.

4th meaning of 'thou': *Chaitnyam – Prathyang* is the word used here.

Sureswaraachaarya says, that, in all the four cases, there is no contradiction with the *mahaa vaakyam*.

How do you say so?

57. Chapter II, Verse 5 to 8 (07-07-2007)

Four principles of *Vedhaantha* have been mentioned in the 1st chapter:

- (1) Self-ignorance alone is the cause of *samsaara*.
- (2) Self-knowledge alone is, therefore, the solution for *samsaara*.
- (3) *Mahaa vaakyam* alone is the source of self-knowledge, and
- (4) *Karma* cannot give self-knowledge or liberation; but *karma* can purify the mind for gaining knowledge and liberation.

Sureswaraacharya has taken the third principle, for analysis, in the 2nd chapter – that, the *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyaani* such as '*thath thvam asi*' etc., are alone the valid sources of self-knowledge.

In the introduction to verse 5, he said *mahaa vaakyam* is a primary source of knowledge and therefore, whatever it reveals has to be the final knowledge. The knowledge revealed by the *mahaa vaakyam* cannot be validated by any other source nor contradicted. An example of a primary source of knowledge is the sense organ 'eye', which cannot be corroborated by any other sense organ, in *its* field of knowledge, the 'colours' and 'forms', which field is unique to the 'eye' only. As other senses do not have access to 'colours' and 'forms', they can neither confirm nor contradict the eyes. Therefore, in the field of colours and forms, whatever the eye reveals, has to be accepted as valid knowledge, which does not require further corroboration or substantiation. So also with the other sense organs, in their respective fields of knowledge. In the same manner, *mahaa vaakyam* **is** the source of knowledge, in the field of *aathmaa*. If properly taught by the *guru* and if properly understood by the student, the transaction **will** result in knowledge. The *Achaaryaa* stresses this, in the introduction to verse 5, as "*vaakyam prathipaadhayathi eva*" - "*vaakyam* will certainly produce knowledge".

"*thath thvam asi*" - "That you are" - is a *mahaavaakyam*. '*Thath*' is a pronoun, whose meaning has to be understood from the context in which it occurs. This *mahaavaakyam* is from the *Chandhogyha Upanishad*, in which the *guru* starts his teaching with '*Sath eva soumya*' etc. From the context, '*thath*' is to be understood as '*sath*' (the *poorna aananda chaithanyam*). Sureswaraacharya makes use of the same word here (in verse 5) – '*sath asi*'.

- '*सदसि*' - 'you are poorna aananda chaithanyam'

This statement is equivalent to '*thath thvam asi*', which means '*sathvam asi*' or '*sath asi*'. Sureswaraachaarya avers, that, when the student receives the sentence, he will receive valid knowledge, which cannot be contradicted by other sources.

- **अभिज्ञस्य** - For one who has understood (properly)
- **'सदसि' इत्यस्मात् वाक्य** - the mahaa vaakyaani, such as '*sath asi*',
- **विरोधः न जायते** - no contradiction appears (in the meaning)
- **अहं ग्राह्यो** – in the context of the body,
- **तद्दीने** - (or) in the context of the senses,
- **दुःखिनि** - (or) in the context of the mind,
- **प्रत्यङ्नापि** - (or) even in the context of consciousness.

Looking from any angle, there is no contradiction for such a student.

How does Sureswaraachaarya say this? If it is stated that "from the state of Consciousness, there is no contradiction", the statement can be accepted, since Consciousness is *sath svaroopam*, *chith svaroopam* and *aananda svaroopam*. But, what about the body, senses and mind? How can you say, that, there are no contradictions with respect to these also? The detailed explanation would be as follows:

If, only the *vaachyaarthaa* (immediate meaning) of the word 'you', in the *mahaavaakya*, is considered, the word would mean, "I, the Consciousness, **including** the body-mind-senses". But, *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam* does not give the *vaachyaartham* for 'you'; it gives, what is termed, *baagha thyaagha lakshanaa* meaning, by which, the word 'you' or 'I' (in the *mahaavaakya*) will refer to **only** the Consciousness principle, **keeping out** the body-mind-senses complex. Thus, the *mahaavaakya* should be understood as calling **only** the pure Consciousness as *aananda svaroopam*:

And, when the *Vedaanthic* statement says, "I the Consciousness is *aananda*", you cannot contradict it at all, since no other *pramaanam* deals with Consciousness, to contradict or confirm this statement and *Vedhaantha* alone is the *pramaanam* for Consciousness.

Aananda svaroopam and body-mind-senses **will** contradict, since your mind only reflects the *aananda* of the Consciousness, that too, only at times. Permanent *prathi-bhimbha-aananda* will not be there. Therefore, contradiction comes if *baagha thyaagha lakshanaa* is not applied.

For one who has understood the *mahaavaakya* properly i.e. with the *baagha thyaagha lakshanaa*, there cannot be a contradiction, since he will realise that, in the case of Consciousness, there is permanent *aananda*, while in the case of body or mind or senses,

there cannot be permanent *aanandaa*. (i.e. Consciousness is *aananda svarooopa*.; while the body or mind or senses are not.)

This is how Sureswaraachaarya's statement "***abignyasya virodha: na jayathe***" – "**For one who has understood properly**, no contradiction appears", should be interpreted.

Chapter II :Verse 6 –

न अविरक्तस्य संसारात् निविवृत्सा ततः भवेत् ।

न च अनिवृत्त तृष्णस्य पुरुषस्य मुमुक्षुता ॥ ६ ॥

In one who has not developed dispassion towards the world, no inclination to renounce it will arise. One, in whom the desires are not quenched, does not develop the urge towards release.

Mahaa vaakyam is the primary and valid source of valid knowledge, which can liberate a person instantaneously. *Nirdhushta pramaanam* is the word used about *vaakyam*.

If *vaakyam* does not liberate, the problem is not with the *vaakyam* – but, with the *guru* or the *sishyaa*. Suppose the *guru* does not have any problem, having given knowledge to some other *sishyaa*, the problem has to be with the *sishyaa* only.

What is the *sishyaa's* problem?

Sureswaraachaarya says that this has to be investigated into. He says that the student has to go through eight stages to succeed in the spiritual project. If there is a snag in any one of the eight stages, it has to be rectified.

Verses 6 to 9, deal with the eight stages, each verse covering two stages. Verse 6 talks of the first two stages, which are *vairaaghyam* and *uparamaa*. If a person wants to attain *mokshaa*, he should work for *mokshaa*. For this, he should have the desire for *mokshaa*, to start with.

What is *mokshaa*? '*Samsaara nivritthi*' i.e. a man desiring *mokshaa*, should have desire for *samsaara nivritthi* - dropping *samsaaraa*. If this is to happen, i.e. if desire for *samsaara nivritthi* is to arise, he should have *samsaara vairaaghyam* first.

Samsaara vairaaghyam will alone lead to *samsaara nivritthi icchaa* or *moksha icchaa*.

- अविरक्तस्य संसारात् - For one who has not got dispassion for *samsaaraa*,
- निविवृत्सा - desire to get rid of *samsaaraa*

- ततः न भवेत् - will not arise.
- अनिवृत्त तृष्णस्य पुरुषस्य मुमुक्षुता न (भवति) - For one who does not have *samsaara nivritthi icchaa*, *moksha praapthi icchaa* will not arise.

The *samssaraa nivritthi icchaa* is what is known as *uparamaa* and is the second stage, as listed by Sureswaraachaarya, while *vairaaghyam* is the first stage.

There is an interesting fact with regard to *vairaaghyam*: People want to be rid of pain. They come to a *Vedhaanthic* teacher, who says "If you want to be free of pain, drop the sources of pain". This is perfectly acceptable to the student. But on deeper analysis, he realises that all sources of pain, happen to be sources of pleasure also. (Normally, it is said that all sources of pleasure are sources of pain also.) This means that, the student has to drop the sources of pleasures also. This is what discourages the student, in his *vairaaghyam*. *Bhagavaan* has made every object which is a source of pleasure, as a source of pain also and *vice versa*. Hence the dilemma for the seeker. *Vairaaghyam* results, when in pain; but, when he enjoys, *vairaaghyam* disappears and *raaghaa* appears. Only when you drop sources of pleasure also, i.e. only on developing *vairaaghyam*, *mumukshuthvaa* (desire for *mokshaa*) will result.

Chapter II: Verse 7 –

न च अमुमुक्षोः अस्ति इह गुरु पाद उपसर्पणम् ।

न विना गुरुसंबन्धं वाक्यस्य श्रवणम् भवेत् ॥ ७ ॥

One who has no urge towards release, will not approach a preceptor. Apart from a preceptor, there is no hearing of the sacred text.

The third stage is "the strong desire for *moksha praapthi*:" – "*mumukshuthaa*" and the fourth stage is "*guru upasarpanam*" or "*guru upasadhanam*" - "approaching a *guru*".

Compare 'the *mumukshu* approaching a *guru* to a 'patient rushing to a Doctor, when in intense pain'. The *mumukshu* is to be given *samsaara rogha vaidhyam*.

"*Mumuksho: eva guru paada upasarpanam*" - "Only a person who has *moksha praapthi icchaa*, will have *gurupraapthi*; ; he alone will approach the *Vedhaanthic* preceptor" is the message that Sureswaraachaarya wants to convey and does it using a double-negative sentence.

- अमुमुक्षोः गुरु पाद उपसर्पणम् न अस्ति - For one who does not have *moksha icchaa*, 'approaching a preceptor' does not result,
- इह – in this subject / circumstances.

The next step: Only when the seeker goes to the *guru*, *vaakya sravanam* can happen i.e. *Guru upasadanam* will lead to *mahaa vaakya sravanam / vichaaram*. The *Aachaaryaa* uses double-negative to convey this also.

- गुरुसंबन्धं विना वाक्यस्य श्रवणम् न भवेत् - Without interaction with guru, maha vaakya vichaaram is not possible.

Vinaa - without.

To recap: Stage:

- (1) *Samsaara vairaaghyam* – detachment from *samsaaraa*
- (2) *Samsaara nivritthi icchaa* – desire to be rid of *samsaaraa*
- (3) *Moksha praapthi icchaa* - desire for attainment of *mokshaa*
- (4) *Guru praapthi*: - approaching a guru.
- (5) *Vaakya sravanam*.

Chapter II: Verse 8 –

तथा पदपदार्थौ च न स्तः वाक्यं रुते क्वचित् ।

अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ च तौ रुते स्तां किम् आश्रयौ ॥ ८ ॥

Without hearing the sacred text, there are no words or meanings to be enquired into. In the absence of words and their meanings, on what should rational inquiry rest?

The 5th step is *vaakya sravanam* and with *vaakya sravanam*, the seeker enters *padhaartha vichaaraa*. *Sravanam* can also mean *vichaaraa*. *Vaakyaa* is, of course, *mahaa vaakyam* (in this text). What is *padha artha vichaaraa*? Ans: 'Word analysis'.

Any sentence consists of only words. 'Sentence analysis', therefore, is always accompanied by 'word analysis'. *Vaakya vichaaraa* will lead to *padha artha vichaaraa*. Sureswaraachaarya expresses this fact as "a person who does not enter *vaakya vichaaraa* will not enter *padha vichaaraa* or *padha artha vichaaraa*".

- वाक्यं रुते - Without *vaakyam*,
- पद पदार्थौ न स्तः - *padha vichaaraa*: and *padha artha vichaaraa*: will not result,
- क्वचित् - in any circumstance.

The 6th step, therefore, is *padha, padha artha vichaaraa*:| Once you enter *padha vichaaraa*:, you enquire into the meaning of 'that'(paramaathmaa) and 'thvam' (jeevaathmaa).

What exactly is conveyed by the word '*thvam*'? If you want to understand the meaning of *jeevaathmaa*, the *saasthraas* have presented a particular method of enquiry - *anvaya vyathirekha vichaara:* This method of enquiry to arrive at the meaning of the word '*thvam*' is adopted by Sureswaraachaarya in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. Adi Sankaraachaarya also uses this method in his *Upadesa Saahasri*, though not to the extent of Sureswaraachaarya in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. Likewise, Vidhyaranya Swami also uses this method in his treatise *Panchadasi*, again not to the extent of Sureswaraachaarya in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Since *padha vichaara:* (the 6th step) leads to *anvaya vyathirekha vichaara:*, the *anvaya vyathirekha vichaara:* is to be considered, as the 7th step.

58. Chapter II, Verse 8 to 12 (14-07-2007)

Sureswaraacharya is establishing in this chapter, that, *mahaa vaakyam* is the direct means of gaining direct knowledge of *aathman*; the knowledge is gained even at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, if the student has gone through the required stages properly. The *Achaaryaa* talks of eight stages, through which the seeker has to go, to gain liberation from *samsaaraa*. The eight stages are covered by four verses, verse 6 to verse 9.

Verse 6 talks of *samsaara vairaaghyam*, which means 'dispassion towards *samsaaraa* (the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*)', as the first stage; the second stage indicated by this verse is *samsaara nivritthi icchaa* - the 'desire to get out of the emotional dependence on *samsaaraa* (the *anaathma prapanchaa*)'.

Verse 7 talks of two further stages, stage 3, being *moksha praapthi icchaa* i.e. the 'intense desire for *mokshaa* or self-dependence' and stage 4, being *guru paada upasarpnam*, 'approaching a *guru* for guidance to attain the goal, which action requires the conviction, that, the goal cannot be attained without the guidance of a *guru*. (*Mundaka Upanishad* - I.II.12 - declares "*pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath naasthi akrutha: kruthena thadvijnartham samithpaani: sa: **gurum eva abhigaccheth samithpaani: srothriyam brahmanishtam**" – "having examined the worlds which are achieved through *karma*, a *brahmin* should come to dispassion. Since *mokshaa* is not possible through *karma*, to attain knowledge, he must, with *samith* in hand, necessarily **approach a teacher**, who is learned in scriptures and established in *Brahman*).*

Verse 8 covers the 5th and 6th stages. The 5th stage is when the *guru* guides the student through a spiritual educational programme – *Vedhaantha vakya sravanam* / *Vedhaantha vaakya vichaaram*. As the student listens to the *mahaa vaakyam*, he will understand that, *Vedhaantha* is talking about *brahma svaroopam* or *aathma svaroopam*; that, it points out, that, that *brahman* is 'you' yourself.

A seeker, in the initial stages, is not receptive to the idea, however much he respects the *guru*. He will assume that the *guru* is talking about a 'Reality', which he, the student, will realise only later. This is a common mistake, the notion, "the *guru* has talked about a *Brahman*, which I have *now* understood intellectually; but, *later* I will get a direct experience in the *thureeyaa* stage". The *guru*, on the other hand, insists "you **are** *brahman*, which is, ever available, even at the time of *sravanam*." When a student thus misses the message of the *mahaa vaakyaa* and does not grasp the meanings of the important words 'that' and 'thou', it is the responsibility of the *guru* to point out to the student "you do not require *saadhanaas* like meditation, to understand the real import of the *mahaa vaakyaa*. What you

do require is further enquiry – into the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' – *padha, padha artha vichaara:*". This *padha, padha artha vichaara:* is the 6th stage, as indicated by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

- वाक्यम् रुते - Without enquiry into the mahaa vaakyam,
- पद पदार्थो न स्तः - the student will not understand the padhaa and the padha arthaa.

Stha: is the dual verb form of *asthi*, (the plural form is *santhi*), the subject of the sentence, *padha, padha arthau*, being dual.

Padha vichaara: is 'word analysis' and *padha artha vichaara:* is 'analysis of the meanings of the word'. Entering into *padha vichaaraa* and *padha artha vichaaraa* is not possible without *vaakya sravanam*.

When the student enters into '*thvam*' *padha vichaaraa* – the word denoting *jeevaathmaa* (*kaarya aathmaa*) and into '*thath*' *padha vichaaraa* – the word denoting *paramaathmaa* (*kaarana aathmaa*), he finds that, when the teacher refers to the student as 'you', he is referring to the essential 'you', not to the non-essential, peripheral, *anna-maya*, *praanamaya kosa* etc. 'you'.

One should segregate the essential 'I' from the non-essential 'I' – as *Katopanishad* (Ch.II – Sec III – Verse 17) points out "*Purusham antharaathmam svaath sareeraath dhairyena pravruheth munjaath isheekaam iva*" – "one should separate the inner Self, from one's own body, with diligence, like separating stalk from *munjaa* grass". This effort requires *anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa*. 'What is *anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa?*' is not going to be detailed now, except that it is a type of enquiry to segregate the essential 'I', from the non-essential, superficial, peripheral person.

- तौ रुते - Without entering the padha, padha artha vichaaraa
- अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ - the anvaya vyathirekha enquiry
- किं आश्रयौ - will be based on what ?

The import of the question is: '*Anvaya-vyathirekha* is based on *padha, padha artha vichaara:*'; alternately, 'only when you enter *padha, padha artha vichaara:* you will enter *anvaya-vyathirekha*'. This is in tune with *Upadesa Saahasri* – Ch. XVIII.

What is the importance of *anvaya-vyathirekha*? Both Adi Sankaraacharya and Sureswaraacharya say "If you do *anvaya-vyathirekha*, you will gain knowledge immediately".

Chapter II: Verse 9 –

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विना वाक्यार्थबोधनम् ।

न स्यात् तेन विना अज्ञानप्रहाणं न उपपद्यते ॥ ९ ॥

Without such an enquiry, there is no comprehension of the significance of the sacred sentence. Without that comprehension, there is no termination of ignorance.

In this verse, the last two stages are mentioned: *Anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa* (which was mentioned in the earlier verse also) and *vaakyartha jnaanam*.

Anvaya vyathirekhaa is the crucial part of the spiritual enquiry. If this is done properly, you get *aparoksha jnaanam* - direct / instantaneous realisation. 'Understanding' takes place during *vaakya sravanam* itself, in *jaagrath avasthaa* – **not** in the *samaadhi avasthaa*, since all sources of knowledge - *guru, saasthraas* etc.- are shut off during *samaadhi*. *Guru* and *saasthraas* are available only in *jaagrath avasthaa*. *Samaadhi* can be used for 'remembering' knowledge, but, **not** for 'acquisition' of knowledge, since 'acquisition' is not possible during *samaadhi*, since *guru, saasthra, vedhaantha* and *sabda pramaanams* are not available in *samaadhi*; they are available only in *jaagrath avasthaa*.

Only through *anvaya vyathirekha, vaakyartha jnaanam* is possible.

- **अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विना** - Without *anvaya vyathirekha* (*anvrutthi* and *vyaavrutthi*) *vichaaraa*,
- **वाक्यार्थबोधनम्** - the direct knowledge of Brahman ('I' am Brahman here and now)
- **न स्यात्** - will not happen.
- **तेन विना** - Without *vaakyartha jnaanam* taking place,
- **अज्ञान प्रहाणं न उपपद्यते** - elimination of self-ignorance is not possible.

Prahaanam - Elimination.

My *jeeva bhaavaa* is replaced by *Brahma bhaavaa* - 'I am *jeeva*' **notion** is replaced by 'I am *brahmar*' **conviction**. This is *mokshaa*.

This displacement of the notion takes place in the intellect of the seeker and, therefore, *mokshaa* is an event of removal of a notion in the intellect.

To summarise: the eight steps listed out by the *Achaaryaa*, in this portion, are:

- (1) *Samsaara vairaaghyam*
- (2) *Samsaara nivritthi icchaa*
- (3) *Moksha praapthi icchaa*
- (4) *Guru praapthi:*
- (5) *Vaakya sravanam*
- (6) *Padha artha vichaaram*
- (7) *Anvaya vyathirekha vichaaram*
- (8) *Vaakyartha bodhanam / aiykya jnaanam.*

If you go through these stages properly, *ajnaana prahaanam* takes place, only when *moksha purushaartha* is attained. This is said in the next verse.

Chapter II: Verse 10 –

विना अज्ञानप्रहाणेन पुरुषार्थः सुदुर्लभः ।

तस्मात् यथोक्त सिद्ध्यर्थं परः ग्रन्थः अवतार्यते ॥ १० ॥

Without the termination of ignorance, the attainment of the supreme good is impossible. Therefore, with a view to establish the import of 'Thou' in 'That Thou art', the subsequent part of the work starts.

"Only when self-ignorance goes, a person attains *moksha purushaartha*" says Sureswaraachaaryaa.

अज्ञानप्रहाणेन विना - Without elimination of self-ignorance,

पुरुषार्थः सुदुर्लभः - mokshaa is impossible.

In the case of the other *purushaarthaas* – viz. *dharma*, *artha* and *kaamaa*, you have to do a lot of action. But, for *moksha purushaartha*, you have to do a lot of thinking/ enquiry – *vicharaa*. *Mokshaa* pursuit is predominantly an educational programme , since, it is only pursuit of intellectual knowledge.

Some people wrongly advise against this, because, they do not understand that knowledge comes through *vaakya vicharaa*, *padha vicharaa*, *anvaya vyathirekha vicharaa* etc. And, one should note that the spiritual journey actually gets over with *sravanam*.

Nidhidhyaasanam is **not** continuation of the journey; but, is only reminding oneself that the journey is over. Otherwise, one will think that the journey is not over and that, one is still a *saadhakaa*. Orientation of the continuation of the journey has to be broken – *nidhidhyaasanaa* should make one understand that, 'one is *Brahman* here and now'. If this is not understood 'further study' has to be done. The *ajnaana prahaanam* (elimination of self-ignorance) is only through study. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says : "I want to advise the student to do *vaakya, padha, anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa*, assuming that the early stages such as *samsaara vairaaghyam* etc. have been achieved by the student".

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- यता उक्त सिद्ध्यर्थ - for accomplishing the stages mentioned (explained in the last 4 verses),
- परः ग्रन्तः - the following part of the work
- अवतार्यते - starts.

Chapter II: Verse 11 –

वर्चस्कं तु अन्नकार्यत्वात् यथा न आत्मा इति गम्यते ।

तद्भागः सेन्द्रियः देहः तद्वत् किमिति नेक्ष्यते ॥ ११ ॥

Just as faeces, a product of food, is regarded as other than the Self, even so the body, along with the senses, being the product of food in the same way, must be regarded as other than the Self. Why is it not so understood?

Up to verse 10, is the introduction to the subject matter. The 'enquiry' begins from the 11th verse only. (The subject matter is *vaakya vichaaraa, padha vichaaraa* and *anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa*).

Padha vichaaraa starts from the 11th verse.

First, Sureswaraachaarya says, that, the primary obstacle to understand *Vedhaantha* is "*deha abhimaanam*". The physical personality obstructs the spiritual personality. The word '*thvam*' has to be understood properly; and, the *deha abhimaanam* should become thinner and thinner, till it disappears totally. *Deha abhimaanam* is also of three types – similar to *deha – sthoola deha abhimaanam, sookshma deha abhimaanam* and *kaarana deha abhimaanam*. Of these, the strongest is the *sthoola deha abhimaanam*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya starts with physical body negation.

He gives several reasons to include the physical body into the *anaathma prapanchaa*. He says that the physical body is a product of *annam*. (*Thathva bodhaa* declares that the *sthoola sareeram* corresponds to the first sheath of the individual - the *annamaya kosa*:

"*annarasena eva bhoothvaa annarasena eva vrudhim praapya anna roopa pruthivyaam yadhvileeyathe thadh annamaya: kosa: sthoolasareeram*" – "the gross body is a sheath born of the essence of food, grows by the essence of food alone and also resolves in the earth, which is in the form of food.")

In the body 'waste' is also there. This faecal matter, referred to as *varchaskam* (*malam*- filth / waste), in the verse, is a product of food – *anna kaaryam*, since, it is the food consumed which has become faeces. Likewise, the gross body also is a product of food. *Varchaskam anna kaaryam ; deha: api anna kaaryam*. "Are you interested in claiming *varchaskam* as yourself ? Is it not repulsive, even to think or talk of *varchaskam*? When you are so inclined to treat *varchaskam* – one *anna kaaryam* with revulsion - why do you treat the other *anna kaaryam*, the gross body, as something precious?" asks Sureswaraachaaryaa.

- यथा - Just as,
- वर्चस्कं तु - the faecal matter,
- अन्नकार्यत्वात् - because of being the result of food,
- न आत्मा इति गम्यते - is not considered the "self" by anybody,
- सेन्द्रियः देहः - the gross body with all the sense organs,
- तद्भागः – being also another variety of anna kaaryam,

Anna kaarya vibhaagha: is thadhbaagha: /

- किमिति नेक्ष्यते - why is not understood / looked upon
- तद्वत् - in the same manner ?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 12:

आक्लिर्ः आलिइउ म् क्र् आम् ः मिओल्क्ः ।

The food is recognised as a non-Self, before consumption and after excretion. What makes it otherwise, in the interval?

Sureswaraachaarya gives the second argument.

"If you analyse the physical body, before the skin, bone, flesh etc. were formed, they were in the form of food, i.e. initially, the body was *anaathmaa – aahaara roopena*. Later the consumed food becomes *varchaskam – mala roopena anaathmaa*. If it is *anaathmaa* in the past and *anaathmaa* in the future, when it is in the body-form for a short duration, in the middle, how can you claim it as *aathmaa*?" asks the *Achaaryaa*.

A fingernail or a hair, which is looked after, with care, when it is a part of the body, becomes *asoucham* when it is removed from the body, the *dharma saasthraas*, in fact, prescribing a bath, if you happen to come into contact with the removed hair or nail.

- कः प्रतिबन्धः - What is the obstacle for you (in accepting) ,
- अनात्मत्वे प्रसिद्धे - what is well established as anaathmaa,
- आध्यन्तयोः - in the past and the future,
- मध्ये अपि – (as anaathmaa) in the interval also ?

This is conveyed by the verse that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 12 –

प्रागनात्मा एव जग्धं सत् आत्मताम् येति अविध्यया ।

स्रग् आलेपनवत् देहम् तस्मात् पश्येत् विविक्थधीः ॥ १२ ॥

What is non-Self before, is identified as the Self, after being eaten, through misconception. Therefore, a man of discrimination must see it as other than the Self, like a garland and a fragrant unguent.

- प्रागनात्मा एव - Before getting converted into blood, skin etc. (i.e. when in the form of food), what is understood as *anaathmaa*, 'Later also' is implied; later also it is *anaathmaa*, in the form of *varchaskam*.
- जग्धं सत् – after eating,
- अविध्यया - because of self-ignorance,
- आत्मनाम् येति - is (mis)understood as 'myself'.

Anna karyathvaath - is the 1st reason given.

Adhyanthayo: anaathmathvaath - is the 2nd reason given.

59. Chapter II, Verse 12 to 16 (21-07-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya wants to establish that, *makhaavaakyan* can directly give self-knowledge, if one undergoes the necessary preparatory stages; by 'preparatory stages', we mean, "grasping the meanings of the word 'thvam' and of the word 'thath'".

'Thath' means *Paramaathmaa*, which should be understood as 'Pure Existence' – as the *Chandoghya Upanishad* says "sath eva soumya idham agra aaseeth" – 'pure Existence', without *nama-roopa* contamination. But, this topic is not discussed here.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to emphasize the '*thvam padha artham*' here. The '*thvam padha*' should be understood as *aathmaa* separated from *anaathmaa*. If *anaathmaa* is not separated, '*thvam*' or '*aham*', in the *mahaa vaakyaani* will include *anaathmaa* and the *mahaa vaakyam* will have no significance. Therefore, one has to take pains to separate '*aham*' from *anaathmaa* – the *sareera thrayam*, the *sthoola sareeram* being the outermost. *Aathma anaathma vivekam* is compulsory before *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

Katopanishad - II. III. 17 – declares: "angushtamaathra: purusha: antharaathmaa sadhaa janaanaam hrudaye sannivishtha:" – "Purushaa, the inner Self, which is of the size of the thumb, is ever seated in the heart of the people"; And exhorts: "Tham svaaath sareeraath pravruheth munjaath eva isheekaam dhairyena | tham vidhyaath sukram amrutham tham vidhyaath sukram amritham ithi" - "One should separate that (the inner Self) from one's own body with diligence, like separating the stalk from the *munja* grass. One should know that to be pure and immortal". One can claim one's immortality, only when one claims 'one's self' from one's mortal body.

This is the reason why Sureswaraachaarya talks of the *sthoola sareera anaathma vivekam* and emphasises that the *sthoola sareeram* should not be included in the meaning of the word 'I'.

'*Aadhyanthayo: anaathmathve prasiddhe madhye api ka: prathibandha:* (the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 12) means: "Before the food is converted into the skin, blood, bone etc. of the gross body, it existed as *anaathmaa*, as 'food on the plate' and also looked upon as such i.e. as *anaathmaa*. The very same *annam* gets converted into and thrown out as waste, which is also considered *anaathmaa*. Then, when the food, in the interval, exists as blood, bone etc., how can you consider them alone as *aathmaa*?"

- **अविध्यया आत्मताम् येति** - Only because of ignorance, you claim (your gross body, made of food), as the "Self".

In the second line of the verse, the *Aachaaryaa* gives another logic. The physical body is acquired temporarily by us and will be dropped later, like a garland or like perfume (sandalwood paste etc.)

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- विविक्तधीः - a discriminating person / a viveki
- पश्येत - should look upon
- देहं - his gross body
- सगालेपनवत् - like a garland or perfume.

Srak – means 'garland'. A garland is thrown off when it fades away. Similarly, the *jeeva* had a particular body in its earlier birth and threw away the body, when the body became old and withered; as Lord Krishna said in the *Bhagavadh Githa*: (verse 22 – Ch. II) "*Vaasaamsi jeernaani yathaa vihaaya navaani grunhaathi naroparaani thathaa sareeraani vihaaya jeernaani anyaani samyaathi navaani dehi*" - "Just as a person gives up worn out clothes and puts on other new ones, so also, the Self gives up worn out bodies and attains other new ones".

The second example given by the *Achaaryaa* is *aalepanam*, which refers to any perfume, like sandalwood paste etc., applied on the body. *Lipyathe ithi lepanam* – that which is applied. The *aalepanam* is only a temporary application on the body and is later washed away. The gross body is like the perfume, a temporary 'plastering' on the *sookshama sareeram* (which is also *anaathmaa*, the negation of which is to be taken up later.)

The body is only temporary, existing for a short period. During that period, 'use' the body as 'means, to realize the *aathmaa* and then reject the body. An example is a plastic cup used to drink from. Once the drink is consumed, the plastic cup is crushed and thrown away. Likewise, the *sareeram* should be used to drink the *jnaana amritham*. The person, who is alive to this fact, is *vivikthadhee*: - a discriminating person.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 13 :

अथ एवमपि मद्बचनम् नाद्रियसे स्वयमेव एतस्माच्छरीरात् अशुचिराशेः निराशः भविष्यसि ।

If you are not inclined to accept my words, even then, you yourself will develop aversion to it, the storehouse of filth, on scrutiny.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "By this much description, you should have got *vairaaghyam* from the body. If not, I will present more shocking facts; I will give you the description of the body, after the *jeeva* leaves the body. Look at the condition of any other dead body and

extend the same condition to your body, when it is dead. Your attachment to your body will go away.”

- एवम् अपि मद्बचनम् न अद्रियसे - If you do not accept this teaching of mine,
- अथ - (then) by further scrutiny (to be presented in the following verse),
- स्वयमेव - by yourself,
- निराशः भविष्यसि - you will get detachment
- एतस्मात् शरीरात् - from this body,
- अशुचिराशेः - (which is) a bundle of impurities.

Verse 13 – Chapter II:

मन्यसे तावत् अस्मि इति यावत् अस्मात् न नीयसे ।

श्वभिः क्रोडीकृते देहे न एवं त्वं अभिमंस्यसे ॥ १३ ॥

As long as you are not conducted out of it, you think you are the body. When it is appropriated by dogs, as belonging to them, you do not identify yourself with it.

- यावत् - As long as,
- अस्मात् न नीयसे - you are not separated from the body,

Asmaath - from the body ; neeyase - separated.

- तावत् - till that time ,
- अस्मि इति मन्यसे - you think that you are the body.

"Marana paryantham- upto the time of death "is what is indicated by "Yaavath asmaath na neeyase thaavath". "As long as it is a live body" is the essence.

What is the condition, when it becomes a dead body? All animals and birds pounce on the body and prey on it.

- श्वभिः देहे क्रोडीकृते - On dogs taking hold of the (dead) body,
- एवं त्वं न अभिमंस्यसे - you will not thus identify yourself with the body.

The *Achaaryaa* is obviously referring to the dead body of a *sannyasin*, which cannot be cremated. Cremation of a dead body is also a ritual, a *samskaaraa* termed *anthyeshthi*, where the son offers the parent's body to the *Agni Devatha*, in a ritualistic manner. A *sanyaasi* has to give up all rituals, especially connected with *agni* – he is called *niragni*: - and, therefore, cannot have the *anthyeshthi samskaaraa*. As a consequence, his body is disposed off in manners other than cremation- thrown into a river or a forest, sometimes even cut to pieces (though such procedures are not discussed, in detail). In such cases, the body is taken possession of, by scavenging animals and birds.

The *Achaaryaa* continues in the same vein, in the next verse also.

Chapter II: Verse 14 –

शिर आक्रम्य पादेन भर्त्सयति अपरान् शुनः ।

ध्रुष्ट्वा साधारणं देहं कस्मात् सक्तः असि तत्र भोः ॥ १४ ॥

One dog takes possession of the dead body, standing on the head and fights with other dogs to drive them away. Seeing that the body is the common possession of you and the dogs, why do you take a special interest in it?

One dog takes possession of the dead body; other dogs approach the body, for a share. But, the dog, which had originally taken possession of the body, stands on the body and challenges the other dogs. The fight between the dogs is over your body, once carefully pampered.

“In the *mahaa vaakyam 'that thvam asi'*, the word '*thvam*' should not include this miserable body” is the idea, that Sureswaraachaaryaa is trying to convey.

- **भोः** - address to the readers / listeners.
- **शिरः पादेन आक्रम्य** - (One dog) taking possession of the body, by standing on the head of the body,
- **भर्त्सयति** - threatens
- **अपरान् शुनः** - other dogs.

Dogs are selfish by nature and hence this reference to them, by Sureswaraachaarya.

- **देहम् साधारणम् ध्रुष्ट्वा** - Thus seeing your body as common property,
- **कस्मात् तत्र सक्तः असि** - how do you take a special interest in it?

Even while alive, your body is not totally yours, since, your physical presence is demanded by people around you –family members, employers etc. After your death, the scavenging animals claim your body.

The intention of the teaching is to create a sense of detachment from the body. At the same time, one should not develop hatred, disgust, anger etc., towards the body. Creating a negative attitude, towards the body, is not the aim. Dissociation from the body is necessary; hatred is not.

Vedhaanthaa also warns that the body is *Deva aalayaa* – auspicious and therefore, to be respected. *Saasthraa*, in certain contexts, glorify the body; and, in certain other contexts,

criticise the body. Though the two teachings are seemingly contradictory, both are correct. To prevent the individual from developing extreme *raaghaa* for the body, *saasthraas* criticise the body. But, if, on the other hand, the individual tends to create an aversion – *dveshaa* – for the body, *saasthraas* glorify the body.

“Use the body as ‘means’; transcend the body” is the advice of *saasthraas*, and for this purpose, they aim to neutralise both extreme *raaghaa* and *dveshaa* for the body.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 15:

श्रुतिपरिप्रापितः अयम् अर्थः अनात्मा बुद्ध्यादिदेहान्तः इति इदम् आह ।

This point, that everything from the mind down to the body is the non-Self, is proclaimed by the *Sruthi* also. This is pointed out now:

So far, Sureswaraachaarya gave *prathyaksha* and *anumaana pramaanaas*, to establish that the body is only a temporary container of ‘you’ – that, the body is not ‘yourself’. Now, he gives *sruthi pramaanam*.

- श्रुतिपरिप्रापितः - Vedaas also reveal
- अयं अर्थः - this idea
- बुद्ध्यादि देहान्तः अनात्मा इति - that “ from the mind to the body (everything) is only non-Self”,
- इदं आह - This is being told in the following verse.

Chapter II: Verse 15 –

ब्रुसत्रीहिपलालांशैः बीजं एकम् त्रिधा यथा ।

बुद्धिमांसपुरीषाम्शैः अन्नम् तद्वत् अवस्थितम् ॥ १५ ॥

Food that is taken in, becomes transformed into three parts as the mind, muscle, faeces, just as the self-same seed exists in a threefold form as husk, bran and grain.

Chandoghya Upanishad (in Section V – Chapter VI) describes what happens to the food that is consumed. The *Upanishad* says that the food has *sthoola*, *sookshma* and *sookshmathathara* constituents.

The *sthoola* constituent is only the ‘taste’ part, not important at all. The *sookshma* (subtle) constituent is the part, which caters or contributes to the nourishment of the *sthoola sareeram*. The *sookshmathathara* constituent is an even subtler, more invisible part, which caters or contributes to the *sookshma sareeram* - the character of the individual.

Details are given in the *Upanishad*. The essence is that, both *sthoola* and *sookshma sareerams* are nourished by food only. As modern medicine also holds, any imbalance in chemicals, causes changes in the individual's mind, thinking, talk, behaviour etc.

How can one type of food cause three-fold effects? Sureswaraachaarya gives the example of a seed, which produces three-fold effects.

- एकं बीजं यथा त्रिधा (भवति) - Just as one seed (becomes) three,
- ब्रुसव्रीहिपलालांशैः - the brawn, the grain and the straw,

Brusau - brawn; vreehi: - grain; palaalam - straw.

- तद्वत् - in the same manner,
- अन्नं - the same food,
- अवस्थितम् - will remain as
- बुद्धिमांसपुरीष अंशैः - sookshma sareeram, sthoola sareeram and waste

Since the character and thinking are affected by the type of food consumed, *saasthraas* prohibit certain specific vegetables like onions, garlic etc. for a serious seeker.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 16 :

यथोक्त अर्थप्रतिपत्तौ सत्यां न रागद्वेषाभ्यां विक्रियते विपश्चित् इति अस्यार्थस्यप्रतिपत्तये धृष्टान्तः।

If this truth is realized, a man of knowledge does not get affected by attachments and hatred. To drive home this implication, an illustration is offered:

Sureswaraachaarya gives more powerful verses – though the motive is good.

- यथोक्त अर्थ प्रतिपत्तौ सत्यां - If the meaning of the previous teaching is understood properly,

Yathoktha – the previous teaching / what has been told; artha – meaning; prathipatthau – knowledge /understanding; sathyaam - if (it) remains.

- विपश्चित् रागद्वेषाभ्यां न विक्रियते - the wise person is not disturbed by raaghaa and dveshaa.

Vipaschith - the wise person (who has the right understanding)

Looking upon the whole universe as one's family is not possible because of *abhimaanaa* – attachment. Attachment to one's immediate family is a result of one's *deha abhimaanaa* only. Attachments and hatreds result from *deha abhimaanaa* and family *abhimaanaa*. If one gets over the *deha abhimaanaa* (a very tough task indeed), *raagha dveshaas* will go away. Nothing can disturb such a person. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya stresses on *deha abhimaanaa thyaaga:*.

- इति अस्य अर्थस्य प्रतिपत्तये - To teach this idea (that deha abhimaanaa is the cause for raaghaa and dveshaa)
- ध्रुष्टान्तः - this example (is given).

Prathipatthi: - *jnaanam* / understanding.

Chapter II: Verse 16 –

वर्चस्के संपरित्यक्ते दोषतः च अवधारिते ।

यदि दोषम् वदेत् तस्मै किं तत्र उच्चरितुः भवेत् ॥ १६ ॥

When faeces is excreted and its filthy character is noticed, does that finding anger the person, whose faeces it is?

Sureswaraachaarya says: "The physical body is *anna kaaryam*; the waste is also *anna kaaryam*. As long as the *anna kaarya varchaskam* remains in my body, as an integral part of my body, I do not have *dosha darsanam* with respect to the waste. I do not see it as pollution – *asoucham*. But, when the same *anna kaarya varchaskam* is separated from the body, *asoucha buddhi* and *dosha darsanam* (with respect to the waste), result. When others also have *dosha darsanam* with regard to my *varchaskam*, I do not feel insulted or offended or disturbed. Should I not extend the same attitude to the other *anna kaaryam*- my body? When somebody criticizes my body, why should I get disturbed?"

60. Chapter II, Verse 16 to 19 (28-07-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is establishing the point that *aathma-anaathma viveka* is extremely important. Only then the meaning of the word '*thvam*', in the *mahaavaakyam* will be very clear; i.e. *thvam padha artham* will never be grasped clearly, unless you have *aathma anaathma vivekam*. If *thvam padha artham* is not grasped clearly, *mahaavaakyam* will not make sense. And, if *mahaavaakyam* does not make sense, any amount of study of *Vedhaanthaa* will only be futile.

Expressing the same in the reverse order, if the study of *Vedhaanthaa* is to be purposeful, *mahaavaakyam* should be understood properly; to understand *mahaavaakyam* properly, *thvam padha artham* should be understood properly; to understand *thvam padha artham* properly, *aathma anaathma vivekam* is essential.

Anaathmaa consists of the *sthoola, sookshmaadhi sareera thrayam*, and, therefore, Sureswaraacharya wants to emphasize the *anaathma nischayathvam* of *sareerathrayam*.

The current topic is "*sthoola sareera anaathma nischaya:*" – "establishing that the physical body is *anaathmaa*; that, the physical body is not myself".

For this purpose, Sureswaraachaaryaa has been giving various arguments. Some more arguments also will be given by him later. But, in these three verses 16, 17 and 18, the *Achaaryaa* makes a small diversion – *prasangavasaath*. What is that diversion? Sureswaraachaarya wants to say "when *aathma anaathma viveka vichaaraa* is done properly, the primary advantage is that the *mahaavaakyam* will be clearly understood. Spiritual benefit is the primary benefit of *thvam padha vichaaraa* or *sthoola sareera anaathmathva nischaya:* / In addition to this primary benefit, there are some secondary benefits – *avaanthara palaani* - also".

The *Achaaryaa* mentions two such secondary benefits here, in these three verses. When the gross body is looked upon as *anaathmaa*, by an individual, the first *avaanthara palan* of such an attitude, is the reduction of *manovikriyaa* - disturbances in the mind – if and when somebody else criticizes the individual's gross body. The second *avaanthara palan*, is, similarly, reduction of 'anger'. He explains the reasons for the *avaanthara palaani* as follows: "When the body is separated from myself, the body is no more included in the 'I'. The consequence is, that, I start looking at my body objectively. I see the 'deficiencies' very clearly; (i.e. *dosha darsanam* results); the further consequence of which, is, that, when I am myself aware of the deficiencies of my gross body, I will not be offended / irritated by others' comments of the *dosham*."

This may be termed as '*Anya dosha vadane vikriyaa abhaava:*' |

To recap: 'Separation of the gross body from 'I' – the *sthoola sareera anaathma nischaya buddhi* (stage 1) helps in '*dosha darsanam* of the *sthoola sareeram*' (stage 2), which, in turn, helps in *vikria abhaava:* - freedom from mental disturbances (stage 3).

To make this view clear, Sureswaraacharya gives the example of *varchaskam*. It is common knowledge that the gross body holds waste matter all the time; but, even though you are aware of this fact, when the fecal matter is within the body, you do not have *dosha darsanam*. You do not feel polluted; you attend to your *Pujaas* and other *anushtaanaas* ; you even visit temples and such other sacred places, without any feeling or fear of polluting them. But, once separation takes place, i.e., the fecal matter is thrown out, *dosha darsanam* results. You consider the thrown out waste as a pollutant. You are not offended by the *dosha darsanam* of your fecal matter by others also.

Separation of *varchaskam* leads to *dosha darsanam*, which, in turn, leads to *vikriyaa abhaava:* | *Varchaskam* is *annakaaryam*; the gross body is also *annakaaryam*. Therefore, apply the same three stages – (1) separation (2) *dosha darsanam* and (3) *anya dosha darsane vikriyaa abhaava:* - to both. There is one difference, though. In the case of *varchaskam*, the separation is physical – throwing away or '*visarjanam*'. In the case of the gross body, the 'separation' is not physical; it is 'mental'– a change in the mental attitude – '*abhimaana thyaaga:*'. Once you do the *abhimaana thyaagha:*, *dosha darsanam* takes place and *vikriyaa abhaava:* results.

The same can be applied to *sookshma sareeram* also.

- **वर्चस्के सम्परित्यक्ते** - Once *varchaskam* is physically separated (stage 1)
- **दोषतः च अवधारिते** – *doshaa* (from both hygiene and religious angles) results (stage 2)
- **यदि दोषं वदेत् तस्मै** - If somebody else talks about the *asouchathvam* of the
- *varchaskam*,
- **तत्र उच्चरितुः किं भवेत्** – in that context, what disturbance results to the 'evacuator' ?
- ('no disturbance results' is the implication . This is stage 3).

Uccharitha - one who has evacuated the waste.

Chapter II: Verse 17 –

तद्वत्सूक्ष्मे तथा स्थूले देहे त्यक्ते विवेकत। :

यदि दोषं वदेत्ताभ्यां किं तत्र विदुषो भवेत् ॥ १७ ॥

In the same way, if the gross and subtle bodies are discarded, as other than the Self, through discrimination and if their defects are noted, can that affect a wise man?

Verse 16 is '*dhrushtaantha sloka:*' – covering the *upamaanam (varchaskam)*. Verse 17 is '*dhaashtaantha sloka:*' – covering the *upameyam (sthoola, sookshma sareeraani)*. The *Achaaryaa* says: "apply the same three stages to the *sareeraani*".

- तद्वत् - Exactly like this,
- स्थूले तथा सूक्ष्मे देहे त्यक्ते - if, with respect to sthoola and sookshma Sareeraas, abhimaanam is given up,
- विवेकतः - through the process of discrimination,

This is stage 1. The second stage, not explicitly mentioned by the *Achaaryaa*, is 'objective perception' of the *sthoola, sookshma sareerani*. The deficiencies of the individual's *sthoola sareeram – jaraa, vyaadhi, mrithyu, dhu:kha dosha:* - and of the individual's *sookshma sareeram* - the *kaama, krodha, lobha, moha, madha, maascharya* defects in the mind – will be perceived by the individual himself. Many *vaasanaas* and *samskaaraas* of earlier births persist, but, are seen only when *abhimaanaa* is given up.

Stage 3, is the *manovikriyaa abhaava:* /

- यदि (अन्यः) ताभ्यां दोषं वदेत् - when (somebody else) talks of the deficiencies of (my) sthoola and sookshma sareeraani,
- तत्र - in that dosha vadanam
- विदुषः - for the wise person (who has separated himself from the sthoola and sookshma sareeraani),
- किं भवेत् - what disturbance will result? ('Nothing will disturb' is the implied meaning).

If somebody criticizes somebody else (in whom I have no *abhimaanaa*), how does *that* criticism affect me? Do I react, at all? For an individual, who has given up his *abhimaanam* for his *sthoola, sookshma sareeraani*, the situation is exactly the same.

What is the other secondary benefit? It follows in verse 18.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 18 – Chapter II:

एतावद् एव हि' अहं ब्रह्मास्मि 'इति वाक्यार्थ अप्रतिपत्तौ कारणं यदुत बुद्यादौ देहान्ते हि अहं मम इति निस्सन्धिबन्धनः ग्रहः । तदव्यतिरेके हि न कुतश्चित् विभज्यते एकल एव प्रत्यक् आत्मनि अवतिष्ठते इति आह ।

Just this: the delusion concerning adjuncts from mind down to the body of the form 'I am that' and 'That belongs to me', a delusion that fastens itself close, is the cause of non-comprehension of the import of the dictum 'I am Brahman'. If

that were to be eradicated, one ceases to be divided from anyone whatever, and abides in the integral inner reality. This is said now:

In this *sambhandha gadhyam*, Sureswaraachaarya is reminding of the primary benefit once again, before elaborating on the second secondary benefit. What is this primary benefit? He expresses it indirectly as follows: 'Not separating / distancing from the *sthoola, sookshma sareeraani* is the main obstacle in receiving 'aham brahma asmi' teaching" (i.e. only *abhimaana thyaaga*: will result in proper grasp of the *mahaavaakyam*).

- एतावद् एव - This much alone
- वाक्यार्थ अप्रतिपत्तौ कारणं - is the main reason / cause / obstacle for the non-receiving of the meaning of the sentence,

Aprathipatthi: - Non-understanding / non-comprehension / non-reception.

What sentence?

- 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' इति - (the *mahaavaakyam*) that 'I am Brahman'.

When the *guru* tells you 'you are *suddha*:', your mind is disturbed (i.e. you are not convinced), since you have the tendency to include your *sthoola* and *sookshma sareeraani*, with all their physical and mental impurities, in your concept of 'I'. Only when you distance yourself from your gross and subtle bodies, you can happily see yourself as '*suddha*:', which '*suddha*:' 'you' **always** are, but, which fact you are unable to perceive, because of non-distancing or non-separating 'I' from the *sthoola, sookshma sareeraani*.

What is the '*ethaavadh*' referred to, in the text? Sureswaraachaarya explains:

- यदुत्त – which (the obstacle to proper understanding of *mahaavaakyam*) is
- बुद्ध्यादौ देहान्ते ग्रहः - the *abhimaanam* in (intimate association with) the entire *anaathmaa*, beginning with the *buddhi* to the physical body.

Graha: - *abhimaanam* / intimate association.

What form of association?

- अहं मम इति - in the form of *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa*.

That's why, in the *Bhagavdh Githa*, Lord Krishna repeatedly exhorts the seeker to be '*nirmama*:' and '*nirahamkaara*:'; without the elimination of *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa*, *mahaavaakyam* will not be understood.

How strong is the association?

- **निस्सन्धिबन्धनः** - such intimate connection that the joint is not visible (adjective to *graha*.)

Nissandhi - without a joint / joint invisible; *bandhana*: - connection.

The connection between the *anaathmaa* part and the *aathmaa* part, in an individual is so intimate that the distinction is not perceived by the individual. This adjective *nissandhi bandhana*: is used by the *Achaaryaa*, to highlight the intimacy.

Even as you touch any part of your body with your hand, the tangible part is *anaathmaa* and the sentiency called '*unarvu*' in Tamil, is *aathmaa*. But, we do not even know where the *anaathmaa* stops and *aathmaa* starts. We do not know how to separate them. The separation **has** to be done to make *Vedhaanthic* study fruitful.

- **तद्व्यतिरेके** - When there is separation / when the connection between *aathmaa* (dehi) and *anaathmaa* (deham) is eliminated,

Vyathireke - separated / eliminated.

- **कुतश्चित् (अहं) न विभज्यते** - 'I', the *aathmaa* is not separate from any other *jeeva* / 'I' is one and the same in every one.

Kuthaschith – any other *jeeva*; *na vibhajyathe* - not separate.

- **एकलः एव (वर्तते)** - (I see every being) as one *aathmaa*.

Your body is different from mine; your mind is different from mine. But, when the bodies and minds are set aside, the remaining 'Consciousness' is one and the same in *every* being (even an ant). *Ekaathma nischaya*: results, by the 'separation' of the 'Consciousness' from the body-mind complex. There is no feeling of 'isolation' – which is the biggest problem of *samsaaraa*.

The *Bhagavadh Githa* – Verse 3 – Ch XIII "*Kshekthragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarvakshethreshu*" – " Also understand *Kshethragnya* to be Myself, obtaining in all bodies" and Verse 29 – "*Sarvabhoothastham aathmaanam sarvabhoothaani cha aathmani ekshathe yogayukthaathmaa sarvathra samdharsana*:" – "One whose mind is disciplined, perceived the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self. He has the same vision everywhere", are relevant here.

Such a person, i.e. a *jnaani*, who has separated the gross and subtle bodies from the 'Consciousness', abides in the *aathmaa*.

- एकलः एव – advaita roopens
- प्रत्यक् आत्मनि अवतिष्ठते - abides in the non-isolated, non-isolatable Aathmaa
- इति आह - This is being said.

The second secondary benefit – 'anger coming down' -, is talked of in the following verse.

Chapter II: Verse 18 –

रिपौ बन्धौ स्वदेहे च सम एकात्म्यं प्रपश्यतः।

विवेकिनः कुतः कोपः स्वदेहे अवयवेषु इव ॥ १८ ॥

How can the discerning seer who sees equally the self-same *aathman* in the enemy and the kindred and in his own body also, be angry with any one? Can one be angry with parts of his own body? The causes are exactly similar.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "It is common observation that one does not get angry with parts of one's own body. Likewise, once I look at myself as one *aathmaa*, in which millions of *sookshma / sthoola sareeraas* are there, I will not get angry with any person, even if the person has any deficiency.

- सम एकात्म्यं प्रपश्यतः विवेकिनः - For a jnaani who sees the uniform Aathmaa
- रिपौ बन्धौ स्वदेहे च - in the enemy, in a relative and in one's own body,
- कुतः कोपः - how can there be anger,
- स्वदेहे अवयवेषु इव - just as (one does not get angry) with one's body and limbs?

You do not get angry with your own limbs. If your teeth bite your tongue accidentally, you do not get angry with your teeth. For a *viveki*, every one is like his own *avayavam*. *Kopa abhaava*: (absence of anger) is the second secondary benefit, *vikriyaa abhaava*: (absence of mental disturbance) being the first (covered already).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 19:

इतश्चानात्मा देहादिः।

For these further reasons also, the body etc. are not the Self.

- इतश्च - Because of the following reasons also,
- देहादिः अनात्मा – deham etc. are anaathmaa.

First reason given was '*anna kaaryathvaath'* – body being a product of food..

Second reason given was '*aagama apaayinathvaath'* – the body being of a temporary nature – subject to 'arrival and departure'.

The third and fourth reasons are given in Verse 19.

Chapter II: Verse 19 –

घटादिवच्च द्रुश्यत्वात्तैरेव करणैर्द्रुशेः।

स्वप्ने च अनन्वयात् च ज्ञेयः देहः अनात्मा इति सूत्रिभिः ॥ १९ ॥

Just as the objects admittedly other than the Self, like a jar are objects of perception through the senses, the body is also an object perceived through the same senses. In dreams, the body of the waking state does not persist. Therefore, it may be judged by the wise, as other than the Self.

- घटादिवत् च द्रुश्यत्वात् - Since experienced like a pot etc.,
- द्रुशेः - by the saakshi chaithanyam – the aathmaa,

The physical body is also 'experienced' like any other object; it is an 'object' of experience, while 'I' is the 'subject'. So the 'body' cannot be 'Me'.

- तैः एव करणैः - using the same sense organs (as used for the pot etc.)

The same sense organs which experience the external objects, experience the gross body also – through *abda*, *gandha* etc. Therefore, the body is also only *anaathmaa*;

It can be used only as an instrument.

But, we have the tendency to include the instrument as 'subject'; for instance, when I use a pen for writing, I claim 'I am writing', including the pen in the 'I'. Similarly, though the body is also used only as an instrument, I tend to say 'I am doing this'; but, there is one difference between the pen and the body. In the case of the pen, I am aware that I am not the pen, whereas, in the case of the body, I make the mistake of not being aware of 'I' not being the body.

The fourth reason (for the body being *anaathmaa*) is given in the 2nd line of the verse. During dreams, a dreamer does not use his physical body for his dream-transactions. He assumes and uses a 'dream-body' for 'dream-transactions'. This is obvious, because, even if the 'dream-body' moves all over in the dream, the dreamer's body remains in bed. The dreamer 'drops' his physical body in the '*jaagrath prapanchaa*', enters the dream-world, assumes a 'dream-body' and involves in the 'dream-transactions', similar to changing one's dress.

In essence, my body does not follow me everywhere – to every *avasthaa*.

'*Ananvayathva hethu:*' is the technical name given for this 'reasoning'. The *Brahadhaaranayaka Upanishad* talks of this in detail.

61. Chapter II, Verse 16 to 19 (04-08-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya, in this portion, is dealing with the topic of *Anaathma sthoola sareera viveka:*. He intends dealing with *sareera thraya viveka:* (i.e. the establishment of the *anaathmathvam* of all the three *sareeraas*) and has first taken up *sthoola sareera viveka:*. Ultimately, by this *viveka:*, the *saakshi* has to be understood as *thvam pada lakshyaartha:* / Only when the *thvam pada lakshyaartha saakshi* is identified, that *saakshi* can be equated to *thvam pada lakshyaartha Brahman*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya is giving various arguments to establish that, 'I, the *saakshi* is not the *sthoola sareeraa*. Until now, three reasons have been given and in verse 19 (under discussion now) two more reasons are given.

The first reason was given in verse 11 – '*annakaaryathvaath'*. The physical body is a product of *annam* and therefore cannot be *aathmaa*. The example given was *varchaskam*.

The second reason was given in verse 12 – '*aadhyanthayo: anaathmathvaath'*. Food is *anaathma* before eating and after excretion. If *annam* is *anaathmaa*, before eating as *aahaaraa* and after excretion as *vachaskam*, in the interim also, the body, which is a version of *annam* has to be *anaathmaa* only.

The third reason, also given in verse 12, is '*aaganthukathvaath'* – subject to arrival and departure – arrival at the time of birth and departure at the time of death. Because of this reason also the *sthoola sareeram* is *anaathmaa*.

Now, in the 19th verse, the 4th and 5th reasons are given. The first line of the verse refers to the 4th reason, the most popular – '*dhrusyathvaath'*. Since the physical body is an object of experience, it has to be different from the subject, exactly like a pot or such other object.

The 5th reason (given in the 2nd line of verse 19) is '*svapne ananvayaath'*. The *sthoola sareeram* does not accompany us during dreams. The dreamer, dropping his physical body in the bed, enters the *svapna prapanchaa*, creates a special physical body of his own and using the *svapna sthoola sareeram* experiences the tangible objects of the *svapana prapanchaa*.

We have one physical body for *svapna* and another physical body for *jaagrath*. The *jaagrath sareeram* does not enter the *svapana prapancha* and the *svapna sareeram* does not enter the *jaagrath prapanchaa*. They are mutually exclusive. This is indicated by the word '*ananvayaath'*. '*Anvaya:*' means 'accompaniment'; '*ananvaya:*' means 'non-accompaniment'.

My *jaagrath sthoola sareeram* does not accompany me to the *svapna prapanchaa*. For these reasons,

- **देहः अनात्मा इति ज्ञेयः** - It should be known that the gross body is *anaathmaa*,
- **सूरिभिः** - *vivekibhi:* /by discriminating people / by discerning people.

The 6th and final reason is given in the following verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to verse 20:

देहादि कार्य कारण संघात व्यतिरेक अव्यतिरेक अदर्शिनः। उपलभ्यते कार्यम् विरुद्ध एव प्रत्यक्षत :

By simple observation we can study the differences that follow from the immanence and the separation of Self, in relation to the complex aggregate of effects and instruments that is the body etc.:

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the body is an object of temporary *aham abhimaanam*, (meaning 'I' identification). How do we know this? He says: "We can experience it directly. When we have *abhimaanaa* in the body, the body seems to be very, very light. But, when the body goes limp in *svapna* or *sushupthi* or coma, i.e. when the *aham abhimaanaa* is withdrawn, the same body becomes heavy". I can experience this (seeming loss of weight) personally in the *svapna avastha*, while others will experience this at the time of my *maranam*. While an individual with *aham abhimaanaa* is able to carry around the weight of his *sthoola sareeram* with ease, when he dies, his body has to be carried by four people – *chathurbhi: uhyathe* | Why this difference? Presence of *aham abhimaanaa* makes the body light, and absence of *aham abhimaanaa* makes the body heavy.

From this, a conclusion can be drawn: 'Body is temporary object of *aham abhimaanaa* and therefore, body is not *aham*'. '*Aham*' enters the body and gets out of the body. The body does not have *aham* intrinsicness. If *aham* is intrinsic to the body, the body will always be light. Therefore, body is not *aathmaa*.

- **कार्य कारण संघात** - The physical-subtle body complex / body-mind complex, *Kaarya* – physical body (in this context); *kaarana* – subtle body (in this context); *sangaatha* – combination.
- **देहादि** – in the form of deham etc.,
- **व्यतिरेक दर्शिनः** - to the *abhimaanaa rahitha*:
- **अव्यतिरेक (दर्शिनः)** - to the one without identification
- **प्रत्यक्षतः एव विरुद्धकार्यम् उपलभ्यते** – the opposite nature is directly experienced

The 'opposite nature', referred to, is lightness of body in 'identification' and 'heaviness of the body' in the lack of identification. This phenomenon can be experienced even in meditation. Suppose you keep your hand on your thigh and gradually withdraw the hand identification – loosen or relax the hand – the hand will become heavier and heavier. Another example: When a baby is carried by the mother, when the baby is awake, it has a certain weight; when the baby goes to sleep and the baby's body becomes limp, the mother finds the baby heavier.

Abhimaana bhaava abhaavayo: viruddha kaaryam upalabhyathe – opposite consequences are experienced when abhimaanaa is present and when abhimaanaa is absent. How? prathyakshatha: - directly.

What are the opposite consequences? : Sureswaraachaarya gives the details in the verse.

Chapter II: Verse 20 –

चतुर्भिः उह्यते यत्तत्सर्वशक्त्या शरीरकम् ।

तूलायते तदेव अहंधियाघ्रातं अचेतसाम् ॥ २० ॥

A body is carried by four persons with all their strength. But the same body is light to a foolish person who lives in it with the sense of identity.

- (इदम्) शरीरकम् - This physical body (when dead) / i.e. the corpse

Use of the word '*sareerakam*' is significant. The dead body / corpse has got inferior value – *asoucham*. To reveal the inferior nature of the dead body the letter '*ka*' is used- *nindhaarthasya 'ka' prathyaya: /*

- चतुर्भिः उह्यते - is carried by four people,
- सर्वशक्त्या – with all their strength.
- तदेव - The same body
- अहं धिया आघ्रातं – enlivened by 'aham abhimaanaa',

'*Agraatham*' literally means 'smelt by'. In this context, it means flavored by / associated with / enlivened by.

- तूलायते - is light like cotton,
- अचेतसाम् - to the ignorant people ('ignorant' because they have 'aham abhimaanam')

Thoolam – cotton.

The individual, who moves about effortlessly 'carrying' his heavy body, has to be carried by four people with all their strength, when dead. The '*aham dhiyaad*' makes all the difference. This proves that the body is an object of temporary '*aham abhimaanaad*' and therefore, not the *aathmaa*.

With this, the 6th argument is also over – '*anithya abhimaana vishayathvaath*' – given in verse 20. This is the speciality of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* – the presentation of six arguments to establish that the gross body cannot be *aathmaa*. In most other treatises, only one argument is generally presented – '*dhrusyathvaath*' (the gross body being an object of experience), the 4th argument in the above group of arguments.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 21:

प्रसिद्धत्वात् प्रकरणार्थ उपसंहाराय आह ।

As this is a familiar matter, the conclusion is sought to be drawn:

Sureswaraachaarya says: "I can give more arguments also; but, since everybody (all *vaidikaas*) already know that 'I' am not the body, I am confining myself to these six arguments".

All *vaidhikaas* or philosophies like *saamkyaa*, *yoga*, *vaisesika* etc., accept the fact that the body is not *aathmaa*.

In fact, even in *karma kaandaa*, our assumption is 'I' am different from the 'body'. How do we say this? Ans: In *karma kaandaa*, people perform rituals so that they can get better births in after-lives i.e. they believe in *punar-janma*, which, in turn, means that they believe in 'survival' after death. But, they also know that their physical bodies, after death, are cremated and therefore, they should know that the 'surviving principle', the *aathmaa*, is different from the physical body. Thus, even in *karma kaandaa*, *sthoala deha vyathiriktha aathmaa* is known.

All other *vaidhika darsanams*, apart from the *Poorva Meemaamsaa* and *Vedhaantha* – like *saamkyaa*, *yoga*, *nyaaya* and *vaisesikaa* also accept the fact that '*aathmaa* is different from the body'. The confusions or differences in opinion are only on (1) whether the *aathmaa* is one or many (2) whether the *aathmaa* is *kartha-boktha* or not (3) whether the *aathmaa* is *anu* or *mahaan* or *madhyama* etc. Only the *Charvaaka* philosophy does not accept the concept of a 'soul', *punar janma* etc. Hence, the six arguments given above by the *Achaaryaa*, need to be presented only to the *Charvaakaa* philosophers. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- **प्रसिद्धत्वात्** - Since known to all the people,

- **प्रकरण अर्थः उपसंहाराय** - for the purpose of concluding this topic (that aathmaa is different from the sthoola sareeram),
- **आह** - the following (verse) is said:

Chapter II: Verse 21 –

स्थूलं युक्त्या निरस्य एवं नभसः नीलताम् इव ।

देहं सूक्ष्मं निराकुर्यात् अतः युक्तिभिः आत्मनः ॥ २१ ॥

Thus through reasoning the gross body must be differentiated from the Self as we differentiate blueness from the sky. In a similar fashion the subtle body must also be discriminated by reasoning.

The Achaaryaa here concludes sthoola sareera viveka: and introduces sooksham sareera viveka: |

- **एवं स्थूलं निरस्य** - Thus negating the sthoola sareeram as anaathmaa,
- **युक्त्या** - by reasoning (the six arguments given above),

An important example is given.

- **नभसः नीलतां इव** - like the blueness in the sky (i.e. just as the blueness of the sky is negated, by the knowledge that the sky does not have blueness and therefore, the blueness does not belong to the sky),

Sureswaraachaarya wants to convey a very important lesson by the use of this example. Even after we negate the blueness of the sky *intellectually*, the 'experience' of the blueness does not go away. The blueness *anubhava* will continue for me, even if I *know* that the sky is not blue. Likewise, even when I recognize that my physical body is different from myself, the recognition will not stop physical experience of pains. It has to be clearly understood that *Vedhaantha* cannot remove my experiential, biological pains, even when I am convinced that I am not the body, that, the pains belong to the body, that, both the body and the pains are only 'objects', whereas 'I' am the 'subject' etc. But, there is a redeeming feature. Going back to the example, even though the blueness 'experience' continues, the experience does not have the power to 'shake' the experiencer's knowledge that the sky is not blue. In the same manner, for a *jnaani*, even when he has intense pain that cannot be stopped, his knowledge 'I am not the body; the pains belong to the body; they do not belong to me' cannot be challenged by the opposite experience. He will not doubt the validity of the *Vedic pramaana*. And, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya gives this example.

Vedhaanthic study and assimilation will not help you get rid of biological or physical pains; but, it will change your psychological response to the pains. Sorrow and worry are unintelligent responses to biological pain. Sorrow and worry – otherwise called *chint* - is

rejected by *aanthara sanyaasaa*, resulting from *Vedhaanthic* study. 'Claiming 'I am the body', anxiety and special prayers' – CL.A.SP – are avoided by a *jnaani*. All these messages are conveyed by this example of '*nabhasa: neelathaam iva*'.

Having dismissed the *sthoala sareeram*, the *Achaaryaa* intends to move on to the negation of the *sookshma sareeram*.

- **अतः** - Hereafter,
- **देहं सूक्ष्मं निराकुर्यात्** - the subtle body is to be discriminated,
- **आत्मनः** - from the *aathmaa* (the real 'I'),
- **युक्तिभिः** - by various reasons.

The negation of the *sookshma sareeram* is much more difficult. Why? Because, it is more intimate. At the time of *svapna*, I drop my gross body; but my subtle body continues even in the *svapna prapanchaa*. So also, even at *maranam*, while the physical body drops, the *sookshma sareeram* continues through – *janmaath janma, janmana: janma, sareeraath sareeram*, the *sookshma sareeram* travels. Separating it (from the *aathmaa*) is more difficult, than separating the *sthoala sareeram* from the *aathmaa*. Nevertheless, it has to be done.

Having introduced the subject, the *Achaaryaa* enters *sookshma sareera viveka: |*

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 22:

कथं देहं सूक्ष्मं निराकुर्यात् इति । उच्यते ।

How is the subtle body to be distinguished from the Self? On these lines:

Sureswaraachaarya raises the question "how to distinguish the *sookshma sareeram* – especially the mind – from 'me'?" The mind is so intimate to me, that it appears to be 'me'.

Chapter II: Verse 22 –

अहं ममत्व यत्न इच्छा न आत्मधर्माः क्रुशत्ववत् ।

कर्मत्वेन उपलभ्यत्वात् अपायित्वात् च वस्त्रवत् ॥ २२ ॥

The ego-consciousness, the feeling of mineness, will and desire are not the attributes of the Self. Just as leanness, for example, is not the attribute of the Self, for they are experienced as objective and they are subject to cessation. In the latter respect, they are like the garment one may wear.

Sureswaraachaarya approaches the subject in a particular manner.

He refers to all the attributes of the mind – representing the *sookshama sareeram* – and, points out that all emotional and intellectual attributes are clearly known and experienced by us. i.e. they are 'objects' of our knowledge. Also, they are subject to arrival and departure also. He argues: "Because they are objects of our knowledge and because they are subject to arrival and departure, they can never belong to 'me'. 'I' can never know 'my' own attributes and therefore, all known attributes must belong to some other entity".

What are those attributes? The *Achaaryaa* enlists a few of them.

- अहं - The 'I' – ness / sense of 'I' feeling / ahamkaaraa
- ममत्वं - the 'my' – ness / sense of 'my' feeling / mamakaaraa,

Both are attributes experienced by me in the *jaagrath* and *svapana avasthaa*. In *sushupthi*, I do not experience them.

- यत्न - free will / the choice to act / effort at mind level / volition,
- इच्छा – desire etc.

All other emotions like anger, jealousy etc. can also be added to this list.

- न आत्म धर्माः - are not attributes of aathmaa,
- कृशत्ववत् - like leanness (of the gross body)

Krusathvam – leanness, as opposed to *sthoopathvam* – fatness/obesity. *Krusathvam* is an attribute belonging to *sthoopath sareeram*. The *Achaarya* has already established that the *sthoopath sareeram* and its attributes are different from the *aathmaa*. "Leanness or fatness which is experienced by me, is neither 'me', nor belonging to 'me'" has already been shown. The *sthoopath sareera dharmaas* are, therefore, taken as examples to negate *sooksham sareera dharmaas*. Both are *dhrusya dharmaa*: - 'experienced attributes', which do not belong to 'me'.

- कर्मत्वेन उपलभ्यत्वात् - because they are clearly objectified by me,

"What is 'experienced' does not belong to the 'experiencer'".

- अपायित्वात् च – also because they go away, even while I continue to exist.

Apaayithvam - Nature of being subject to departure; *apaayin* – one who is subject to arrival and departure.

If they are attributes belonging to 'me' or intrinsic to 'me', they should continue as long as I continue. But, they are subject to arrival and departure and therefore, are different from 'me'.

- वस्त्रवत् – similar to the dress you wear and remove.

These are further elaborated.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 23:

- वैधर्म्ये ध्रुष्टान्तः।

To indicate the distinction, an analogy is offered:

- वैधर्म्ये – If you do not accept this important law (that experienced attributes always belong to the experienced objects and never to the experiencer 'subject')
- ध्रुष्टान्तः - the following example is given.

Chapter II: Verse 23 –

न उष्णिमानम् दहति अग्निः स्वरूपत्वात् यथा ज्वलन् ।

तथा एव आत्म आत्मनः विध्यादहं न एव अविशेषतः ॥ २३ ॥

The blazing fire does not burn up its own heat, for heat is its very nature. In the same way, the Self could never objectify the ego etc., if they were constitutive of its very nature.

A counter-example is given by the *Achaaryaa*.

- यथा - Just as
- अग्निः उष्णिमानं न दहति - fire does not destroy its 'heat' (its own attribute, while it destroys everything else),

Ushnimaanam – 'heat' (attribute of fire), Destruction represents 'objectification'.

Fire cannot burn its own heat faculty / feature.

- ज्वलन् - even when it is burning intensely,
- स्वरूपत्वात् - (this heat) being its own nature,

"*Aathmaa* can never objectify Consciousness" is the lesson to be drawn by the *Achaaryaa*. That's why a seeker is always advised: "Never work for experiencing *aathmaa*; because, if you do try, it will amount to the Consciousness trying to experience Consciousness, which

never works. In Vedhantic meditation, after coming to blankness, I have to entertain thoughts 'this blankness itself is illumined by the awareness and the awareness I can never objectify. The blankness-illumining awareness 'I' am- the silence awareness, 'I' am'".

Thereafter you have to change the thought pattern, seeing various features of the 'awareness'. The silence awareness 'I' am (1) is not a part or property of the body (2) is an entity independent of the body (3) is not limited by the body – but is all-pervading (4) not limited by time also and (5) will continue to survive even after the fall of the body etc.

Even the 'all-pervading' nature cannot be 'experienced'. It means only 'entertaining the thought that limitations do not belong to the silence Awareness'. '*Aham nithya:, aham suddha:*' – such thoughts are to be entertained. We are not to look for any *aathma anubhava* – any experience. Even if you get any such experience , ignore that, since that is also only an object of experience, subject to arrival and departure. Entertain the thoughts, centred on 'I' the silent Awareness. The *Achaaryaa* is developing this portion towards these teachings only.

He says: "Fire cannot destroy (objectify) its own heat; similarly *aathmaa* cannot objectify its own Consciousness".

तथा एव - in the same manner,

In the same manner, *Aathmaa* can never objectify itself and its 'Consciousness' also.

62. Chapter II, Verse 23 to 25 (11-08-2007)

As a part of *mahaavaakya vichaaraa*, Sureswaraachaarya has entered into *thvampadha vichaaraa*, since *thvampadhaa* is a part of *mahaa vaakyaa*. And, as a part of *thvampada vichaaraa*, he has come to *aathma anaathma viveka:*, since *thvampadhaa* is a mixture of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. In this course of *aathma anaathma viveka:*, the *Achaaryaa* had already rejected *sthoala sareeram* (in verses up to verse 21).

Now, from verse 22, *sookshma sareera viveka:* is being discussed. In the *sookshma sareeram*, the most important component is the mind or *antha:karanam*. And, Sureswaraachaarya wants to establish that the mind is different from 'me'. 'I' am the observer of the mind; the mind is observed by 'me'. One ('I') is the subject and the other (the mind) is the object and therefore, they cannot be identical. This is what the *Achaaryaa* wants to establish.

For this purpose, he has entered into an enquiry. He uses a particular, very interesting method of analysis- referring to our experience of our emotions. Every individual intimately and intensely experiences emotions; in fact, the experience of emotions alone is the cause of *samsaaraa* – experiencing fear, worry, anger etc. This 'emotion-experience' is taken up by the *Achaaryaa* for analysis. And, for the purpose of this analysis, some fundamental laws, which are derived from *tharka saasthraa* and commonly known to us, are to be remembered.

The first law: A substance and its attributes can never be physically separated. They are always intimately together. To refer to this intimate connection, *Tharka saasthraa* uses the technical term *samavaaya sambhandha:* or *avinaa bhaava sambhandha:*, Attributes - colour or height or length - cannot independently exist by themselves. The moment any attribute of a substance is separated from the substance, it cannot even exist. The attributes have to rely on the substance for their very existence – they are *parathanthraa*. "Substance and attributes are inseparable" is the first law.

From this first law, we get the second law as a corollary: "Since a substance and its attributes are inseparable, they must always be experienced together only" i.e. the experience of the substance implies the experience of its attributes; or conversely, the experience of the attributes, implies the experience of the substance. You can never hope to experience the attributes alone without experiencing the substance or the substance alone without experiencing its attributes. "Experience of one (substance or its attributes) presupposes the experience of the other (attributes or substance)" is the second law.

The third law is: "If a substance and its attributes are objects of experience, there must be a subject-experiencer, who is different from both the substance and the attributes".

The fourth law (a corollary of the 3rd): "All the experienced attributes should belong to the experienced substance only – the object and never to the experiencer – subject".

With the help of these four laws or principles, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to establish that "sorrow does not belong to 'me'". Because 'sorrow' is an emotional attribute, i.e. understanding sorrow as an emotional attribute, Sureswaraachaarya establishes "'I' am free from sorrow".

How does he do that?

Using these four principles, first, he takes up 'emotions'. Emotions are experienced by us. 'Emotions' are 'attributes'. Why do you say that 'emotions are attributes' and not substances? Because emotions cannot exist separately by themselves – i.e. they cannot exist independently. Obviously, one cannot 'perceive' any emotion (anger, jealousy etc.) in a physical form. Therefore, emotions are attributes.

Now Sureswaraachaarya argues "emotions are experienced and are attributes of the mind. Therefore, experience of emotional attributes, imply experience of the mind, which is the 'substance' having the 'attributes'; therefore, 'mind', the 'substance' and 'emotions', the 'attributes' are inseparable and both are objects of experience. They are simultaneously experienced by us; therefore, it is proved, that, both are only objects of our experience. Therefore, 'I' am neither the mind nor the emotions; but, 'I' am the observer of the emotional mind."

By 'emotional mind' is meant 'emotion-attributed mental substance'. 'I' am the observer of the emotional mind; therefore, 'I' am different from both mind and emotions; therefore, no emotions belong to me; therefore, sorrow also does not belong to me; therefore, I do not require *mokshaa*. (Only if I have sorrow, I have to eliminate the sorrow by attaining *mokshaa*).

This, Sureswaraachaarya implied in verse 22: "Merely watch your sorrow, claiming you are free from sorrow, since you are *nithya muktha svaroopaa*." All the emotions, he enlisted by using four terms – *aham*, *mamathva*, *yathna* and *icchaa*. *Aham* (*ahamkaaraa*) is a particular type of thought; *mamathvam* (*mamakaaraa*) is another type of thought; *-yathna* (will) is also yet another type of thought and *icchaa* (*raagha*.) – attachment- is also another emotion. All the four words represent 'emotion'; Sureswaraachaarya argued that the emotions and mind are respectively, the attributes and substance objectified.

Having said that, now, in the 23rd verse, Sureswaraachaarya is saying "If you do not accept what I say, what will be the problem?" (This portion will be complicated, since it is all 'supposition', which requires a highly imaginative approach.) Sureswaraachaarya said "emotions are the attributes of the mind, which (i.e. the mind) is an object". The *poorva pakshi* does not accept this; he (especially the *nyaaya vaiseshikaa* philosopher) vehemently argues "emotions are not the attributes of the mind; they do not belong to the **mind**; but to 'I' the *aathmaa*- the observer". If this view is accepted as correct, it will mean, that, *aathmaa* will become the substance and emotions will become the attributes of the *aathmaa* substance. A further consequence: "Whenever I experience emotions, it will mean, I the *aathmaa* is experiencing the emotions, which are my own attributes; which would mean that substance is experiencing its own attributes. This would mean that the substance

(*aathmaa*) becomes the subject and its own attributes (emotions) become the objects".

Sureswaraachaarya tells the *poorva pakshin* "In your philosophy, the substance and its attributes will have subject-object relationship". How? *Aathmaa* will be the substance-experiencer and emotions, the attributes, will become the objects. Substance and attribute will have subject-object relationship, under the *poorva pakshin's* theory. And Sureswaraachaarya firmly says: "This can never happen. You can study any number of your experiences; you can use any amount or type of logic. Substance and attributes cannot have subject-object relationship." An example to understand this better: "my eye and its white colour, together, is, for me, the 'subject' experiencing the world, and, at the same time, for you, who are looking at me, my eye and its white colour are together an 'object' of experience; whereas, my eye can never look at its own white colour." A substance can never objectify its own attributes. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya's contention is "substance and attributes cannot have subject-object relationship".

Sureswaraachaarya establishes this law with an example (in verse 23) – 'fire' and its attribute, 'heat'. The *Achaaryaa* says "the fire can burn other objects; but, it cannot burn its own heat. i.e. while, fire can have subject-object relationship with other objects, it cannot have this subject-object relationship with its own attribute, 'heat'."

- यथा अग्निः उष्णिमानं न दहति – Just as fire does not burn its own attribute of 'heat',

Ushnimaanam – heat

- ज्वलन् – even if the fire is a huge conflagration/ however big the fire may be

Fire can burn everything in the universe; but, never its own 'heat'. (If this happens, fire will become cold, which is certainly impossible.)

"I' can never observe my own attributes; therefore, all observed attributes belong to something else. 'I' am free from all attributes" is what the *Achaaryaa* wants to establish as his final conclusion, by this course of his arguments.

- **स्वरूपत्वात्** – because it (heat) is its very attribute,
- **तथा एव** – in the same manner,
- **आत्मा अहं न विध्यात्** – aathmaa can never know the ahamkaaraa/ aathmaa can never experience emotions

Aham in this verse can be interpreted as *raaga-dveshaadhi* emotions. If the emotions belong to *aathmaa*, *aathmaa* would not have experienced the emotions, just as fire does not burn its own heat.

- *Aathmaa* – *aathmaa*, the observer
- *Naiva vidhyaath-* would never have experienced
- *Aham* – the emotions
- *Aham* = *aham mamathva yathna icchaa*: (from the previous verse)= all emotions.

I would not have experienced the emotions, if the emotions were my own attributes. But, I do experience the emotions intimately. This shows that I am aware of the emotions; that means, I am free from emotions.

Vedhaantha does not give you 'freedom from sorrow'; it only teaches "you never have sorrow, for it to be necessary, to become free from sorrow".

अविशेषतः - if (as the *poorva pakshin* says) the emotions are attributes of the *aathmaa*

Sambhandha gadhyam to verse 24:

एकस्यात्मन ग्राहक अहंप्रत्ययग्राह्यत्वात् । प्रत्यवतिष्ठते :मीमांसक श्रुत्वा इति नोपपद्यत सर्वथा :कर्मकर्तृभावः । निवृत्त्यर्थमाह तत् इति आत्मा

The *Meemaamsaka*, hearing that the Self can never be both the subject and the object, raises his objection. He holds that the self is cognized through the notion of the ego and is also the cognizing Self. That is refuted now: (in the following verse)

Until now, what we have established is "*ekasya aathmana: karmakartrubhaava: na upapadyathe*" – "One and the same 'I', the *aathmaa*, the observer, can never be the

subject-observer and the object-observed also; and, therefore, 'I' am ever the observer and never the observed."

- **एकस्य आत्मनः** - " One and the same *aathmaa*, the *saakshi chiathanyam* – theobserver Consciousness,
- **न उपपद्यते** – cannot have
- **कर्मकर्तृभावः** - both the subject status and the object status

bhaava: - status

Subject-status and object-status, both statuses together, can never be located in one *aathmaa*, the observer

- **सर्वथा** – under any circumstances".

That's why, it is repeatedly said "Never work for *aathma anubhavam*, the experience of *aathmaa*", since (by this approach) you are trying to make *aathmaa*, the 'experiencer' and also the 'experienced', which is never possible.

- **इति श्रुत्वा** – After listening to this Advaita siddhantha: ,
- **मीमांसकः** - the *meemaamsaka* philosopher, especially the *Paatta Meemaamsaka* philosopher,

Just as there are internal sub-divisions as *Advaita Vedhaanthee*, *Visishtadvaita Vedhaanthee* and *Dvaita Vedhaanthee*, in *Vedhaanthee*, there are sub-divisions among the *Meemaamsaka* philosophers also. One is *Praabhaakara Meemaamsaka*, propounded by *Prabhaakara Misra*: and another as *Paata Meemaamsaka*, propounded by *Kumaarila Patta*: Here, the reference is to *Paata Meemaamsaka*, which challenges our *siddhantha* by saying "*aathmaa* can be both the subject and the object and, therefore, there is something called self-cognition, in which Self is the subject and Self is the object".

"Whenever I am talking about myself, it is because I know myself; i.e. I am the 'knower' and I am the 'known' and this is expressed by the word *aham*; the very fact that people use *aham prathyaya*, reveals self-cognition. In every *aham prathyaya*, there is self-cognition and in every self-cognition, I am cognizing myself – which means, that, I am the subject and I am the object also. Therefore, I can enjoy the status of the subject and the status of the object. How do you say that *aathmaa* cannot have *karma karthru bhaava*?" questions the *meemaamsaka* philosopher.

- **आत्मा** – "The Self,

- अहंप्रत्यय ग्राह्यत्वात् – since it is cognized through the notion of the ego (is an object of cognition)
- ग्राहकः - (and) is also the Subject”.

Graahyathvaath –Since it is an ‘object’ (of cognition) through
Aham prathyaya – self cognition / self-knowledge

- इति (मीमांसकः) प्रत्यवतिष्ठते – In this manner, (the paatta meemaamsaka philosopher) is challenging the advaitin
- तत् निवृत्त्यर्थम् – To negate such a challenge or objection,
- आह - the author (Sureswaraachaarya, referring to himself) says the following

Chapter II: Verse 24 –

यत्कर्मको हि यो भावः। यत तत्कर्तृको नासौ :

घटप्रत्ययवत् तस्मात् न अहं स्यात् ध्रुवकर्मक ॥ २४ ॥:

No idea, which has a particular object, can have that object itself as the subject. Just like the notion of, say, a jar, the notion of the ego cannot have as its object the seer himself.

In any cognition, we require a distinct subject and (a distinct) object. Cognition (knowledge / experience) in Sanskrit is called *prathyaya*: In this *sloka* Sureswaraachaarya uses the word *bhaava*: in the place of *prathyaya*:, to mean ‘cognition’. Every cognition requires a distinct subject and a distinct object. You can never have an identical subject and object in any particular cognition. This is an universal and unnegatable law. This has to be dwelt upon and assimilated i.e. “every particular cognition requires a distinct subject and a distinct object”; therefore, if there is a self-cognition, you cannot say that “self” is the subject and “self” is the object; in self-cognition also, the subject and object will have to be different. This is what the *Achaaryaa* wants to convey.

- यो भावः - Every particular cognition
- यत् कर्मकः - which has got a particular object,
- असा - that cognition
- तत् कर्तृकः न (भवति) – cannot have the same object as the subject also (of the cognition),

yath karmaka: - *yath karma yasya sa*: - object (adjective to *bhaava*:); *thath karthruka*: - *sa*: *karthaa yasya sa*: - subject (also adjective to *bhaava*:)

எந்த ஞானமானது எந்த வஸ்துவை **‘object’** ஆக உடையதாக இருக்கிறதோ, அந்த ஞானமானது அதே வஸ்துவை **‘subject’** ஆகவும் கொண்டு இருக்காது.

Every particular cognition which has got a particular entity as an object can never have the same entity as the subject also. In other words, every particular cognition should have a distinct subject and a distinct object; applying this law, self-cognition cannot have the same 'self' as the subject and the object. It is impossible.

An example is given. "Pot-cognition", where I am the subject and the pot is the object.

- घटप्रत्यवत् - exactly like 'pot-knowledge'.
- तस्मात् – therefore
- अहं ध्रष्टुकर्मकः न स्यात् – self-cognition can never have 'self' as the object (since 'self' is the subject of the self-cognition)

aham – self-cognition (in this context) – *aham prathyaya: ; dhrashtru karamaka: na syaath* – can never have the 'self' as the object. *Dhrashtaa karma yasya sa: -: dhrashtru karamaka: /*

The *poorva meemasaka* argues further.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 25:

अत्राह प्रत्यक्षेण आत्मनः कर्मकर्तृत्वं अभ्युपगमे तत्पादोपजीविनः अनुमानेन प्रत्यक्षोत्सारणम् अयुक्तम् इति चोध्यम् तत् निराकरणाय प्रत्यक्ष उपन्यासः।

Here it may be objected: Perception reveals the ego as both the subject and the object. The other ways of knowing are subordinate to perception, as they rest on its support. How can they negate the deliverance of perception? To answer this, perception is considered:

The *poorva meemasaka* challenges the *Achaaryaa's* contention. He says: "In self-cognition, when I am talking about myself, it is very clear to me, that I am the subject and that I am talking about myself only. In other words, in self-cognition, "that I am the subject and I am the object" is very evident to me; it is the *anubhava* of every one. Therefore, self-cognition having the self as *both* the subject and the object is *anubhava siddham (prathyaksha pramaana siddham)* – direct experience".

On the other hand, the *Advaitin* says: "In self-cognition, "self" is the subject and cannot be simultaneously the object also." The *Meemasaka* contends: "Your (the *Advaitin's*) view is based on *anumaana pramaanam*, while my principle is based on *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Between the two *pramaanams*, *prathyaksha pramaanam* is *upajeevya pramaanam* (primary), whereas *anumaana pramaanam* is *upajeevi pramaanam* (secondary), because inference (*anumaanam*) is based on perceptual (*prathyaksham*) data. Therefore, *prathyaksha* is more powerful than *anumaana* and since I have *prathyaksha pramaanam* in my favour, against the *anumaana pramaanam* in your favour, you cannot negate my stand".

This objection of the *Meemaamsaka* has to be answered, which, Sureswaraachaarya does in the verse that follows.

63. Chapter II, Verse 25 and 26 (18-08-2007)

Chapter II: Verse 25 –

यत्र यो द्रुस्यते द्रष्टा तस्यैवासौ गुणो न तु ।

द्रष्टुस्थं द्रुश्यतां यस्मान्नेव इयात् द्रष्टुबोधवत् ॥ २५ ॥

That which is perceived in some locus, is a quality of that locus and not that of the perceiver. What belongs to the perceiver himself is never an object of perception, even as consciousness belonging to the perceiver never becomes the object of perception.

As a part of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, Sureswaraachaarya has come to *thvam padha vichaaraa*, otherwise termed *jeevaathma vichaaraa* and as a part of *thvam pada vichaaraa*, he has entered into *aathma-anaathmaka viveka*. *Anaathmaa* is divided into three parts – *sthoola sareeram*, *sookshma sareeram* and *kaarana sareeram*, and, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya is differentiating each one of the *sareerams* from *aathmaa*.

Sthoola sareera viveka has been completed. Now, the *Achaaryaa* has entered into *sookshma sareera viveka*. The most important component of *sookshma sareeram* is the mind and therefore, Sureswaraachaarya is separating the mind from 'myself'. This is 'the toughest nut to crack', because all of us look upon ourselves as our minds only. The very liberation is dependent on breaking this *hrudaya granthi* – the 'knot' because of which I mistakenly look upon myself as the mind. And, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya is now engaged in establishing "I' am different from the mind". And for this purpose, he is employing a particular argument.

For understanding the argument, certain basic principles are to be remembered. First and foremost principle is: "a substance and its attributes can never be separated". The reason: if they are separated 'attributes' cannot even exist – *guna* is always *dravyaasraya*: ('attribute' is dependent on 'object'). This principle has been established in *Tharka Saasthram* and, therefore, the *Achaaryaa* assumes this principle for 'granted' (he does not intend to establish this principle here).

Once we know this principle viz., 'subject and attributes cannot be separated', we can come to the second principle: 'since a subject and its attributes are not separable, objectification of one, automatically means the objectification of the other; i.e. if a substance is objectified, its attributes are also objectified and conversely, if the attributes of a substance are objectified, the substance is also objectified'. And, therefore, all the known attributes can belong to only known objects; all experienced attributes can belong to the experienced objects only; and, therefore, no experienced attribute can belong to the 'experiencer', the

subject. And, therefore, all the attributes that you talk about do not belong to 'you', including sorrow or fear or worry or anxiety or stress.

Having enunciated the principles, what is the *Achaarya's* argument? : If you talk about any attribute, it means that the attribute is 'known'. You cannot talk about unknown attribute. In other words, the very fact that you talk about an attribute makes it a 'known' attribute, and it has been seen that the 'known' attribute can belong to a 'known object' only; never to the 'knower-subject'. And, therefore, all the emotions belong to the known *sookshma sareeram*; the 'known' *mamakaaraa* and the known *ahamkaaraa* (the individuality, the 'I' sense) also belong only to the mind or *sookshma sareeram*.

And, as an extension of this, Sureswaraachaarya said: "If any one of the attributes belongs to 'me', the subject, I can never know or experience that attribute, because to know my own attributes, I have to remain as the subject and the attributes will have to be made the objects; and to make the attributes the objects, I will have to remain here as the 'subject' and the attributes will have to be separated from 'me', to make them as objects, but, unfortunately the attributes cannot be separated from me to objectify and therefore, I can never have any attribute ; if I have any attribute, I can never know it or experience it. Therefore, you have never experienced your attribute and therefore, you have no proof to say that you have got attributes, like *samsaarithvam*, *purushathvam*, *brahmanathvam*, *raaghitvam*, *dveshithvam* etc. You have no *pramaanam* for saying this".

When the *Achaarya* said this, the *poorva pakshi* comes up with an argument (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 24). He says: "You are saying that attributes belong to the object *sookshma sareeram* only, based on inference - *anumaana pramaanaa*. 'That, 'I', the subject, cannot be objectified and my attributes also cannot be objectified and therefore, I can never know or experience myself as an object' is established by you, based on *anumaana pramaanam*. Whereas, *prathyaksha pramaanam* proves, that, we all know about ourselves; that, we are able to know about ourselves; that, we are able to have 'self-knowledge' (not the *Vedhaanthic* self-knowledge; but the conventional self-knowledge – we introduce ourselves to others). That we have 'self-knowledge', in which 'self' is the subject and the 'self' is the object also, is proved by our experience – *prathyaksha pramaanam*. When *prathyaksha* proves self-knowledge, *anumaana* cannot negate the knowledge of the self. Therefore, what you say is wrong; therefore all the emotions are my emotions only. I have the self-knowledge of myself as a *samsaaree*". (It is interesting to note, that most philosophies try to establish *samsaaraa*, with the claim that they can only teach the 'means' to get out of the *samsaaraa* and attain liberation. The *Advaithin* alone is truthful and says 'you do not require a means for liberation, because you are not a *samsaari*.' And, he teaches *Vedhaantha* not as a 'means' for liberation, but, to prove or establish that you do not require liberation.)

The *poorva meemaamsaka* wants to prove that I am knowing myself as a *samsaari*, therefore, there is a self-knowledge, in which I am the subject and I am the object also. Therefore, here the *poorva pakshaa* is: "The self can be both the subject of knowledge and the object of knowledge. And, since the Self can be the object of knowledge, its attributes can also be objects of knowledge. And, therefore, 'I' sense belongs to the *aathmaa* alone". This contention has to be refuted by Sureswaraachaarya.

What is Sureswaraachaarya's answer? He tells the *poorva meemaamsaka*: "Certainly *anumaanam* is weaker than *prathyaksham*. And, therefore, if you can quote *prathyaksham*, then, I agree, my *anumaanam* will be defeated. But, what you talk about, is **not** real *prathyakshaa* – but, only *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*, a seeming *prathyakshaa* - like *rajju-sarpaa*. I can boldly negate your stand, since what you claim or think as *prathyakshaa* is only *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*. When *you* talk about self-knowledge, what you are actually objectifying is not the *aathmaa* but your mind. In the term, 'self-knowledge', the 'self' should be 'I', the subject *saakshi* – i.e. the real self. But, what **you** are objectifying is **not** the *saakshi* - *saakshi* is never objectifiable - you are objectifying your own mind, because mind is the object of the *saakshi*, termed *saakshyam*. And, that mind is endowed with *chidh aabhaasaa* and therefore, it is sentient. And, the sentient mind is only an object; but, because of its sentiency, it appears as 'I', the subject. What you are objectifying is the mind with *chidhaabhaasa*, the pseudo 'I', the *ahamkaaraa*, while, the subject is the real 'I', which is neither the mind nor the *chidhaabhaasa* – but, 'I' the *chith*, am the Self – but, because of the confusions explained above, objectifying the mind, you have mistaken it as objectifying your 'self' and you are calling it 'self-knowledge'. In that (i.e. your objectification), there is no self-knowledge; but, only knowledge of the mind and its attributes".

To convince the *poorva meemaamsaka* of this, we quote the example of the *sthoala sareeram*. The *poorva meemaamsaka* accepts that *sthoala sareeram* is an object different from one's self and even though *sthoala sareeram* is the object, when one talks about the attributes of the *sthoala sareeram*, one does not take them as attributes of the object (*sthoala sareeram*), but of oneself – for example, if one's body is fat, one does not say "my body is fat", but, says "I am fat". So also the age of an individual; nobody claims "my body is old"; instead claims "I am old" i.e. the biography of the *sthoala sareeram* is mistaken as the biography of the 'self'. In the same manner, the *Achaaryaa* points out, the biography of the mind is mistaken as the biography of the 'self' by the *poorva meemaamsaka*, who quotes this mistakenly as *prathyaksha pramaanam*, which it is not; but, is *prathyaksha aabhaasaa* only.

Prathyaksha pramaana, on the other hand, only proves that all the 'known' attributes belong to 'known' objects; and the 'self' or its features can never be objectified. What is the

example? The consciousness of the *aathma* is never objectifiable. Have you ever objectified the consciousness of the *aathmaa* in any particular experience? No particular experience can objectify consciousness. Similarly, if *aathmaa* had any other attribute, we would not have experienced it; therefore, all experienced attributes do not belong to *aathmaa*.

- यत्र यः गुणः द्रुस्यते – Whatever attribute is experienced in whatever locus (substance),

(That attribute belongs to that locus only and never to the experiencer subject)

- द्रष्टा - by the saakshi aathmaa

Ya: guna: - whatever attribute (refers to ahamkaaraa, mamakaaraa, raghaa, dveshaa etc.– mentioned in verse 22 – as aham, mama, yathna, icchaa)

Yathra dhrusyathe – where experienced (the mind or *sookshma sareeram*)

- असौ (गुणः) - that attribute (aham, mama, yathan, icchaa etc.)
- तस्यैव (भवति) - will belong to that mind or *sookshma sareeram* only,

The mind or *sookshma sareeram* is also an object of observation.

The *gunas* (attributes) can never belong to 'I', the observer.

The *Achaaryaa* further says: "If, 'I', the observer has any attribute (purely hypothetical – 'I' do **not** have any attribute) it can never be experienced at any time or place or under any condition. *Sarveshu deseshu, sarveshu kaaleshu, sarvaasu avasthaasu* – you can never experience. Therefore, you can never prove the attribute of the *aathmaa*."

- यस्मात् द्रष्टुस्थं – since any attribute which is located in the observer,

'Any' implies 'if, at all, there is an attribute located in the observer'; there can be no such attribute; the argument is only hypothetical. In such a theoretical situation,

- द्रुश्यतां न एव इयात् – can never become an object of your experience,

Any dimension you can talk about does not belong to you. "If you have pain, you will never experience it" Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa points out in his treatise Upadesa Saahasri – Gadhya Baagham, "you are experiencing pain, because you do not have it".

- द्रष्टुबोधवत् – like the 'consciousness' of the observer.

You would have never objectified – seen, heard, touched, smelt- Consciousness, because Consciousness happens to be your very nature.

The conclusion: 'I' do not have any attribute.

This raises a question (which is not intended to be discussed in this context) "How do then *Vedhaanthins* talk about self-knowledge? How are we supposed to gain *aathma jnaanam*, if *aathmaa* is not an object of knowledge?"

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) of Verse 26:

प्रत्यक्षेण एव भवदभिमतस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य आभासीकृतत्वात् सुस्थम् एव अनुमानम् ।

As perception itself falsifies your perception, the reasoning distinguishing the Self from the ego is quite secure.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "I have established that your *prathyaksha pramaanam* is not real *pramaana*, but, *prathyaksha aabhaasaa* only. The 'self-knowledge' you are talking about is a false self-knowledge, in which I am not the subject and the object simultaneously, but, I am the subject and mind is the object. To repeat: Subject and object are not identical. *Chaithanyam* is the subject and mind is the object. Therefore, there is no *prathyakshaa* to prove that subject and object are identical.

"And, since your *pramaana* is *prathyaksha aabhaasa*, my *prathyaksha pramaanaa* which is real *prathyaksha pramaana* proves that subject and object are different only. I always experience that the experienced attributes belong to experienced objects only and never to the experiencer-subject. This is *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

"And, since your *pramaana* is only *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*, not real *prathyakshaa* – but, pseudo *prathyakshaa*, you cannot challenge my *anumaana pramaanam* with your *prathyaksha aabhaasa pramaanam*. Therefore, my *anumaana pramaanam* stands unchallenged."

- प्रत्यक्षेण एव – By quoting real *prathyaksha* itself,
- भवदभिमतस्य प्रत्यक्षस्य – your so-called *prathyakshaa*,
- आभासीकृतत्वात् - has been falsified by me ; because of this,
- अनुमानम् सुस्थम् एव - my *anumaana pramaanam* stands unchallenged / safe.

"My *anumaanam* – *Raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *ahamkaaraa*, *mamakaaraa* etc. should belong to the 'known' mind alone; they never belong to me" the *Achaaryaa* contends. There is also *sruthi*

and *smruthi pramaanam* for this stand, though Sureswaraachaarya does not quote them in this context. He tries to establish his contention, purely by *yukthi* – logic. There is a *vaakyaa* in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – "Kama:, sankalpa:, vichikithsaa, icchaa, dhruthi:, adhruthi: sarvam mana: eva". As for *smruthi pramaanam*, verse 6 – Ch. XIII of the *Bhagavadh Githa* declares: "Icchaa dvesha: sukham dhu:kham samghaatha: chethanaa dhruthi: ethath kshethram samaasena savikaaram udhaahrutham" - "desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, the body-mind complex, sentiency, fortitude – all this enumerated above briefly, is *Kshethram* with its modifications", whereas you are the *Kshthragnya:* / All the three, *sruthi*, *smruthi* and *yukthi* confirm that " 'I' am free from *dhu:kham*".

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 26:

अतः तदेव प्रक्रियते । तत्र च विकल्पदूषणाभिधानम् ।

Therefore, the same is supported in another way and alternative formulations of the *prima facie* view are criticized:

- अतः - Therefore (since my *anumaanam* is safe and sound),
- तदेव प्रक्रियते - the same subject (*anumaanaa* topic) is continued with.

Since the 'mind-I' separation is a tough topic, the Achaaryaa wants to elaborate on this.

- तत्र च - In the *anumaanam* discussion,
- विकल्प दूषणाभिमानम् - I am going to talk about the defects of the *poorva pakshaa*, by dividing my arguments.

Vikalpa: - division; *dhooshanam* – picking holes / finding the deficiencies.

Very intricate discussions follow. The same line of analysis is presented in the *Upadesa Saahasree* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* - Ch. XVI and XVII. This treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is heavily based on the *Upadesa Saahasree*, as indicated earlier also.

Ch. II: Verse 26–

नात्मना न तदंशेन गुणस्वस्थोवगम्यते । :

अभिन्नत्वात्समत्वाच्च निरंशत्वादकर्मतः ॥ २६ ॥ :

A quality residing in the Self is not grasped either by the Self as a whole or by a part of it, for, there is no difference between what grasps and what is grasped, the 'grasper' and the 'grasped' are homogeneous in nature, the Self is not composite and it is not an object.

The *Achaaryaa* is now making a *vikalpa* – a 'division'. "Suppose, 'I', the *aathmaa*, have to know 'my' attributes, how will I know the attributes of *aathmaa*?" He gives two options. (1) Does the whole *aathmaa* know its attributes, by objectifying the attributes? OR (2) Does one part of *aathmaa* see the attributes of the other part – one *amsa* of the *aathmaa* know the attributes of the other *amsaa*?

How does *aathmaa* know its own attributes, if the *Bhaataa Meemaamsaka* is talking about *aathmaa* knowing itself and talking about its attributes?

And, Sureswaraachaarya says both are not possible. If the whole of the *aathmaa* has to know its attributes, then *aathmaa* should become the 'subject' and the 'attributes' should become the 'object'. And, if the *aathmaa* should be the subject and attributes the 'object', you will have to separate them. 'Objectification' requires 'separation' of the object. Unfortunately, the attributes can never be separated and kept in front, for the whole *aathmaa*, to see the attributes. The first option is thus ruled out.

The second option is now considered. Divide the *aathmaa* into two parts. One part will objectify the second part and its attributes and *vice versa*. The *Achaaryaa* says this is not possible, since *aathmaa* does not have parts – *niramsa*:, unlike the gross body, which has parts and therefore, one part can objectify another.

The *Achaaryaa* goes one step further. Assuming that the *aathmaa* has two parts, (which is not possible and therefore the argument is purely hypothetical), on what basis would you say, which part is the subject and which part is the object? Both parts are equally *chaitanya svaroopam* – self effulgent parts. One cannot or need not 'objectify' another; similar to a tube-light, which cannot be divided into two parts, claiming that one part lights up or illumines the other.

- आत्मना - By, the whole Self,
- तदंसेन - or by one part of the Self,
- गुणः स्वस्थः न अवगम्यते – attributes can never be known.

The attribute is neither known by the *aathmaa* by itself; the attribute is not known by the *aathmaa* through division also – i.e. neither wholly nor partially can the *aathmaa* know its attribute. Therefore, you can never prove *saguna aathmaa*; therefore, it should be remembered, that, in *Vedhaanthaa*, we never believe in *saguna aathmaa* and therefore, we never believe in *saguna Brahman* also. *Sagunam Brahman* is not acceptable; this statement may give rise to a doubt. In the entire *Karma Kaandaa*, *saguna Brahma Puja* and in the entire *Upaasanaa Kaandaa*, *saguna Brahma Upaasanaa* are talked about. How do you explain this? Ans: There is no such thing called *saguna Brahman* at all; but, *saguna*

Brahman is temporarily accepted, by transferring the *mithya* attributes of *anaathmaa* to *aathmaa*. *Sagunam Brahman* is only temporarily accepted by falsely transferring the attributes of matter to the Consciousness *Brahman*, for the purpose of *Puja / Upasanaa*, hoping, that, ultimately, the seeker will mature for 'de-masking' the *saguna Isvara* – i.e. understanding, that, in reality, there is only the *asabdam, asparsam, aroopam, arasam chaithanyam*, which is 'myself' and which is never objectifiable – 'I' am the Truth.

Attributes of the *aathmaa* can never be known. Why?

- **अभिन्नत्वात्** - Because there is no subject-object division between *aathmaa* and its(hypothetical) attributes
- **निरंशत्वात्** - and, because, there is no division in Consciousness or the *aathmaa* for one part of the *aathmaa* to objectify the other,
- **समत्वाच्च** – and, also because, even if there is a division (purely hypothetical) in the *aathmaa*, both parts are *samam* (and therefore, there cannot be a subject-object division)

The example of the light, given earlier, should be remembered. The light example has been cited in the *Upadesa Saahasree*.

Consciousness is indivisible and therefore, invisible also. You cannot 'see' Consciousness. "Vignyaathaaram are kena vijaaneeyaath?" *Yagnyavalkya* asks *Maithreyi*, in *Maithreyi Brahmanam* – meaning "Who will 'know' the 'knower'?" or "Who will 'experience' the 'experiencer'?" Never work for self-experience; there is no question of self-experience as a particular experience.

अकर्मतः - Therefore, *aathmaa* is never an object of knowledge.

'*Karma*', in this context, means 'object' and '*akarma*' means 'not an object'.

64. Chapter II, Verse 25 to 28 (25-08-2007)

In these important verses, Sureswaraachaarya establishes, that, *aathmaa* is ever experienced in the form of 'I', the Conscious principle, all the time and this form of *athmaanubhava* is universal, available for all. And, this universal *Athmaanubhava*, we need not work for, at all. Other than this universal *aathmaanubhava*, there is no other separate and specific *aathmaanubhava*; a time-bound *aathma* experience is not all possible. To consolidate : Other than the universal *aathmaanubhava*, available for everyone, in the form of 'I' , the Conscious principle, for which *aathmaanubhava*, we need not work at all, there is no separate, specific, special and time-bound *aathmanubhava* possible for any one, at any time.

And, this is because, *aathmaa* is never an object of experience; *aathmaa* does not have two divisions also, for one part of *aathmaa* to experience the other part. Therefore, *aathmaa* cannot experience itself at a particular time; other than the universal *aathmaanubhava*, which everybody has all the time, a separate, specific experience is not possible, because it is not an object of experience, which will come in front of me at a particular time, give an experience for a particular time and disappear from me, for me to lose the *aathmaanubhava*. All specific and time-bound experiences deal with *anaathmaa* and only *anaathmaa*.

And, therefore, in the 26th verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa strongly refuted *aathmaanubhava* as a specific event, giving the reasons, "*abhinnathvaath, samathvaaccha niramsathvaath*", (1) *abhinnathvaath* - because, *aathmaa* is not an object different from me, for me to experience (2) *niramsathvaath* – because *aathmaa* does not have divisions, for one part objectifying the other and (3) *samathvaath cha* - and, because even if hypothetically you make a division, one part of *aathmaa* cannot illumine the other part of *aathmaa*, because, both parts of *aathmaa* are already self-shining – how can one part illumine the other? It is similar to claiming that one part of a flame illumines the other parts of the flame.

And, from that, the corollary is, that, since *aathmaa* is not an object of experience, we are not going to experience the attributes of the *aathmaa* also. Only if *aathmaa* is going to become an object of experience, then you can experience the attributes of the *aathmaa*, **assuming** that the *aathmaa* has got attributes. To repeat: If *aathmaa* were an object of experience, at that time, you could have experience of the attributes of the *aathmaa* also, **if** *aathmaa* had any attributes. Since *aathmaa* is not an object, *aathmaa's* possible attributes also cannot be the objects; and, therefore, objectified attributes cannot belong to *aathmaa*. And, since objectified attributes cannot belong to *aathmaa*, they should belong to *anaathmaa* and, therefore, *ahamkaara, mamakaara, prayathna, icchaa* (verse 22) – the 'I'

sense, the 'mine' sense, *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, depression, worry etc. – all these objectified attributes belong to the *sookshma sareeram*, belong to the mind, belong to the *kshethram*; they do not belong to 'I', the *kshetragnya*: / Then, what attributes belong to 'me'? 'I' am absolutely attributeless.

This process of enquiry is called "*aathma-sookshma sareera viveka*:" - "segregating *sookshma sareeram* and 'myself'" – "segregating emotions and 'myself' and claiming 'I' am emotion-free". And, therefore only, I am sorrow-free and I am ever-free. This *sookshma sareera viveka*: is the topic, being discussed currently. `

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 27:

न युगपत् न अपि क्रमेण उभयथा च एकस्य धर्मिणः ग्राह्य ग्राहकत्वम् उपपद्यते इति प्रतिपादनाय आह ।

To demonstrate that the same substantive entity cannot be both the cognizer and cognized, either simultaneously or in succession or both ways, the following is stated:

The same idea is elaborated further for more clarity.

- **एकस्य धर्मिणः ग्राह्य ग्राहकत्वम् न उपपद्यते** – One and the same entity cannot serve as the subject and the object in one cognition or experience.

In a particular cognition, I can be the subject and your body can be the object; and, in another cognition, you can be the subject and my body can be the object. But, there is no one single cognition, in which, one and the same entity can be **both** the *graahakam* and *graahyam*.

Graahakam - 'subject' / 'experiencer' / 'knower' / 'grasper'; *graahyam* - 'object' / 'experienced' / 'known' / 'grasped'; '*dharmi*' means 'entity' and *dharma*: means 'of the entity'; *na upapadyathe* - is not possible.

"*Graahyam* and *gaaahakathvam* cannot be of one and the same entity" is the direct meaning.

This negation is done in two different ways: it is not possible 'simultaneously' nor sequentially.

- (न) युगपत् (उपपद्यते) – (not) simultaneously (possible)

In one cognition, (at the *samaana kaalaa*), 'I', the *aathmaa* becoming the subject and 'I', the *aathmaa* itself becoming the object, is not possible, because, when *aathmaa* is the

subject, it cannot be the object and when *aathmaa* is the object, it cannot be the subject. Therefore, *ugapath na sambhavathi*.

Then the question may be asked: "If it is not possible 'simultaneously', why cannot it be 'sequentially'? Initially, *aathmaa* will be the subject and later, *aathmaa* will be the object. Thus, *aathmaa* will serve as the subject at a particular time, say at 8-00 AM, and a little later, at 8-01 AM, will serve as the object." But, this is also obviously not possible, since, when *aathmaa* serves as the subject at 8-00 AM, (in the example assumed) there is no object, since *aathmaa* starts serving as the object only later, at 8-01 AM. At 8-00 AM, for cognition to take place, there is the 'subject' *aathmaa*, but, there is no object. In the same manner, at 8-01 AM, *aathmaa* is available as the object; but, there is no subject for the cognition to take place. At no time, are the subject and object available together, for the *aathmaa* cognition to take place. Therefore, sequentially also *aathmaa* cannot experience itself.

- न अपि क्रमेण - - nor sequentially also ,
- उभयथा - both ways (i.e. simultaneously or sequentially)

Anybody talking about getting *aathma anubhavaa* has only had some *anaathma anubhavam* and has mistaken it as *aathma anubhavaa*. Extraordinary *anubhavaas* are possible; but, all extraordinary *anubhavaas* are only *anaathma anubhavaas*. *Aathma anubhavaa*, on the other hand is the most ordinary, universal *anubhavaa*, which, we always have in the form of 'I am a Conscious entity'. That Consciousness is ever 'experienced'/ ever available for all the people, all the time, referred to as 'self-evidence', '*svayam prakaasathvam*', '*saamaanya aathma anubhava:*' etc.

- इति प्रतिपादनाय - To establish this,
- आह - the author explains.

Chapter II: Verse 27 –

द्रष्टृत्वेन उपयुक्तत्वात् तदा ऐव स्यात् न द्रश्यता ।

कालान्तरे चेत् द्रश्यत्वं न हि अद्रष्टृकम् इष्यते ॥ २७ ॥

As the Self is taken up wholly in being the cognizer, it cannot fall outside itself and be at the same time, the cognized also. If it becomes the cognized at a different time, the act of that cognition must take place without a subject to cognize.

This idea is clarified.

- **द्रष्टृत्वेन उपयुक्तत्वात् तदा ऐव द्रश्यता न स्यात्** - In any particular experience, since *aathmaa* is playing the role as the 'experiencer', in that same experience, **simultaneously**, *aathmaa* cannot have the status of 'experienced' / 'object'.

Dhrashtruvam – the role of the 'subject' / 'experiencer'

Upayukthathvaath - since utilized / employed

Thadhaa eva - (*vyaakyaanam* for *ugapath*) – simultaneously (i.e. while playing the role of the subject)

Dhrusyathaa na syaath – (*aathmaa*) cannot have the status of the experienced / object

In any specific experience, *aathmaa* is already employed as the subject. Since thus *aathmaa* is already utilized / employed as the subject, it cannot simultaneously serve as the 'experienced' / 'object' also. (It is like wanting to see one's own eyes, when one looks through a telescope or microscope, which, is obviously not a possibility.)

The first line of the verse (27) thus negates *ugapath aathma anubhavaa* – an *aathmaa anubhavaa*, in which *aathmaa* is the subject and the object simultaneously.

What about 'sequential' *aathmaa anubhavaa*?

Sureswaraachaarya says:

- **कालान्तर** – At a different time / at a later time,
- **द्रश्यत्वं चेत्** – if *aathmaa* becomes the object,

This is a purely hypothetical argument; *aathmaa* can never become the 'object' at any time – *dhruk eva na thu dhrusyathe* – but, for argument' sake, suppose we imagine, that *aathmaa* becomes an object later, what will happen?

- **अद्रष्टुकम् (भवति))** - (Will become) 'subject'less.

When the *aathmaa* becomes the object, then, who will be the 'subject' of the perception of the *aathmaa*? Subject will not be there. It will become '*adhrashtrukam vijnaanam*' - meaning 'a subjectless perception'. Because, when *aathmaa* becomes the 'object', what can be the 'subject'? There are three possibilities.

Possibility (1): Another part of the *aathmaa* can become the subject. But, this has been ruled out, in the earlier verse, since *aathmaa* does not have another part to become the 'subject'.

Possibility (2): Can you say that *anaathmaa* can become the 'subject', observing the *aathmaa*? No, *anaathmaa* cannot become the 'subject' – '*anaathmana: jadathvaath-anaathmaa*' being inert. How can *jadam* objectify *chethanam*? Thus, the second possibility has to be ruled out.

Possibility (3): Then, why cannot we have another *aathmaa* objectify the first *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* No. 1 objectifying *aathmaa* no. 2, similar to one person 'seeing' another and the second person 'seeing' the first? This is also not possible, reasoned as follows: When one person 'sees' another, the first person's *aathmaa* (*chithanyam*), through the mind, sees the second person's body only and not the second person's *aathmaa* and, in the same manner the second person's *aathmaa*, through *his* mind, sees only the first person's body and not his *aathmaa*. Never does one *aathmaa* see another, *aathmana: ekathvaath* - since there is only one Consciousness behind all the bodies objectifying all the *anaathmaa*. (The statement of Lord Krishna, in the Bhagavadh Geetha – "*Kshethragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarva kshethreshu*" – "May you understand Me as the Consciousness in all bodies" (Verse 3 – Ch. XIII) is relevant here.) Therefore, one *aathmaa* objectifying another *aathmaa* is also not possible.

In a nutshell, (1) *aathma amsaa* cannot objectify *aathmaa*, (2) *anaathmaa* cannot objectify *aathmaa* and (3) *anya:* or *dveethiya aathmaa* also cannot objectify *aathmaa*. Therefore, there is **no** specific experience, in which *aathmaa* becomes the 'object' of your experience. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says (the second half of the verse is being recast into two sentences):

- कालान्तरे द्रुस्यत्वं चेत् (तत्) अद्रष्टुकं (विज्ञानम् भवति) - If, at a later time, *aathmaa* becomes an 'object', that perception will become 'subject'less perception.
- अद्रष्टुकं न इष्यते - A 'subject'less perception (in which perception, the 'subject' has become the 'object') is not acceptable.

What the *Achaaryaa* conveys: The 'object'ness of an object is possible, only when there is a 'subject'. (Without the 'subject', the 'object' loses its status of 'object').

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 28:

सन्तु कामं अनात्मधर्मा :मम्त्वादय :यथोक्त न्याय बलात् अनात्मतयैव च तेषु व्यवहारात् अहंरूपस्य तु प्रत्यक् आत्मसंबधितयैव प्रसिद्धे :अहम्ब्रह्मास्मि इति श्रुते :च अनात्मधर्मत्वं अयुक्तं इति चेत् तत् न ।

"Let qualities like 'mineness' be ascribed to the non-Self on the argument stated as they are perceived as non-self. But the 'I' (ego) presents itself as integral to the inner cognizing Self itself. *Sruthi* also says 'I am *Brahman*'. As such, to relegate ego to the non-self is untenable" – this argument is rejected as follows:

The *poorva pakshi* continues his dialogue, making another suggestion- a compromise. What is that compromise? He says: "Among the various attributes enumerated, I am willing to accept most attributes, as belonging to *anaathmaa*, the mind, the attributes such as *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *yathna* and as not to the *aathmaa*". (It is to be noted, that, in *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosophy, *raaghaa*, *dveshaa* etc. are properties or attributes of the *aathmaa*. This conclusion of the *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosophers, who are considered to be highly rational thinkers and who also hold *Vedas* as *pramaanam*, being *aasthikas*, may surprise a *Vedhaanthin*. The *poorva pakshi*, in this context, is not a *nyaaya-vaisheshika* philosopher, but a *meemaamsaka* of a particular school.). The *poorva pakshi* continues: "Inasmuch as I have conceded on this aspect, that most attributes belong to the mind and not to the *aathmaa*, I expect you also to make a compromise. I desire to retain one attribute, as belonging to the *aathmaa* – the attribute *ahamkaara*: - the 'I' sense or individuality. This is because *ahamkaaraa* is intimately associated with 'I', the Self. Even *mamakaaraa*, I am willing to accept as *anaathma dharma* / *sookshma sareera dharma* / *mano dharma*; but, **you** should accept *aham sabda*: or *aham prathyaya*: as the intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*." The *poorva pakshin* claims that this is admitted by the *Upanishad* also, which, after negating everything, teaches "*aham brahma asmi*". He argues: "Though the *sruti* statement runs '*Athatha aadeso neti, neti – kama:, sankalpa:, vichikithsaa, sraddha, asraddha, dhruthi:, adhruthi:, hree:, dhe:, adhee: ethath sarvam mana: eva'– sruthi*, though, after thus negating everything else, still retains '*aham brahma asmi*' – *aham*, 'I', as different from 'you', the *madhyama purushaa* and 'he' the *prathama purushaa*. The 'second person' and the 'third person' are all negated; but 'I', the 'first person' is retained and that 'first person' is the *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, that *ahamkaaraa* is *aathma dharma*, you have to accept". This is the topic (of the current *sambhandha gadhyam*).

- सन्तु कामं - As you wish, let them be (i.e. let most of the properties belong to *anaathmaa*.)

Santhu – Let them be; *kaamam* – as you wish (an indeclinable word, in this context)

What are the properties (referred to)?

- ममत्वादयः - all the attributes other than *ahamkaaraa* (referring to verse 22 – among the properties mentioned therein, '*aham, mamathva, yathna, icchaa* etc.' - properties **other than** *aham*)
- अनात्मधर्मः (सन्तु) - (let them) belong to *anaathmaa* (i.e. *sookshma sareeram* or mind),

The *poorva pakshin* considers this as a compromise / a big concession to the *Advaitin*. He says to the *Advaitin*: "I admit your arguments, in favour of that".

- यथोक्त न्याय बलात् – because of the reasons given by you (in verses 26 & 27)

Yathoktha – mentioned (in the previous two verses); *nyaaya* – reasoning; *balam* - force/ strength.

- **अनात्मतया एव तेषु व्यवहारात् च** -- and also since all of them (i.e. all attributes other than *ahamkaaraa*) are looked at, only as *anaathmaa*."

An example of the reasoning, behind the attributes being considered *anaathmaa*: In the word *mamathvam*, the very word *mama* indicates that I am claiming them as 'belonging to me', thereby admitting that my 'belongings' are not 'me'. I am the 'possessor'; my belongings are the 'possessed'. My 'belongings' are different from 'me'; the duality is there. This fact reveals the *anaathmathvam* of *mamathvam*.

Anaathmathayaa eva – only as objects to be claimed or possessed; *thesu vyavahaaraath* – they (*mama*, *yathna*, *iccha* etc.) are transacted with / referred to / appreciated / recognized.

Upto this, is the 'compromise' part of the *poorva pakshin*. What follows is that stand of the *poorva pakshin*, on which he is not willing to make any compromise.

- **अहं रूपस्य तु** - On the other hand, the individuality / the 'I' notion / the *ahamkaaraa*/ the ego,

'*Thu*' indicates 'unlike those attributes - *mamathvaadhaya*: - earlier referred to'.

The *Vedhaanthin* believes that 'ego' is the cause of *samsaaraa* and therefore, desires to get rid of the 'ego', so as not to be bound by *samsaaraa*. On the other hand, the *poorva pakshin* wants to retain 'ego' as an attribute of the Self (as *aathma dharma*).

- **प्रसिद्धे**: - as is well known,
- **संबन्धितया एव** – is intimately associated with
- **प्रत्यगात्म** - 'I', the innermost Self.

The *prasiddhi* (awareness) is not only *loukika prasiddhi* (i.e. well known in the common parlance). It also has *saasthra prasiddhi* (claims, the *poorva pakshin*). He says:

- **'अहंब्रह्मास्ति' इति श्रुते**: - Sruthi also says 'I am Brahman'.

"Even the *upanishad*, after negating everything, retains the word *aham* in the *mahaa vaakyam* – when it wants to reveal the 'liberating' *Brahman*. This fact indicates that the 'I' sense, *ahamkaaraa*, is connected with *Brahman*. Therefore, *Brahman* has one attribute – *aham*" is the *poorva pakshin's* view.

Because of these two reasons – *loukika prasiddhi* and the *Upanishad Mahaa Vaakyam 'aham Brahma asmi'* (*Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad* – I.iv.10), (the *poorva pakshin* concludes):

- (अहंरूपस्य) अनात्म धर्मत्वम् अयुक्तं - (Taking *ahamkaaraa*) as an attribute of *anaathmaa* / mind is improper.

'*Ahamroopasya*' / '*ahamkaarasya*' is to be supplied; *Anaathma dharmathvam* – attribute of *anaathmaa* / mind; *ayuktham* – is improper.

This is the *poorva pakshin's* argument. A corollary, according to him, follows: "If *ahamkaaraa* is not an attribute of the *anaathmaa*, it has to be the attribute of *aathmaa*". The result: *Aathmaa* is *saguna*: and *ahamkaaraa* is its attribute.

- इति चेत् तत् न - If you argue like this (Sureswaraachaarya tells the *poorva pakshin*), it is not so.

His argument is given in the verse that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 28 –

अहंधर्मस्त्वभिन्नः चेत् अहंब्रह्मेति वाक्यतः ।

गौरः अहं इति अनैकान्तः वाक्यं तद्व्यपनेत्रु तत् ॥ २८ ॥

On the authority of the text 'I am *Brahma*', if the ego is identified with the Self, the same should hold in the case of the idea 'I am fair'. But, the sentence 'I am *Brahma*' removes that supposition.

- अहंधर्मः अभिन्नः चेत् - If you consider the *ahamkaaraa* as the attribute belonging to the *aathmaa*,

Abhinna: - *aathma abhinna*: - 'identical with *aathmaa*' / one with *aathmaa*.

- अहंब्रह्मेति वाक्यतः - based on the *saasthra prasiddha vaakyam 'aham brahma asmi'*,

'And also because of *loka prasiddhi* (universal experience)' – though not explicitly mentioned by Sureswaraachaarya, is to be understood. (When I say 'I', the 'I' is associated with the inner Self)

"Then there is *doshaa* (in both)" says the *Achaaryaa*. What is the *doshaa*?

The *Achaaryaa* first deals with the *doshaa* in the *loka prasiddhi* claim of the *poorva pakshin*. The *poorva pakshin* had said: "I use the word '*aham*', along with the *aathmaa*, the Self. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is associated with *aathmaa*." The *Achaaryaa* replies: "You are using the word *aham* with *anaathmaa* also. If you say *ahamkaaraa* belongs to the Self, because *ahamkaaraa* is associated with *aathmaa*, I will argue that *ahamkaaraa* belongs to *anaathmaa*, because you use the word *aham* with the body also. So, who is right? You do not have conclusive evidence. That the word *aham* is used in association with the body is also *loka prasiddham*".

65. Chapter II, Verse 28 to 30 (01-09-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is now continuing with *sookshma sareera viveka*: | He does this in a particular fashion. First he is taking all the attributes of *sookshma sareeram*, which are in the form of various emotions like *iccha* etc. And, he points out that all these emotions are very clearly 'experientable' to us, because we are able to clearly express these emotions. And, if the emotions are 'experientable', they should belong to some substance, which also must be an object of experience, because, without experiencing the substance, you cannot experience the attributes. So, from 'attribute experience' Sureswaraachaarya goes to 'substance experience' – the attributes being 'emotions' and the substance being the *sookshma sareeram* or the mind. And, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya concludes that all the emotions, as well as, the locus of the emotions, viz., the *sookshma sareeram* or the mind, must all be 'objects of experience' and therefore, 'I', the 'experiencer', am someone different from the all of them.

While making this statement, Sureswaraachaarya enumerated various attributes of the mind, where he included *ahamkaara* and *mamakaara* also, the 'I'- sense and 'my'- sense, which clearly give one an individuality/ an ego/ a crystallized personality. This *ahamkaara* and *mamakaara* pair also belongs to the mind or *sookshma sareeram* only, because it is also clearly experienced and one is able to express it also, in the form of a bio-data.

When the *Achaaryaa* made these statements, the *poorva pakshin* is almost convinced; he accepts that most attributes, **except** *ahamkaara*, belong to the mind - the *sookshma sareeram* – and not to the *aathmaa*. But, he is not able to accept *ahamkaara* as *anaathmaa*. He wonders: "How can *ahamkaara* be categorized as *anaathmaa*? The very word '*aham*' means 'I', the very word 'I' means the Self and the very word 'Self' means *aathmaa*. *Ahamkaara* = 'I' = the Self = *Aathmaa*." Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* holds that *ahamkaara* must be accepted as an attribute of *aathmaa*. He is willing to compromise on even *maamkaara* being an attribute of the mind – but, not *ahamkaara* - the 'I' sense. In support of his contention, he gave two *pramaanams* – (1) *loukika prasiddhi* and (2) *saastreeya prasiddhi*. *Loukika prasiddhi* is the worldly expression "I, myself". One uses these words 'I', 'myself' etc., in which use, there is a *saamaanaadhikaranyam* between *aham* and the *aathmaa*. "This *saamaanaadhikaranyam* (i.e. usage in **apposition** – I, myself) indicates *ahamkaara* is an attribute of *aathmaa*" claims the *poorva pakshin*. "And, there is not only *loukika prasiddhi*; but there is *Saastra prasiddhi* also, in the well-known *mahaa vaakyam* of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*- *aham brahma asmi*. In that *vaakyam*, *aham* and *brahma* are in *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, indicating *ahamkaara* is an integral attribute of *Brahman* or *aathman*. And, because of this *prasiddhi dvayam*, *ahamkaara* is an attribute of *aathmaa*" he contends.

Sureswaraachaarya replies : "I cannot accept even your compromised stand (i.e. while conceding that all other attributes other than *ahamkaaraa* as belonging to *anaathmaa*, but insisting that *ahamkaaraa* can only be an attribute of *aathmaa*), since, neither of the two reasonings given by you, in support of your contention - *loukika prasiddhi* and *saasthra prasiddhi* is sound".

The *loka prasiddhi* argument is first negated by the *Achaaryaa*, by the statement, "*goura: aham ithi anaikaantha:*" (2nd line of verse 28). By this statement, the *Achaaryaa* implies: "worldly expressions cannot be taken as serious supports, because they are quite often 'confused'. The word 'I' is, of course, sometimes, used with the Self, when one says 'I, myself did this' etc. – the *ahamkaaraa* joining the *aathmaa* during such occasions; but, on most other occasions *ahamkaaraa*, the *aham*, joins the *anaathmaa* – the *sareerams* also. For example, in the statement, '*aham goura:*' (I am fair), '*aham*', obviously, is used to refer to the gross body. The same is true about the mind also; one may say 'I am disturbed' or 'my mind is disturbed', both conveying the same message, but, causing a confusion as to whether the speaker is the 'mind' or 'possessor of the mind'. There is, thus, *anaikaantha dosha:*, in your argument. Whether *ahamkaaraa* joins the *anaathmaa* or the *aathmaa* can never be conclusively said, based on our worldly expressions, because in worldly expressions, *aham* is loosely used to mean either *aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*".

Anaikaantha: means 'non-conclusive' or 'indefinite'; in technical language, it is called *vyabichaara dosha:* / Five fallacies in reasoning are enumerated in *Tharka saasthraa*, called *hethvaabhaasaa:* / One of the fallacies is called *anaikaanthikathvam* or *vyabichaara dosha:* – non-conclusiveness.

- गौर :अहं इति अनेकान्तः - (The statement) 'I am fair' etc. is indicative of non-conclusiveness (with regard to the meaning of *aham*).

After thus refuting the *loukika prasiddhi* argument of the *poorva pakshin*, the *Achaaryaa* proceeds to negate the second argument, viz., *saasthra prasiddhi*.

"While clarity or conclusiveness may be found wanting in worldly usages, *saasthraa* being *pramaanam*, *saasthraa* has to be taken as valid. In the *saasthraa*, '*aham brahma asmi*' is a well-known and accepted statement. Therefore, the word *aham*, referring to *ahamkaaraa* must be an attribute of *Brahman*, the *Aathmaa*" is the second reasoning of the *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraachaarya gives a *samkshepa uttharam* – a brief answer – to this *saasthra prasiddhi* argument, in this verse. He elaborates his answer in later verses.

- तत् वाक्यं - That mahaa vaakyam (that you are quoting)
- व्यपनेत्रु (भवति) – (is the) eliminator (of)
- तत् - ahamkaara: |

“This *Mahaa vaakyam* does not give *ahamkaaraa* as an attribute of *aathmaa*; but, on the other hand, is eliminating *ahamkaaraa* as attribute of *aathmaa*; it is not an ‘including’ *mahaa vaakyam*; but, is an ‘excluding’ *mahaa vaakyam*. It has to be interpreted properly” is the brief answer, given by the *Achaaryaa*, in this verse. He proceeds to elaborate on this *samkshepa uttharam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 28:

कथं वाक्यं तद्व्यपनेत्रु तदिति । उच्यते ।

How does the sentence remove that supposition? As follows:

- कथं तत् - How does this mahaa vaakyam (aham brahma asmi)
- तद्व्यपनेत्रु (भवति) - (become) eliminator/ remover of ahamkaaraa?
- इति - (If) thus (you ask),
- उच्यते - I will explain.

Chapter II: Verse 29 –

य :अयम् स्थाणुः पुमान् एष पुंशिया स्थाणुधी :इव ।

ब्रह्म अस्मि इति धिया अशेषा हि अहंबुद्धिः निवर्त्यते ॥ २९ ॥

When one says ‘this post is a man’, the idea of the post is cancelled by the idea of man. Similarly, the sentence ‘I am Brahman’ sets up the idea that sublates the whole idea of the ‘I’.

Here, Sureswaraachaarya is discussing a technical aspect.

Consider the example of two sentences. Suppose a visitor to a country asks a citizen “who is the king of this country?” and the citizen answers “the king is Raama”. In this reply, both the nouns ‘king’ and ‘Raama’ are in nominative case; there is no proposition at all; both nouns refer to one and the same entity. Such a statement is called a *Samaanaadhikaranyam Vaakyam*. What is the idea conveyed by this *saamaanaadhikaranyam* “The king is Raama”? The attribute or status of ‘kingship’ is added to Raama. Raama is an already known person; but, that he is king, is not known and by the *saamaanaadhikaranyam vaakyam*, the kingship is included in Raama. Therefore, this is an ‘inclusive’ *saamaanaadhikaranyam*.

Now, consider a second sentence, in a different context, the well-known *rajju sarpa* context. There is a rope in a dimly lit area and a person mistakes the rope for a snake and in fear, tries to run away. He persuades his companion also to get away. But, the companion points

out "the snake that you are seeing, is a rope". In this sentence also, both nouns 'snake' and 'rope' are in nominative case. Similar to the earlier sentence, "The King is Raama", this sentence also is a *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyam*. The difference is, in the earlier sentence, the 'kingship' was included in Raama as a status or attribute; but, in the current sentence "the snake is rope", the 'snakeness', a falsely seen attribute, is excluded from the rope. Therefore, though this sentence is also *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, the intention is 'exclusion' and not 'inclusion'. Thus, *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyams* can be of two types – (1) 'inclusive' *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, otherwise known as *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam* and (2) 'exclusive' *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, known as *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*.

"The king is Raama" is an example of *eiyya saamaandhikaranyam*, where 'kingship' is **added** to Raama, while "the snake is rope" is an example of *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*, where 'snakehood' is **eliminated** from the rope. Therefore, whenever a *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyam* is come across, care should be taken to analyse the nature of the *saamaanaadhikaranyam*. *Saasthraas* elaborately discuss this subject and enumerate sixteen types of *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, though, only two types, *eiyyam* and *baadhaayaa* are relevant in this context. In the statement, '*pragnyaanam brahma*', '*pragnyaanam*' is Consciousness and '*brahman*' is '*brahman*' and in this sentence, the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* is *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam*, because Consciousness is 'included' in *Brahman*. Sureswaraachaarya says, in the sentence '*aham brahma asmi*', the *ahamkaaraa* or ego, the *vaachyaartham* (the primary meaning) of the word *aham* is not included in *Brahman*, but is excluded and therefore, you cannot take *ahamkaaraa* as an attribute of *Brahman* or *aathmaa*. This statement '*aham brahma asmi*' is a *baadhaayaa saamaanaadhikaranyam*, when you take *aham padha vaachyaartham*. When you consider the *aham padha lakshyaartham*, the sentence will become *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam*, though, in this portion, the *Achaaryaa* talks only of the *aham padha vaachyaartha*, which is *ahamkaaraa*, in which circumstance, the sentence is *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*.

For *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*, Sureswaraachaarya gives the example of an individual mistaking a person for a post, in a dimly lit area and his companion pointing out to the individual, that, it is a man and not a post. (This is in contrast to the usual example given in *Vedhaanthaa*, of a post being mistaken for a thief. In the *Viveka Chhodaamani* also, Adi Sankara uses the well known *rajju sarapa* example, in the reverse manner – instead of 'mistaking a rope for a snake', 'mistaking a snake for a rope').

- **यः** - When (the statement is made, that)
- **अयं स्थाणुः पुमान्** - "This post is a man",
- **पुंधिया** - through the knowledge of the 'man' (that the post is, in fact, a man),
- **स्थाणुधीः निवर्त्यते**- the notion of the post is eliminated/ removed.

In the same manner,

- ब्रह्म अस्मि इति धिया - By the knowledge 'aham brahma asmi',

By this knowledge, the *ahamkaaraa* is not included as an attribute; on the other hand, the *Upanishad* eliminates *ahamkaaraa* – the individuality, the ego, the 'I' notion.

- अहं बुद्धिः (निवर्त्यते) – the *ahamkaara* notion / the individuality/ the ego/ the 'I' sense is eliminated,
- अशेषा - in totality.

"After *mahaa vaakyam* the 'ego' should not be included in *aathmaa* – but, must be excluded" is the final idea conveyed by the *Achaaryaa*. In fact, even the "I am *jnaani*" sense will go away, as conveyed by the *Sruthi vaakyam* "*Brahmaiva na brahmavith*". Because, even the word *jnaani* is an attribute belonging to the *ahamkaaraa*, while *aathmaa* can neither be a *jnaani* or *ajnaani*. And, therefore only, a *jnaani* will not claim to be a *jnaani* – nor claim to be an *ajnaani* – but only say "I am 'I'".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 30:

अहंपरिच्छेद व्यावृत्तौ न किञ्चिदव्यावृत्तं द्वैतजातम् अवशिष्यते द्वितीयसंबन्धस्य तन्मूलत्वात् । अत आह ।

When once the determination of oneself as the 'I' is sublated, no quality whatever remains unsublated, for all relation to an 'other' is rooted in that. Therefore, it is said:

The primary point to be noted here, is, that, Sureswaraachaarya has taken the sentence '*aham brahma asmi*' as *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam vaakyam*. This is an important topic discussed by several *Achaaryas* in several contexts, whether, '*aham brahma asmi*' should be taken as *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam* or *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam*. The answer: Both are right, but, depending on the meaning of *aham*. If the primary meaning (*vaachyaartham*) of the word '*aham*', which is '*ahamkaaraa*' is given to the word *aham*, then the sentence '*aham brahma asmi*' is *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*, which means, that, '*ahamkaaraa*' must be eliminated through the *mahaa vaakyam*. On the other hand, if the word '*aham*' is taken to give its implied meaning (*lakshyaartham*) of '*saakshi chaithanyam*', through *baagha thyaaga lakshanaa*, '*aham brahma asmi*' will become *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam*. The *mahaa vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi*', *vaachyaarthe sathi baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam bhavathi*, *lakshyaarthe sathi eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam bhavathi*.

Sureswaraachaarya proceeds: "Once you have taken '*aham brahma asmi*', as *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam* and have eliminated the *ahamkaaraa*, then all the *mamakaaraa* also will automatically go". *Mamakaaraa* means 'relationship with the world'. Sureswaraachaarya

says: "This has to automatically go away, when, the individuality, the *ahamkaaraa*, is eliminated, since, through *ahamkaaraa* alone, *mamakaaraa* comes into existence."

Identification with *sthoola sareeram* and *sookshma sareeram* as 'I', results in all the attributes of the *sthoola* and *sookshma sareerams* becoming 'mine' – 'fatness', 'leanness', *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, family relationships etc., resulting in *samsaaraa*, further resulting in worry etc. Any worry, in any context, is the result of *mamakaaraa*, which, is itself, a result of *ahamkaaraa*. *Ahamkaaraa* continues because the *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam* of the *maha vaakyam* has not worked

and the real meaning of the *maha vaakyam* has not been grasped and assimilated. It should be realized that *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa* do not belong to me, but, to the totality *Iswara*, and, therefore, there is no need to 'worry'. 'Worrying' is 'trespassing into *Iswara's* territory'.

- **अहंपरिच्छेदव्यावृत्तौ** - Once 'aham abimaanaam' (*ahamkaaraa*) has been eliminated (through 'aham brahma asmi' *baadha saamaanaadhikaranya* wisdom)

Parichcheda – *abhimaana*; *vyaavrutthau* – by elimination.

- **न किञ्चित् द्वैत जातम् अव्यावृत्तं अवशिष्यते**- *Dvaitha jaatham vyaavruttham bhavathi* -

Relationship with the entire dualistic universe (*mamakaara*;) is also eliminated.

Dvaitha jaatham – sarva dvaitha sambhandha: /relationship with every single person or object / *sarva mamaakaara*; *vyaavruttham* – elimination.

Sureswaraacharya presents it as "No *sambhandha* is un-eliminated" meaning "every *sambhandha* is eliminated".

And, that is the reason, in *jnaana yoga*, even the triangular format – *jagath*, *jeeva*, *Iswara* - should go, since, in the triangular format the *jeeva-Iswara sambhandha*: is retained. In prayers, *ahamkaaraa* is activated, *Iswara*, as an object, is activated and *baktha-Iswara sambhandha* is activated. Therefore, a *jnaana yogi* cannot even pray in crisis. *Swami-bhruthya sambhandha* is permitted in *Karma Yoga*, whereas, a *Jnaana Yogi* should not resort to prayers in crisis; but, to the *nidhidyaasanam* "I am free from *ahamkaaraa*; crisis belongs to *ahamkaaraa*". During crisis, for a *Jnaana Yogi*, '*Asongoham*' is the invocation. He responds with the conviction: "All the crisis belong to *ahamkaaraa*; *ahamkaaraa* does not belong to 'me'; it has been eliminated by *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*." Any crisis activates the *nidhidyaasanam* for a *jnaana yogi* "*Asongoham asongoham sarva karma vimukthoham*". The day a seeker takes the vow that thereafter, in a crisis, he will not pray, but, only invoke his *asangasvaroopam*, he enters the 'binary format' - he becomes a *jnaana*

yogi. Not praying during a crisis is a difficult proposition; but, a *jnaana yogi* is expected to do just that (i.e. not to resort to prayers to *Isvara*; but, to resort to *nidhidhyaasanam* as "*asanga: aham*"). *Isvara* comes only when *jeeva*, the *ahamkaaraa* comes. (For a *jnaana yogi*) *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* is not there. Only 'I', the *sathya aathmaa* and *mithyaa prapanchaa* (*anaathmaa*) are there. (For him) crisis belongs to *anaathmaa*. The *jnaana yogi* always remembers "*Asangoham*". *Jnaana Yoga* goes with *sannyaasa*, which is renunciation of prayers (also); if a *sannyaasi* does a *Puja* as a ritual, during the time of the *Puja*, there is the temporary invocation of the triangular format and during the *Puja* time, the *jnaani* will thank the Lord for giving the binary format – for the 'knowledge'. Triangular format is temporary for a *jnaani*, during *Pujas* or temple visits, when he thanks the Lord for this wisdom (of the binary format) and thereafter, all the time he has the conviction "I am *asanga aathmaa; sarvam mayyeva jaatham, mayi sarvam prathistitham, mayi sarvam layam yaathi. Thadh brahma advayam asmi aham*". The internal lifestyle of a *jnaani* is, thus, totally different from that of a *karma yogi* or a mere *karmi*.

Reverting back to the text, the *Achaaryaa* asserts, that, with the elimination of *ahamkaaraa*, the *mamakaaraa* should go away. Why?

द्वितीय संबन्धस्य तन्मूलत्वात् - since the root of *mamakaaraa* is *ahamkaaraa*.

Dvitheeya sambhandha: - *mamakaaraa*; thath – *ahamkaaraa*.

Once *ahamkaaraa* goes away by *baadha samaanaadhikaranyam*, *mamakaara* goes away. *Samsaaraa* also goes away.

66. Chapter II, Verse 30 to 33 (08-09-2007)

Chapter II: Verse 30 –

निवृत्तायां अहंबुद्धौ ममधी :प्रविलीयते ।

अहंबीजा हि सा सिध्येत् तमो अभावे कुत :फणी ॥ ३० ॥

When the idea of 'I' is removed, the idea of 'mine' dissolves. The latter idea emanates from the I-consciousness. When there is no darkness, how can there be the (illusory) snake?

As a part of *thvam pada vichaaraa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is dealing with *sookshma sareera aathma viveka*. As a part of that, Sureswaraachaaryaa is doing *antha: karana-aathma-viveka:*, because, *antha: karanam* is a part of *sookshma sareeram*. And, as a part of that, the *Achaaryaa* is doing *antha: karana dharma aathma viveka:* - "discrimination between the mental properties and *aathmaa*". To put in other words: as a part of *anaathmaa*, Sureswaraachaarya has taken *sookshma sareeram*, as a part of *sookshma sareeram* he has taken *antha: karanam* and as a part of *antha: karanam* he has taken *antha: karana dharmaa:* or properties. And, Sureswaraachaarya said that all of them are *anaathmaa*, because, they are all objects of experience and *aathmaa* is the 'experiencing' Conscious principle.

When all the *antha: karana dharmaa:* were negated, the *poorva pakshin* came for a compromise: "we are willing to accept that all the *antha: karana dharmaa:* are *anaathmaa*; but, the *ahamkaaraa* or the 'I' notion or sense – the individuality should not be taken as *anaathmaa*, because, the very word 'I' refers to I, myself, the ultimate subject". Now, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya has entered into *ahamkaara – aathma – viveka:* (to refute this stand of the *poorva pakshin*).

And, Sureswaraachaarya said "you cannot go by worldly experiences, because, in the worldly common parlance, you use the word 'I' for *aathmaa* also and often we use the word 'I' for the body also; therefore, the worldly usage cannot be taken as conclusive evidence for proving anything; and, therefore, we have to see whether *saasthraa* gives any support (either for or against)".

The *poorva pakshin* quoted the *saasthric* support of the well-known *Brahadhaaranyaka vaakyam* – "*aham brahma asmi*" and, he said "in this *vaakyam*, *aham* refers to 'I' sense, *ahamkaaraa* and *brahma* refers to my original nature, *Paramaathmaa* or *aathmaa*. Because of *saamaanaadhikaranyaa* usage, we come to know that *ahamkaaraa* is included in *Brahman* or *aathmaa*, as an attribute. And, therefore, '*aham brahma asmi*' reveals that *ahamkaaraa* is *aathma dharma:*"

It is this interpretation of the *poorva pakshin* that Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting now; and, the point he conveys is: "in `aham brahma asmi, the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* used is *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*".

There are four types of *saamaanadhikaranyam* (as earlier pointed out - also discussed in detail in *Brahma Suthra* classes, under *Suthra* no. 3.3.9, "*vyaapthe: cha samanjasam*").

The four *saamaanaadhikaranyams* are:

- (1) *Upaasanaayaam saamaanaadhikaranyam*: in which the idea conveyed, is 'deliberate superimposition for *Upaasanaa*'. The well known example is 'man is fire' – '*purusho vaa agni:*' | This is a typical example of *samaanaadhikaranyam*, in which 'fire' and 'man' are equated. There cannot be *eikyam* between man and fire. Here, it is meant for *Upaasanaa*. The *Upanishad* says: "May you meditate upon man, as a fire principle – as a part of *panchaagni vidhya*". (The subject is dealt with, in *Chaandhogya Upanishad, Brahadaranyaka Upanishad, Brahma Soothraas* and *Anuboothi Prakassaa*). This "Man is fire" is an example of *Upaasanaayaam saamaanaadhikaranyam*.
- (2) *Baadhaayaam saamaanaadhikaranyam*: where two words are used, one negating the other. Sureswaraachaaryaa himself had used this *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, when he said (in verse 29) "You have mistaken a man for a pillar and somebody points out that the so-called pillar is nothing but a man". Here pillar and man are used in *saamaanaadhikaranyam* – the 'man-knowledge' negating the 'pillar-notion'. This *saamaanaadhikaranyam* is, therefore, called 'negation-*saamaanaadhikaranyam*' or '*baadhaayaam saamaanaadhikaranyam*".
- (3) *Eikya saamaanaadhikaranyam*: is the main one – where two things are equated; otherwise called *mukya saamaanaadhikaranyam* also, since *eikyam* is *mukyam*. The well-known example is '*soyam devadhattha:*' – 'that young Devadhatta whom you experienced twenty-five years ago, is the same aged Devadhatta you see now, though physically changed'. "*thathvamas*" and similar *vaakyaas*, will come under *eikya saamaanaadhikaranyam*.
- (4) *Viseshana-viseshya bhaave saamaanaadhikaranyam* - when an attribute and a substance are mentioned together. The well-known example is 'blue lotus' – '*neelam uthpalam*' – where both the words *neelam* and *uthpalam* are in nominative case. There is *saamaanaadhikaranyam* - not in '*eikyam*', because 'blue' and 'lotus' are not one and the same, since one is an attribute and the other is the substance. Such a *saamaanaadhikaranyam* is termed '*viseshana-viseshya bhaave saamaanaadhikaranyam*'.

Of these four *saamaanaadhikaranyams*, in what category would '*aham brahma asmi*' fall? Normally, we would take it as *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam*; but, in this portion (of the treatise), there is a difference.

The *poorva-pakshin* takes the *vaakyaa* as *viseshana-viseshya bhaave saamaanaadhikaranyam*, *aham* referring to *ahamkaaraa* and *brahma* referring to *aathmaa* – the statement, thus meaning (according to him) '*ahamkaaraa* is the *dharma* or attribute of *aathmaa*', just as in the term '*neelam uthpalam*', *neelam* refers to the attribute of *uthpalam*. This is the interpretation given by the *poorva pakshin* (vide verse 28).

From verse 29, Sureswaraacharya is refuting the *viseshana-viseshya bhaave saamaanaadhikaranyam* and is establishing the *Advaitin's siddhaanthaa*.

In this process of refuting, the *Achaaryaa* does not categorise the *vaakyaa 'aham brahma asmi'* as *eiyya saamaanaadhikaranyam* (as is usually done), but, as *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam* (this being a speciality of this text *Naishkarmya Siddhi*). He takes '*aham*' to mean its *vaachyaartha* – i.e. as *ahamkaaraa* (as the *poorva pakshin* does). *Ahamkaaraa* is *mithya* and *Brahman* is *sathyam*; and, (the *Achaaryaa* contends) by using *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam*, the *mithyaa -ahamkaaraa* is displaced or negated like negating the *sthanubraanthi* upon the *purushaa*. Thus the individuality is a *misconception* superimposed on *Brahman* or *chaithanyam* and through the *mahaa vaakyam* the individuality-notion is to be negated and the pure *chaithanyam* alone remains – which is free from *prathama purusha*: - the first person, second person and third person.

A beautiful verse in *Sad-darsanam* runs: "*Thath yushmathor asmathi samprathishta thasmin vinashtesmathi moola bodhaath thath yushmadhasman mathi varjithaika sthithir jvalanthi sahajaathmanasyaath*".

Second person and third person are dependent on the first person, which itself is a misconception; you need not negate the second person and third person separately; it is enough, if you negate the first person *ahamkaaraa*, since '*thath yushmatho: asmathi samprathishta*' – *asmath* means *ahamkaaraa*.

- *Thasmin vinashte asmathi moolabodhaath* – by knowing the *aathma chaithanyam*, when the *ahamkaaraa* is negated,

What remains?

- *Thath yushmadhasman mathi varjithaa* – without the first person, second person and third person

- *Aathmana: sahajaasthithi: syaath*-That *aathmaa* is neither 'me', nor 'you' nor 'he'.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says (in the 29th verse) "through *baada saamaanaadhikaranyam, ahamkaaraa* is **eliminated; not included** through *viseshana-viseshya-bhaavaa*."

And, what is the corollary of this understanding? It is given in the 30th *sloka*: "Once *ahamkaaraa* is negated, all others are automatically negated, without the need for separately negating them". How? As mentioned in the *Sad-darsanam* verse above, all the 2nd persons and 3rd persons rest on *ahamkaaraa* alone. That's why, *Shri Ramana Maharshi* concentrated on *ahamkaara vichaara*: | "*Ahamayam Kutho bhavathi chinva: ayi pathathyaham nijavicharanam*" – "Oh! seeker! For the one who enquires thus 'where from does this 'I' arise?', the I-notion drops. This is self-enquiry" (Verse 19 – *Upadesa Saaram* of *Shri Ramana Maharshi*).

This is what is referred to by the *Acharyaa*. Instead of using the words '2nd person' and '3rd person', Sureswaraachaarya says that all the *mamakaaraas* are born out of *ahamkaaraa* only. 'My' father, 'my' mother, 'my' husband, 'my' wife, 'my' company – all the 'mines' are possible only when 'I', the *ahamkaaraa* is born. What is the proof? In the *sushupthi avastha*, when the *ahamkaaraa* is resolved, the *mamakaaraa* also gets resolved. In *jagrath* and *svapna*, *ahamkaaraa* rises – the *mamakaaraa* also rises.

This is also said in *sad-darsanam*: "*dhiyaa sahodhethi dhiyaasthamethi lokas thatho deepra vibhaasya esha*."| In fact, for *ahamkaara vichaara*., the ideal *granthaa* is *Sad-darsanam*. A very thorough *vichaaraa* is done in the *granthaa*.

Reverting to the text,

- अहं बुद्धौ निवृत्तायां - When the 'I' false notion goes away,
- ममधीः - the 'mine' notion (also) / *mamakaaraa*
- प्रविलीयते - resolves;

When *ahamkaaraa* goes away, even one's family is negated. That's why, *Gowdapaadhaa* calls it *asparsha yoga*: (in *Maandookya Kaarika*) - 'relationless *yoga*.' – no more relations, including 'my' *Bhagavaan*. (When the seeker attains this stage) *Bhagavaan* is no more an object of *mamakaaraa*, but remains as the essence of *ahamkaaraa* – 'I', the *saakshi*.

The reason for 'mine' notion getting resolved, is given in the second line of the verse.

- सा हि - The *mamakaaraa* surely (*Saa* refers to *mamadhee*.),

- सिध्यते - emanates,
- अहं बीजा – with aham as the seed (kaaranam),

'*Ahamkaaraa*' is *kaaranam* and '*mamakaaraa*' is *kaaryam*; '*kaarana naase kaarya naasa.*'|

That's why Gowdapaadha said that *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* is scary to most people, because *all* relationships are negated by *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*, whereas it is the nature of human beings to find 'security' in one relationship or other - worldly relationship or relationship with *Bhagavaan* or relationship with *Guru*. *Visistaadvaitam* and *dvaitam* appear 'safe', because they retain relationship with God. Even in *Mokshaa*, according to these philosophies, though worldly relationships are dropped, there is lasting relationship with *Bhagavaan*. Therefore, many people are happy with *Visistaadvaitam* and *Dvaitam*, while, to them, *Advaitam* appears as a 'terrible' philosophy, because, in *Mokshaa*, it negates all relationships, including relationship with *Bhagavaan*. Gowdapaadha refers to such people as '*bhayadarsina.*' – 'who look upon *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* as *bhayam*'. "*Kaschith dheera: prathyak aathmaanam eikshathu*" – "Only a rare *dheera:* is able to 'drop' all relationships and 'discover' an *aathmaa*, which does not require a 'relationship' for security". Relationshipless security is the ultimate goal of *Advaita*.

"When the *kaarana ahamkaaraa* goes away, *kaarya mamakaaraa* also goes away" is the essence. The *Achaaryaa* explains this with an example; i.e. to establish the principle '*kaarana naase kaarya naasa.*', he gives an example.

- तमो अभावे - When the rope ignorance goes away,
- कुतः पणी - where is the snake? (There cannot be a snake)

The *Achaaryaa* keeps in mind the well-known rope-snake (*rajju-sarpa*) example. *Thamas* implies (in this context) *rajju ajnaanam*. *Panee* means snake. '*Kutha:*' (again, in this context) is not a question; 'where is the snake?' is in the meaning of negation - 'there cannot be a snake'

The 'false' snake is born out ignorance. 'Ignorance' is *kaaranam*. 'Snake-notion' is *kaaryam*. Ignorance-*naase* snake-*naasa:*; therefore, *kaarana naase kaarya naasa:*; therefore, *ahamkaara naase mamakaara naasa:* |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 31:

विवक्षित द्रष्टान्तांशजापनाय द्रष्टान्तव्याख्या ।

The analogy is interpreted to bring out the intended point in it:

In the previous *sloka*, Sureswaraacharya briefly referred to 'ignorance and snake'. Though this is a well-known example known to *Advaita Vedhaantha* students, he elaborates on the example.

- **दुष्टान्त व्याख्या** - A brief note on the example (is given in the following verse),

For what purpose?

- **दुष्टान्त अर्थ जापनाय** - for clarifying the example part (of the previous *sloka*),

A brief note on the example is given, so that the *vivakshitham* will be known. *Vivakshitham* means 'the message to be communicated'.

- **विवक्षित** - (so that) the message to be communicated (is very clear).

'*Mamakaara naasa:*' is the original message; to clarify that message, the *Acharya* clarifies the example given.

Chapter II: Verse 31 –

तमो अभिभूत चित्तः हि रज्ज्वां पश्यति रोषणम् ।

भ्रान्त्या भ्रान्त्या विना तस्मात् न उरगम् स्रजि वीक्षते ॥ ३१ ॥

He whose intelligence is hampered by darkness, sees the snake in the rope in illusion. In the absence of the illusion the snake would not be seen.

This is the well-known *rajju-sarpa* (rope snake) example explained.

There is a rope lying in semi-darkness (*mandha anathakaara:*) and is curved also. If the area is brightly lit, there will be no problem, since the rope will be clearly seen for what it is; and, if it is total darkness, the rope will not be seen at all. But, because of the semi-darkness (*thama:*), the eyes and the mind are stultified (*abhibootham*); i.e. capacity for clear vision and clear understanding are obstructed.

- **तमो अभिभूत चित्तः** - A person whose mind (and sense-organ) is overpowered/ obstructed, by darkness ,
- **रज्ज्वां रोषणम् पश्यति** - perceives a snake in a rope,

Rajju - rope; *roshanam* - snake (in this context – though the word is not generally used in this meaning).

This is called *anvayaa* logic, which reveals the co-existence of ignorance and erroneous perception: 'Wherever ignorance exists, error is also there'.

The snake is seen. How?

- भ्रान्त्या - falsely / erroneously.

The word `bhraanthyaad` is used twice. The first `bhraanthyaad` is to be connected to the first line, as `bhraanthyaad pasyath/` – 'erroneously perceives'.

- भ्रान्त्या विना - When the delusion born out of ignorance is not there / goes away,
- तस्मात् - because of that reason (because delusion goes away),
- स्रजि उरगं न वीक्षते - the snake is not seen upon the rope.

Uragam – snake; *sraji* – upon the rope. (*Srak* means rope or garland)

This is *vyathirekaa* logic: 'in the absence of ignorance and delusion, error goes away'.

Ignorance alone is the cause (*kaaranam*) for error (*kaaryam*). When *kaaranaa* goes, *kaaryaa* also goes away.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 32:

अनन्वया :च न आत्म धर्म अहंकार :।

The ego is not the character of the Self, for it does not attach itself to the Self always.

Now, the previous topic is over. What is the previous topic? "'*Aham brahma asmi* is *baadha saamaanaadhikaranyam* and through '*aham brahma asmi*', *ahamkaaraa* is not included in the *aathmaa*'; on the other hand, *ahamkaaraa* is eliminated from the *aathmaa*. When *ahamkaaraa* goes away, *mamakaaraa* also goes away; therefore, both *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa* are not attributes of *aathmaa*' is the previous topic.

Now, the *Achaaryaa* enters into a new argument. The aim is (still) 'negation of *ahamkaaraa* from *aathmaad*'. What is the argument?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Suppose *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic property of *aathmaa* (as claimed by the *poorva pakshin*, who is willing to eliminate all other attributes - *raaghaa*, *dveshaa* and even *mamakaaraa* - but, insists that *ahamkaaraa* should be accepted as an intrinsic part of *aathmaa*), in that case, *at all times*, *ahamkaaraa* must be associated with *aathmaa*, similar to heat, the intrinsic nature of fire, being *always* associated with fire. Then in *sushupthi avasthaa* also, *ahamkaaraa* must continue, since *aathmaa* is eternally there.

Still worse, during *mokshaa* also, *ahamkaaraa* will continue. What is the consequence? If during *mokshaa*, *ahamkaaraa* continues, *samsaaraa* being an intrinsic property of *ahamkaaraa* – because *ahamkaaraa* is *karthaa-bokthaa* and has got infinite, inexhaustible *sanchitha karma* – *samsaaraa* also will continue; such a *mokshaa* is meaningless”.

In the *sambhandha gadhyam*, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- अनन्वयाः च - Because of non-accompaniment (of *ahamkaaraa* with *aathmaa*)

Anvaya: means 'accompaniment'; *ananvaya*: means 'non-accompaniment'. When (is the non-accompaniment)? During *sushupthi* and *vimukthi* – especially during *vimukthi* /*mokshaa*. Therefore,

- अनन्वयाः च - Because of non-accompaniment (of *ahamkaaraa* with *aathmaa*)

The essence: “In *mokshaa*, *samsaaraa* does not continue; therefore, *ahamkaaraa* does not continue; therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is not *aathmadharmaa*”.

This is the brief introduction to Verse 32, which elaborates the argument further.

Chapter II: Verse 32 –

आत्मनः चेत् अहंधर्मः यायात् मुक्तिसुषुप्तयोः।

यतो न अन्वेति तेन अयं अन्यदीयः भवेत् अहम् ॥ ३२ ॥

If the ego characterizes the Self, it must persist in deep sleep and the state of liberation. Since it does not so persist it must be construed as belonging to something alien.

- अहं आत्मनः धर्मः चेत् – Suppose *ahamkaaraa* is the attribute of *aathmaa*,

Aham – *ahamkaaraa*; *dharma* – property / attribute ; *aathmana*: - of the *aathmaa* ; *cheth* – suppose.

Then what will be the tragedy?

- मुक्ति सुषुप्तयोः यायात् - (that *ahamkaaraa* property) will accompany (the *aathmaa*) in *mokshaa* and in *sushupthi*.

Yaayaath - will accompany/ would have accompanied.

This is a hypothetical situation, visualized by the *Achaarayaa*. "Ahamkaaraa does not accompany *aathmaa* in *mukthi* and *sushupthi*. It would have accompanied, if *ahamkaaraa* were an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*" is what he the *Achaaryaa* conveys.

But, the fact is:

- न अन्वेति - (the individuality – the ahamkaaraa) does not accompany (the aathmaa in sushupthi and moksha:)

Sushupthi is the 'deep sleep' state. In dream, *ahamkaaraa* is there ; but, in deep sleep state, *ahamkaaraa* is not there; this absence of *ahamkaaraa* in deep sleep state, is proved by our own *anubhava pramaanam*. This has been said in *Chaandhogya Upanishad* also i.e. *sruthi pramaanam* is also there for this fact.

In *mokshaa* also, *ahamkaaraa* is not there. How do you prove this? "If *ahamkaaraa* continues in *mokshaa*, *karma* also would have continued, *samsaaraa* also would have continued; it cannot be *mokshaa* at all".

Na anvethi – (*mukthi sushupthayo: ahamkaara: aathmaanam na anvethi*) –*ahamkaaraa* does not accompany *aathmaa* in *mukthi* and *sushupthi*.

- यतः तेन – Because of this reason,
- अयं अहम् अन्यदीयः भवेत् - *ahamkaara:* can belong to something else (other than *aathma*) only.

Aham – *ahamkaara:*; *anyadeeya:* - something else only. If it cannot belong to *aathmaa*, it can belong to some other *anaathmaa* only.

Which *anaathmaa* does it belong to?

Ans: To the mind or the *sookshma sareeram anaathmaa*. Therefore, 'I' have no individuality; what self-experience we have in *sushupthi* is 'our' real nature, while, the self-experience we have in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* is the *vesham* that we put on - as father, mother, spouse etc. The 'I' of *sushupthi* is 'my' real nature.

But, we tend to believe that the 'I' of *jaagrath* is our real nature and what we experience in *sushupthi* is temporary – we tend to interchange the two – 'fact and faction'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 33:

आत्म धर्मत्व अभ्युगमे अपरिहार्य दोषप्रसक्तिः च ।

If it is regarded as belonging to the Self inherently, unavoidable difficulties issue therefrom.

This is the next argument of the *Achaaryaa*.

The first argument was "the *vaakyaa* should be interpreted with *baadhayaam saamaanaadhikaranyam*". The second argument was "if *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*, in *mokshaa* also, *ahamkaaraa* will continue, *samsaaraa* will continue, in which case *mokshaa* will not be *mokshaa*".

Now the *Achaaryaa* goes to the third argument.

- (अहंकारस्य) आत्म धर्मत्व अभ्युगमे - Suppose you accept *ahamkaaraa* to be the attribute of *aathmaa*,
abhyugamam – acceptance; 'ahamkaarasya' is to be supplied.
- दोष प्रसक्ति :च - there will also be another *doshaa* or defect in your interpretation,
- अपरिहार्य - which defect can never be remedied.

Aparihaarya dosham – Unremediable problem.

What is that problem? That is stated in the *sloka*.

Chapter II: Verse 33 –

यध्यात्मधर्मो अहंकार :नित्यत्वं तस्य बोधवत् ।

नित्यत्वे मोक्षशास्त्राणां वैयर्थ्यं प्राप्नुयात् ध्रुवम् ॥ ३३ ॥

In case the ego inheres in the Self, it will have to be considered eternal like consciousness. If it is eternal, the scriptures preaching liberation would all be futile.

The *doshaa* that Sureswaraachaaryaa points out is called "*moksha saasthra vaiyarthya prasanga*:" – "redundancy of all the spiritual scriptures". *Vaiyarthyam* means 'uselessness/ redundancy'. *Prasanga*: means 'possibility/ contingency'. "The possibility/ contingency of all the spiritual literature becoming redundant/useless", because, in *mokshaa* also *ahamkaaraa* will continue and therefore, *samsaaraa* also will continue.

67. Chapter II, Verse 33 to 36 (15-09-2007)

Suresvaraachaarya is continuing with *thvampadhaartha vichaaraaa*, as a part of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

Thvampadhaartha vichaaraa consists of *aathma anaathma viveka*: - separating *aathmaa* from *anaathmaa*. *Anaathmaa* consists of three *sareerams* – *sthoola*, *sookshma* and *kaarana sareeraani* and, therefore, *aathmaa* has to be separated from all the three.

In this portion, the *Achaaryaa* has come to *sookshma sareera – aathma viveka*: (realization of the distinction between the *anaathma sookshma sareeram* and *aathma*).

Within *sookshma sareeram*, *anatha:karanam* is a very important component and, therefore, he is doing *antha:karana-aathma viveka*:

Again, within the *antha:karanam*, the most important aspect is *ahamkaara*: - the 'I' sense/ the individuality/ the ego. And, since *ahamkaaraa* is the most powerful factor and since *ahamkaaraa* is the cause of *samsaaraa*, it is very important to separate 'I' the *aathmaa* from the pseudo 'I', the *ahamkaaraa*.

It is relevant to note here, that, Ramana Maharishi mainly concentrated on the *aathma-ahamkaara viveka*: The principle is "once *ahamkaaraa* is separated, the entire *samsaaraa* has to collapse", because, *ahamkaaraa* is the foundation, on which *mamakaaraa* and all the problems are resting.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya is taking pains to establish that *ahamkaaraa* is **not** an integral part of *aathmaa*. The topic under discussion is "*ahamkaara: na aathmadharma*."

In these verses, the *Achaaryaa* is giving a suppositional argument – an *abhyupedhya vaadha*:

What is that *vaadha*:? "Suppose we take *ahamkaara*, the individuality, as an intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*, what will be the adverse consequences?" Sureswaraachaarya points out "If *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*, *ahamkaaraa* will never go away from *aathmaa*, at any time, since what is intrinsic, cannot be lost ('what cannot be lost' alone is called 'intrinsic'). Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* also will become as much *nithyam* as *aathmaa* is".

That "*aathma* is *nithyam*; *mokshaa* is *nithyam*" is a common understanding in all systems of philosophy. And, now, if you say *ahamkaaraa* is also *nithyam*, then during *mokshaa* also,

along with *aathmaa*, *ahamkaaraa* also will continue. What is the further consequence? Sureswaraachaarya replies "Since *samsaaraa* is the intrinsic nature of *ahamkaaraa*, if *ahamkaaraa* continues, *samsaaraa* also will continue".

The question may arise: "Why do you say that *samsaaraa* is an intrinsic nature of *ahamkaaraa*?" (The *Achaaryaa* does not discuss this aspect, in this portion; nevertheless, it is relevant). The answer: "*Ahamkaaraa* means recognition of *karthruthvam*, which means the individual is still prone to the inexhaustible, infinite *sanchitha karma*, and therefore, to *praarabhdha karma* and therefore, to *samsaaraa*".

Sureswaraachaarya concludes: "If *ahamkaaraa* pursues you, *samsaaraa* will also pursue you, wherever you go". An example is that of the crow (as the well-known story goes) which had an eatable in its beak and was, therefore, chased by a number of other crows and when it dropped the eatable, the other crows rushed for the prey, leaving the crow alone, in peace. Drop the *ahamkaaraa*, comparable to the prey – the *samsaaraa* crows will not chase you.

"Retaining the *ahamkaaraa*, one can never gain *mokshaa*. This would mean that all *moksha saasthraas* will become futile, if *ahamkaaraa* is 'my' intrinsic nature and therefore, 'undroppable'" says the *Achaaryaa*, in this verse.

- अहंकारः यदि आत्मधर्मः (स्यात्) - If *ahamkaaraa*: is the intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*,
- तस्य नित्यत्वं (स्यात्) - then, the *ahamkaaraa* will also be eternal (as *aathmaa*)

'Thasya' refers to *ahamkaaraa*:

The *Achaaryaa* gives an example.

- बोधवत् – similar to *chaithanyam* (which is the intrinsic nature of *aathmaa* and as eternal as *aathmaa*)

If *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*, it will also be as eternal as *chaithanyam*, which is the *svaroopam* of *aathmaa*.

Bodha: - *svaroopa chaithanyam*.

What is the consequence of *ahamkaaraa* being eternal?

- नित्यत्वे (सति) – If *ahamkaaraa* is eternal,
- मोक्षशास्त्राणां वैयर्थ्यं प्राप्नुयात् – all the scriptures that preach liberation and guide the seeker to liberation, will become futile,
- ध्रुवम् - certainly.

Vaijathyam – futility; *praapnuyaath* – will be attained.

Another poorva pakshaa (objection) is raised by the Visishta advaitins and dvaithins, in this context. This aspect is also not discussed by Sureswaraachaarya here; but, some commentators of the treatise, have referred to this poorva paksha vaadha:

This poorva pakshin – visishtaadvaitin / dvaithin - argues: "We have to retain individuality in mokshaa also. If the individuality goes away in mokshaa, such a mokshaa is not attractive. When I, as a seeker of mokshaa, do any spiritual saadhana, it is because I look for results. Therefore, for me to enjoy the moksha palan, the 'I' sense should be there; if it is not there, why should I work for such a mokshaa at all? Since ahamkaaraa is destroyed in Advaita mokshaa, resulting in denial of the moksha palan, working for Advaita mokshaa is itself not desirable. On the other hand, ahamkaaraa should continue in mokshaa and it does continue in our mokshaa – i.e. in Vaikuntaa"

The Advaitin, in reply, says: "At the time of mokshaa, the destruction of ahamkaaraa, is destruction of only the false or pseudo 'I'. The real 'I', 'aham padha lakshyaartha:', will continue. In mokshaa, 'I', the aathmaa, the muktha:, free from ahamkaara and samsaaraa problems, am eternally there, eternally enjoying freedom from *samsaaraa*. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* need not be and will not be there in *mokshaa*".]

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 34:

स्यात् परिहारः स्वाभाविकधर्मत्व अभ्युपगमे अपि आप्रादिफलवत् इति चेत् तत् न ।

The difficulty may be sought to be solved by supposing, that, though a natural character of the Self, the ego-hood, can be subject to cessation like the passing, though natural qualities of fruits like the mango. It cannot be so:

The poorva pakshin comes up with another suggestion. He says: "Let us grant that ahamkaaraa should go away in mokshaa. But, why cannot I assume that ahamkaaraa is an intrinsic nature of the aathmaa and, that, that intrinsic nature, ahamkaaraa, goes away in mokshaa ? In other words, during samsaara kaalam, ahamkaaraa will be there, while during moksha kaalam, it goes away. I will give you examples of the intrinsic natures/properties 'going away'. As in the case of those examples, in the case of aathmaa also, ahamkaaraa, will go away during mokshaa. So we will consider ahamkaaraa as an intrinsic nature of aathmaa".

- **स्वाभाविक धर्मत्व अभ्युपगमे अपि** - (The *poorva pakshin* says) Even after accepting *ahamkaaraa* as the intrinsic (not incidental *adhyaasaa*) nature of *aathmaa*,
- **परिहारः स्यात्** - there is an answer to your (the *advaitin's*) question/objection.

The advaitin had said: "If ahamkaaraa is intrinsic to aathma, it will continue in mokshaa also". The poorva pakshin responds: "Even if ahamkaaraa is intrinsic, it will go away".

"Parihaara:" can be interpreted in two ways:

- (1) As 'answer/remedy to your question' and
- (2) As 'remover of / remedy to ahamkaara:' (ahamkaarasya apavaadha:)

The poorva pakshin gives the example of fruits.

आम्रादिफलवत् - similar to fruits like the mango.

A raw mango has certain qualities. It produces a particular noise when tapped, is hard to the touch, green in colour, has a particular taste and a particular smell. These - sabda, sparsa, roopa, rasa, gandhaani – are intrinsic to the mango i.e. the substance and the properties are inseparable. But, in the same mango, when it ripens, all the properties – the colour, smell, texture, taste etc.- change. i.e. the intrinsic properties of the raw mango gave way to other intrinsic properties of the ripe mango, the substance, mango, being the same. From this, a general rule may be arrived at: svaabhaavika dharmasya api parithyaagha: sambhavathy.

The poorva pakshin argues "the samsaari aathmaa is like the raw mango, with the ahamkaara dharma present as intrinsic property, while in the moksha avasthaa, like the ripe mango, drops the ahamkaara dharma, the mamakaara dharma and the samsaaraa".

- इति चेत् - If the *poorva pakshin* gives such an argument,
- तत् न - that argument will not work.

Verse 34 – Chapter II:

आम्रादे :परिणामित्वात् गुणहानि :गुणान्तरै :।
अविकारि तु तद्ब्रह्म" न हि द्रष्टु "ःइति श्रुते :॥ ३४ ॥

The fruits like the mango are subject to change and hence the taste of one condition may be replaced by other tastes in other conditions. But *Brahman* is unchanging and the *sruthi* says 'the seer's seeing is inextinguishable' (B.U.IV.iii.23).

Sureswaraachaarya explains why: "If a substance has got an intrinsic property and if that property is dropped and is replaced by another intrinsic property, it means, that the

substance itself is undergoing a change. To repeat: if a substance has a particular intrinsic property at any given time and the intrinsic property is replaced by some other intrinsic property at some other time, it means that the substance itself is undergoing change." And Sureswaraachaarya gives the rule: "Any substance that loses its original intrinsic property and gains a new intrinsic property is a 'changing substance' – a *parinami dhravyam na thu kootastha dhravyam*".

And, extending this Rule, if *ahamkaara* is an intrinsic property of *aathma*, and, if *aathma* enjoys or possesses this intrinsic property at some time and, at another time, loses this intrinsic property and gains some other property, replacing the previous property, that would mean *aathma* itself is a *parinaami* - a changing substance acquiring and losing properties.

But, all the scriptures uniformly say that *aathma* is *nirvikaara*: / "*Avyakthoyam achinthyoyam avikaryoyam uchyathe - nithya: sarvagatha: sthaanu: achaloyam sanaathana*." – "This Self is unmanifest, inconceivable and **unchangeable** – is eternal, all-pervading, changeless, immovable and unborn" declares the *Bhagavadh Githa* (verse 25 & 24 – Ch. II). So also do all the *Upanishads* declare that *aathma* is *nirvikaara*: / And, that's why we do not look upon consciousness (*chaithanyam*) as a **changing** property of *aathma*; we say, that, consciousness is the **very** nature of *aathma*; in fact consciousness **is** *aathma*.

- **आम्रादे :परिणामित्वात्** - Because of the changing nature of fruits like the mango,
- **गुण हानि) :भवति** (- losing of intrinsic property (is possible),
- **गुणान्तरैः** - (caused) by the arrival of new properties / by new properties replacing old properties / by a fresh set of properties.

This is similar to the human body which constantly acquires new sets of properties replacing old sets of properties, because of which nature, the body is considered a *parinami dhravyam*. If *aathma* also is of a similar nature – acquiring new properties and dropping old properties – it will also be a *parinami dhravyam*.

Whereas:

- **तद्ब्रह्म** - The Brahman we are talking about
- **अविकारि (अस्ति)** – is free from all forms of change.

What is the *pramaanam* for this?

"न हि द्रष्टु "ःइति श्रुतेः - Based on the well-known *Brahadharanyaka Upanishad Vaakyam* (Ch. IV – Sec 3: *svayamjothi braahmanam- manthra* 23)

The relevant portion of the quoted *manthraa* runs: "na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilopa: vidhyathe avinaasithvaath". In this *manthraa*, "dhrashtu:" means "aathmana:" (not *ahamkaarasya*) and "dhrushte:" means "of the Consciousness". The essence of the *manthraa* is: "Consciousness of the Witness *aathmaa*, is never lost at any time. Even in *sushupthi avasthaa* and even in *videha mukthi*, *aathmaa* is endowed with Consciousness".

The nature of *aathmaa* is consciousness; it is not a losable property; it is the very nature of *aathmaa*. Since thus (1) *aathmaa* does not lose the consciousness, (2) consciousness is not the property of *aathmaa* and (3) it is not lost also, *aathmaa* does not undergo any change.

In the case of the body, changes do occur; the *chethana sareeram* will become *achethana sareeram*. Such a change cannot happen to *aathmaa* – it is *nirvikaara:*; it is ever *chethana vasthu* ; in fact, it is *chaithanya aathmaa*.

While the *Aachaaryaa* has quoted this particular *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad manthraa* to reinforce this view, the *Bhagavadh Githa Sloka* (quoted above) "*avikarya: ayam*" and the *Katopanishad manthraa* (I.ii.18) "*na jaayathe mriyathe vaa vipaschith na ayam kutha:chith na babhoova kaschith ajo nithya: saasvatha: ayam puraana: na hanyathe hanyamane sareere*" – "This omniscient one (the Self) does not originate or die. It did not originate from anything. It did not become anything. It is birthless, deathless, decayless and growthless. It is not afflicted when the body is afflicted", are equally powerful. More such *Upanishadic manthraas* can also be quoted.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 35:

अहंकारस्य च आगमापायित्वात् धर्मिणः च अनित्यत्वं प्राप्नोति ।

Since the ego appears and disappears, the Self in which in which it is supposed to inhere, would not be eternal:

The same idea is clarified further. If you look upon *aathmaa* as something with changing properties, similar to a mango, whose properties (like colour etc.) in a raw stage, change to other properties, when it ripens, what will be the consequence? It is elucidated.

अहंकारस्य आगमापायित्वात् - Since (if, as the *poorva pakshin* claims) *ahamkaaraa* is subject to arrival and departure,

In *sushupthi avasthaa*, *ahamkaaraa* goes away. This need not be proved by *sruthi*, since every one knows this, by personal experience. Nevertheless, there is *sruthi pramaanam* for this fact also. *Chandhogya Upanishad* (in verse 2 – Section 11 – Chapter VIII) states, that, in *sushupthi*, nobody has a sense of *aham*. That's why, in *sushupthi avasthaa*, *mamakaaram*

and *samsaara* also are not there. The conclusion: *Ahamkaara: jagrath avasthaayaam aagachhathi; sushupthi avasthaayaam apagachhathi* |

Aagama – arrival; *apaayee* – departing (*apaaya:* - departure)

- **तत् धर्मिणः च** - the substance on which the arriving & departing *ahamkaara* property is resting (i.e. the *aathmaa*), will also be subject to change.

Can you say that *aathmaa* has changing properties? *Visishtaadvaita* and *advaita* do look upon *aathmaa*, as acquiring new properties while attaining *mokshaa*, such as *sathya kaama:*, *sathya sankalpa:* etc. But, Sureswraachaarya points out, that once you accept *vikaara:* (change), *aathmaa* will also be subject to the six types of modifications (*asthi, jaayathe, vardhathe, viparinamathe, apaksheeyathe* and *vinasyathi*) including *vinaasam*.

- **अनित्यत्वम् (च) प्राप्नोति** - (*aathmaa*) will (also) become perishable.

On the other hand, *sruthis* say "*aathmaa nithya:*".

This is further explained in the verse 35.

Verse 35 – Chapter II :

आगमापायि निष्ठत्वात् अनित्यत्वं यात् ध्रुसिः।

उपयन् अपयन् धर्मः विकरोति हि धर्मिणम् ॥ ३५ ॥

Consciousness, if it contains what comes into being and goes out of being, would not be eternal. A quality, if it could arise and cease to be its substratum, would infect the latter with change.

- ध्रुसिः : अनित्यत्वं यात् - *Aathmaa*, the substance, will be subject to mortality/ finitude/ impermanence,

Dhrusi: - means "chaithanya svaroopaa aathmaa".

When will *aathmaa* be subject to finitude? If *aathmaa* is a substance possessing the temporary *ahamkaara*. Therefore, the Achaaryaa says:

- आगमापायि निष्ठत्वात् - because it (the *aathmaa*) is the possessor of the arriving and departing attribute of *ahamkaara* (according to the *poorva pakshin*)

Nishtaa - means "*aasraya:*"// *possessor*.

We do not look upon *chaithanyam* (consciousness) as an 'arriving and departing' property of *aathmaa*. If consciousness is an 'arriving & departing' property of *aathmaa*, then *aathmaa* will also become a changing substance.

Sureswaraachaarya gives the law: "Any substance which has properties subject to arrival and departure, is perishable".

Sureswaraachaarya says this, in the 2nd line of the verse, which is a very important statement quoted very often: "*upayan apayan dharma: vikarothi hi dharminam*".

This is a very important law, because, in all systems of philosophy, a very crucial and subtle topic is discussed: "What is the relationship between *aathmaa* and consciousness?"

All the 12 *darsanaas* – the 6 *naasthika darsanaas* and the 6 *aasthika darsanaas* – talk about the relationship between 'I' and 'consciousness'. They have different theories, but, many of them conclude "Consciousness is a property".

But *Advaita* differs; and argues: "Once consciousness is considered a property, the *upayan-apayan* problems will arise. Therefore, *aathmaa* is **not having** the property of *chaithnyam*. It **is** *chaithanyam* itself".

All the discussions are based on this very important law (in the 2nd line of verse 35).

- धर्मः - Any property / attribute,

(*Nyaaya saasthraa* talks of 24 attributes, in which, they include 'consciousness' as a property of 'matter'. *Adhvaithaa* opposes this vehemently, in all *Vedhaanthic* scriptures.)

- उपयन् अपयन् – which is subject to arrival and departure,

Upayan – arriving property; *apayan* – departing property.

- धर्मिणम् विकरोति - modifies the substance, which is the locus of the attribute.

"An arriving and departing attribute will modify the locus of the attribute" is the essence. It follows, that, if *chaithanyam* is an arriving & departing property of *aathmaa*, then, *aathmaa* will be subject to changes, including death.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36:

अस्तु अनित्यत्वम् कम् उपालभेमहि प्रमाण उपपन्नत्वात् इति चेत् न ।

Let the Self be non-eternal. Whom can we reproach about it, if it is a hard fact, established by unimpeachable evidence? This is not so:

The *poorva pakshin* says: "Let it be so; i.e. let *aathmaa* be non-eternal".

"Dropping of *ahamkaaraa* results in death" is a very common misconception.

All sources of pain are also sources of joy. So is *ahamkaaraa* and it is very difficult to drop *ahamkaaraa*, since, though it is the cause of *samsaaraa*, it also enables the individual to enjoy pleasures, including *svarga*.

The *poorva pakshin*, therefore, wants to maintain that *ahamkaaraa* as an intrinsic property of *aathmaa*, even if it means that *aathmaa* will become non-eternal.

68. Chapter II, Verse 36 and 37 (22-09-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is establishing that *ahamkaaraa*, the individuality, can be an attribute of only *anaathmaa*, the *antha:karanam* and that, *ahamkaaraa* cannot be the intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*. If *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*, then, even during *mukthi*, along with *aathmaa*, the *ahamkaaraa* also will continue; and, if *ahamkaaraa* continues, *karma* will continue; then, *samsaaraa* also will continue. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* should not be an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*.

For this, the *poorva pakshin* gave a suggestion: "Why cannot we assume that, *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*; but, at the time of *mokshaa*, the *aathmaa* loses *ahamkaaraa*, even though it is an intrinsic attribute? This is very much possible, since, for example, in a mango or any other fruit, during raw condition, it has a particular set of attributes like colour, taste etc, but, when the fruit ripens, that set of intrinsic attributes are lost; but, is replaced by a new set of intrinsic, inseparable attributes. Why cannot the *aathmaa* be like this, losing the *ahamkaaraa* attribute, during *mokshaa*?"

Sureswaraachaarya answers this doubt in the 35th verse: "If *ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic attribute and is lost at the time of *mokshaa*, as in the case of a mango ripening, then there will be a new problem. Whenever a substance loses its intrinsic attribute, then the substance itself undergoes change; because, any intrinsic attribute cannot arrive at and depart from a substance, without making a change in the substance. If it is an incidental or superimposed attribute, it will not bring about a change in the substance; but, if it is an intrinsic attribute, which comes to the substance and goes away from the substance, then the substance itself will undergo a change, just as the mango itself undergoes a change, when it ripens. Similarly, if *aathmaa* is having *ahamkaaraa* now, but, loses it, at the time of *mokshaa*, then it will mean that *aathmaa* itself is subject to change". Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa gave an important law "*upayan apayan dharma: vikarothi hi dharminam*" – "Any property/attribute, subject to arrival and departure, will modify the substance, which is the locus of the attribute".

- द्रुसि :अनित्यत्वं यात् - Aathmaa, the substance, will be subject to mortality/ finitude/ impermanence,

Dhrusi: - means "*chaithanya svaroopaa aathmaa*".

When will *aathmaa* be subject to finitude? If *aathmaa* is a substance possessing the temporary *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- **आगमापायि निष्ठत्वात्** - because it (the *aathmaa*) is the possessor of the arriving and departing attribute of *ahamkaaraa* (as claimed by the *poorva pakshin*)

Nishta - means "*aasraya:*" / possessor.

Why should *aathmaa* be subject to change and finitude because of the possession of the temporary attribute? One has to remember the law, given in the second line of the verse, "*upayan apayan dharma: vikarothi hi dharminam*" – "whenever a changing attribute is located in a substance, as even the attribute comes and goes, it will bring about a change in the substance".

A simple example is an individual getting affected by a viral fever – even after the fever is got rid of, it leaves the individual changed – he is weak and listless. When *dharma* comes and goes, *dharma* will become 'changing' and 'perishable'. This law "*upayan apayan dharma: vikarothi hi dharminam*" is a very important law, often quoted in *Vedhaanthic* discussions.

- **धर्मः** - Any attribute,
- **उपयन् अपयन्** - arriving and departing,
- **विकरोति** - will bring about a change in / will modify
- **धर्मिणम्** - the substance upon which it comes and goes.

When this much was said by Sureswaraacharya, the *poorva pakshin* raises another question, which is given in the Introduction to verse 36. He says: "Let it be so; but, I will still hold on to my view. Even assuming *aathmaa* is *anithya:*, it does not matter. Let us assume that *ahamkaaraa* belongs to *aathmaa* only and let it be subject to change also. And, therefore, let *aathmaa* become *anithyam* also. So what? We will have to accept *aathmaa* is *anithyam*, if that is the conclusion that is arrived at by logical discussion. We should not blindly hold on to ***nithya aathmaa***; we should accept *aathmaa* as *anithyaa* if it is proved by logic. Logically, it has been proved that *ahamkaaraa* is my property, and therefore, *ahamkaaraa* belongs to *aathmaa* and, therefore, *aathmaa* is *anithyam*. If it has been logically proved, you will have to accept the *anithyathvam* also of *aathmaa*. What is wrong, in accepting a fact? "

- **अस्तु अनित्यत्वं** - Let us accept the impermanence of the *aathmaa*.

If it is logically proved (that *aathmaa* is *anithyam*), because, what is a fact should be accepted. One cannot go by emotions. Facts do not depend on likes and dislikes. Intellectual honesty is an important virtue every seeker should have; a compulsory necessity. Even if *advaita* philosophy is disproved in a convincing manner, a seeker should be willing to accept it, since he is a 'seeker of truth' and not of any particular philosophy. Of course, there had been so far, no convincing proof or argument against the philosophy of *Advaitam*.

- कम् उपालभेमहि - Whom can one find fault with / angry with (just because he has proved a theory not in consonance with one's views)?
Why should one accept the *anithyathvam* of *aathmaa*? The *poorva pakshin* says:
- प्रमाण उपपन्नत्वात् - because it is logically proved.

The logical proof (as presented above by the *poorva pakshin*): *Ahamkaaraa* is an intrinsic attribute of *aathmaa*; *ahamkaaraa* is 'changing'; therefore, *aathmaa* must also be 'changing'; and, if *aathmaa* is 'changing', *aathmaa* must be *anithyam*.

The *Achaaryaa* replies:

- इति चेत् - If this is the argument (of the *poorva pakshin*),
- तत् न - that cannot be accepted (by me).

"*asthu anithyathvam kam upaalabhemahi pramaana upapannathvaath*" is the *poorva pakshin's* averment. "*Ithi cheth thath na* – if that is the argument, it is not acceptable" is the *Achaaryaa's* rejoinder.

Why cannot you accept the *anithyathvam* of *aathmaa*?

The *Achaaryaa* presents his argument in the verse.

Verse 36 – Chapter II:

सदा विलुप्त साक्षित्वं स्वतस्सिद्धं न पार्यते ।

अपह्नोतुं घटस्य इव कुशाग्रीय धियात्मनः ॥ ३६ ॥

The self-evident fact of the Self being a timeless observer cannot be denied. Even the subtlest intellect cannot prove that the Self is subject to change like objects such as a jar.

Here, Sureswaraacharya says: "That *ahamkaaraa* is subject to change, is proved by our own experience and that *saakshi* is not subject to change, is also proved by our own experience. The changeless nature of the *saakshi* is self-evident. And, therefore, *aathmaa* is eternal. You cannot, therefore, claim, that the impermanence of *aathmaa*- the *saakshi* - is proved".

- आत्मनः अविलुप्त साक्षित्वं – The status of 'being the changeless *saakshi*' of the *aathmaa*

Aviluptha – changeless; *saakshithvam* – the status of being a *saakshi*.

- स्वतस्सिद्धं - (is) self evident.
- सदा - all the time / eternal

“The eternal, changeless *saakshi* status of *aathmaa*, the real ‘I’ is self-evident”, which, nobody can challenge.

What does the *Achaaryaa* mean by this? It is a subtle topic. When the word ‘I’ is used, in that word, sometimes the changing *ahamkaaraa* is evident; and, at some other times the changeless *saakshi* is evident. It has to be carefully discerned, as to, when is ‘I’, the *ahamkaaraa* evident and when is ‘I’, the *saakshi* evident. And, how?

Suppose, by the word ‘I’, I am referring the present ‘I’, ‘I’ as the happy or sorrowful ‘I’, ‘I’ who am of a certain age, ‘I’, who has got particular *raaghaas* or *dveshaas*, ‘I’ as perceiving an object in front etc., the ‘I’ that is being referred to , is the ‘present experienced I’, because, I am referring to the ‘I’, which is associated with this particular time (*kaala:*), this particular place (*desa:*) and also this particular set of attributes (*dharmaa:*). This is the *ahamkaaraa* ‘I’, called the ‘experienced I’.

Suppose I am referring to another ‘I’, which was in the past – ‘I’ went to a particular function and had a very thrilling experience- and I am referring to that ‘I’, which was at that time, at that place and also having those attributes (thrill etc.), then I am referring to the *ahamkaaraa* ‘I’ of the past time, past place and past attributes. This ‘remembered I’ is also *ahamkaaraa* ‘I’.

The present experienced ‘I’ is *ahamkaaraa* ‘I’, and the past remembered ‘I’ is also *ahamkaaraa* ‘I’; but, these two *ahamkaaraas* are different – due to *kaala beda:*, *desa beda:* and also because of difference in attributes.

Now, suppose I am saying “that *ahamkaaraa* of the past time, that ‘I’ alone am the present ‘I’” – i.e. when I am equating the past *ahamkaaraa* and the present *ahamkaaraa* – *sa: aham asmi* – that ‘I’ is called ‘recognized I’; i.e. ‘recognized I’ is that ‘I’, which is equating the past ‘I’ and the present ‘I’.

In every recognition, we are always equating the past and the present. When I say, ‘now, I recognize you’, what I mean is that ‘the past person, that I saw a few years before, and the present person whom I am experiencing now, *that* person is *this* person’. Only when you are equating the past and the present, you can use the word ‘recognition’. Suppose I am seeing a person for the first time, the word ‘recognition’ cannot be used; only the word ‘cognition’ can be used. The verb ‘recognize’ is extremely important in *Vedhaanthee*, because only through this verb, *saakshi*, is to be proved.

“When I ‘remember’ a person not in front of me, there is only a past person; in ‘cognition’, there is only the present person in front of me ; only in ‘recognition’, there is an equation of the ‘past’ person and the ‘present’ person. Similarly, when I say the last Saturdays’ *Naishkarmya Siddhi* teacher was me and the present *Naishkarmya Siddhi* teacher is also me, i.e. when I recognize as ‘*sa: aham asmi*’, in that self-recognition, I am equating the remembered *ahamkaaraa* and the experienced *ahamkaaraa* i.e. in this ‘self-recognition’, I am equating the remembered past *ahamkaaraa* (last week’s *Naishkarmya Siddhi* teacher) and the experienced present *ahamkaaraa* (this week’s *Naishkarmya Siddhi* teacher”.

But, here, we have a problem. Past *ahamkaaraa* and present *ahamkaaraa* can never be equated, because, the *kaala*, *desa* and attributes are different. To solve this problem, *Vedhaantha* points out: “Whenever you are recognizing a present person in front of you, as an old friend of yours, you are equating the old and the present person, by recognizing ‘my classmate of the old days, is the present person in front of me’ ; in this equation, even though the attributes are different – the friend’s physical body, including the complexion of his skin, has undergone changes due to old age – you claim ‘that person is this person’; this claim is the result of your removing the differentiating attributes – not physically, but, intellectually. Both the past and present attributes are removed and you are recognizing the common factor between the old friend and the present person.”

Whenever there is ‘recognition’, the superficial differences are removed and the essential common factor is taken. This is what is happening in ‘*soyam devadattha:*’ (a popular phrase in *Vedhaantha*).

Vedhaantha contends: “Whenever you are equating your past *ahamkaaraa* and your present *ahamkaaraa* as ‘*sa: aham asmi*’, you are removing the time, the space and all the attributes; you are considering **only** the common factor between the past *ahamkaaraa* and the present *ahamkaaraa*. **This changeless common factor in the ‘changing’ *ahamkaaraas*, is the *saakshi***, which has been continuing without any change in the changing *ahamkaaraa*. Body, mind, emotions etc. undergo change; only the *saakshi* remains unchanged. This ‘recognized I’ is the *saakshi*; the ‘experienced I’ is *ahamkaaraa*; the ‘remembered I’ is also *ahamkaaraa*. ”

Part of verse 6 of the *Dakshinamoorthy Sthothra* of *Sri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadha* refers to this as: “*Praak asvaapsam ithi prabhodasamaye ya: prathyabhijnayaayathe*” – “who, on waking up, remembers to have slept”.

In Sanskrit, 'recognized I' is called '*Prathyabhijnyaatha aham*'. '*Anubhootha aham*' (experienced I) is *ahamkaaraa*; '*smrutha aham*' (remembered I) is *ahamkaaraa*; '*Prathyabhijnyaatha aham*' (recognized I) is *saakshi*.

"When I say 'I am experiencing this class', I am referring to *ahamkaaraa*; but, when I say 'to-day's class is better than last week's class', I am referring to the common 'I', which is the *saakshi aham*. Therefore, if you ask 'Is *saakshi* experienced or not?', the answer is 'yes, it is experienced'; 'how is it experienced?' 'changelessly experienced'. 'how is it recognized?', the answer is '*Soham. Dehino asmin yathaa dehe kaumaaram, youvanam, jaraa thathaa dehaanthara praapthi:*'. In the next *janma*, the *ahamkaaraa* will be different, body will be different, time and place will be different; but, the *saakshi* will continue. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says: "The permanent *saakshi* is ever evident as 'recognized I'"

Svatha: siddham - The eternal 'I' is ever available as recognized 'self'.

What is its nature?

Aviluptha saakshi - It is the changeless 'witness' which was behind the remembered 'I' also and which is behind the experienced 'I' also,

- आत्मनः (साक्षित्वं) अपह्नोतुम् न पार्यते - (The witnesshood of *aathmaa*) can never be negated,

Na paaryathe – cannot be/ *na sakyathe*; *apahnothum* – to negate.

- घटस्य इव - in the manner of negating any object like a jar,

Any object in the world can be negated; even the *ahamkaaraa* can be temporarily negated during *sushupthi*, *moorchaa* etc.; but, the *saakshi* can **never** be negated.

- कुशाग्रीयधिया - (even) by a person of a very sharp intellect.

Kusaa is a type of grass, with very sharp edges, and, often used in *saasthraas* to emphasize intellect, similar to the use 'razor-sharp intellect' in English.

"The changeless 'witnesshood' of the real 'I' can never be negated by any one" is the message of the verse. From this, we get a corollary. If the changelessness of the real 'I' is established, then its immortality is also established; because, death is also a form of change. If change is negated, death is also negated; if *aathmaa* is changeless, it is deathless also – therefore 'eternal'. Therefore, *aathmaa* cannot have the 'changing' *ahamkaaraa* as its attribute.

Aathmaa is *saakshi*; *aathmaa* is changless; therefore, *nithya*: /

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 37:

एतस्मात् च हेतोः अहंकारस्य अनात्मधर्मत्वम् अवसीयताम् ।

On this further ground also, let it be understood that the ego is the character of something other than the Self:

It was seen that, according to *Vedhaantha*, when the word 'I' is used, it may mean the 'recognized 'I' *saakshē* or the 'experienced 'I' *ahamkaara*'. The recognized 'I' is original Consciousness; the experienced 'I' is reflected Consciousness; the two are 'mingled' together. The original Consciousness is all-pervading, while the reflected Consciousness is confined to the body only – though, both types of Consciousness pervade the body. Unfortunately, the *guru* cannot physically separate and 'show' the original Consciousness – *saakshi* and the reflected Consciousness - *ahamkaara*. Because, thus, they cannot be physically separated, the seeker has to do the 'separation' only intellectually. The *guru* can only *help* the student in this intellectual effort.

How to do the 'separation'? Recognized 'I' is the Original Consciousness; experienced 'I' is the Reflected Consciousness. When you say 'this is Devadatta', it is 'experienced' Devadatta ; when you say 'that Devadatta (whom you have met elsewhere) is *this* Devadatta', the 'remembered' Devadatta had certain attributes – for instance, he was 'younger' , the 'experienced' Devadatta also has certain attributes - again, for instance, he is 'older'; but, the 'recognized' Devadatta has no attributes- neither 'young' nor 'old'. If the 'recognized' Devadatta had any attribute, no equation can be made.

Similarly, the recognized 'I' is '*nirguna aham*'; with this recognized 'I' only (as the meaning of 'I'), one should claim '*aham brahma asmi*'. *Bhagha thyaagha lakshananaya* (by the well-known means of excluding one part of the direct meaning of a sentence, but, retaining another part) remove all attributes and claim '*aham*, the attributeless Consciousness is *Brahma*'. This *ahamkaara-aham-viveka* has to be very carefully done. And, therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "I will dwell on this topic a little bit more, because that is the last step before '*aham brahma asmi*". Therefore, he says:

- एतस्मात् हेतोः च – Because of the following reason also (the reason is given in verse 37)
- अहंकारस्य अनात्मधर्मत्वम् – the *ahamkaara* belongs to the *anaathmaa* only.

The experienced 'I' and the remembered 'I' are both *ahamkaaras*; both these *ahamkaaras* belong to *anaathmaa* only.

The experienced 'I' is associated with present *samsaaraa* (problems of the present), while the remembered 'I' is associated with past *samsaaraa* (problems of the past) and both the *ahamkaaraas* having the present or past *samsaaraa* belong to *anaathmaa* – the *kshethram* only. They do not belong to the recognized 'I' – the *saakshi* - but to the *anaathma kshethram* or mind only.

- (इति) अवसीयताम् - Let this be very clear.

The moment you understand this, you can claim: "I' the *saakshi*, do not have past *samsaaraa*, which *samsaaraa* belonged to the past *ahamkaaraa* and is now gone; nor do I have the present *samsaaraa*, which *samsaaraa* belongs to the present *ahamkaaraa* and will also go away. *Samsaaraa* belongs to the arriving-departing *ahamkaaraa*; but, 'I' am the recognized 'I', which was behind the past *ahamkaaraa* and which is behind the present *ahamkaaraa* - but, similar to the screen in a movie which continues unaffected during all types of actions in the movie, 'I' the *saakshi* continue during all the changing circumstances as an *asamsaaree*".

A seeker is likely to react: "If I know this, will I get *mukthi*?" But, he should know, that, the very understanding "'I' am *nithya muktha*:" is *moksha*: | Since only the *ahamkaaraa* is *bandha*., while, 'I' the *saakshi* is *nithya muktha*., there is no need even to be rid of your surroundings and circumstances. The *ahamkaaraa* will ever be a *samsaari*, while the *saakshi* will never be a *samsaari*. *Ahamkaaraa* will never get liberated; *sakshi* need not get liberated. Other than thoroughly understanding "I am the ever-liberated *saakshi*", there is no other 'liberation'. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* stresses "*avaseeyathaam*" – "let this be clearly grasped by you".

Chapter II: Verse 37 –

प्रमाणैः च अवगम्यत्वात् घटादिवत् अहं द्रुसेः।

यतो राद्विः प्रमाणानां स कथं तैः प्रसिध्यति ॥ ३७ ॥

The ego is to be cognized like a jar through means of knowledge like perception, and, hence, in relation to the Self, stands on the same footing. But, that which is presupposed by means of such knowledge, as their very foundation is not to be established through them. (The Self is not dependent on proofs, for all proofs depend on it.)

Here, the *Achaaryaa* says "because *ahamkaaraa* is subject to arrival and departure and it is an attribute belonging to the mind (the *anaathmaa* only), the *ahamkaaraa* also should be classified under 'objects'. You should learn to classify *ahamkaaraa* also, as one of the objects in Creation".

By the term '*Abhimaana thyaaga:*', what is implied is "learn to look at the *ahamkaaraa* also, as an object belonging to the world. Never include *ahamkaaraa* in the real 'I'".

And, how do you 'classify' *ahamkaaraa* as just an object? The *Achaaryaa* says: "Just as a pot is an object perceived through a *pramaanaa* (i.e. the pot is a *pramaana vishaya:*), in the same manner, *ahamkaaraa* is also an object proved through a *pramaanaa*. *Ghata:* is a *prameyam* – an object proved by a *pramaanam*. *Ahamkaaraa* is also a *prameya* – an object proved by a *pramaanam*. There is no difference".

A 'blunder' often committed is, to include very intimate 'objects' in the 'subject'. For instance, if a person using spectacles for 'constant wear' is asked to list out the objects in front of him, he is most likely to overlook his spectacles, since it is his very intimate object. This same 'blunder' is committed with regard to *ahamkaaraa* also; I include *ahamkaaraa* also in 'me'. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya points out "*ahamkaaraa api prameya: pramaana vishayathvaath ghataavath*" – "*ahamkaaraa* also is an object, since it is also only perceived through a *pramaanam*, similar to a jar". Therefore, it will come under *anaathmaa* only.

- अहं (अपि) – *ahamkaaraa:* (also)
- घटादिवत् – similar to a pot

69. Chapter II, Verse 37 to 40 (29-09-2007)

As a part of *thvampadhaartha vichaara*, Sureswaraachaarya is now engaged in *aathma-anaathma-viveka*: *Anaathma* consists of *sareerathrayam* and therefore, he has to do *sareeratthraya-aathma viveka*: In the *sareera thrayam*, *sookshma sareeram* is one *anaathmaa* and in *sookshma sareeram*, *ahamkaaraa* is one of the important attributes. And, therefore, as a part of *sookshma sareera viveka*:, Sureswaraachaarya is now doing *ahamkaara-aathma-viveka*: /

Sureswaraachaarya is paying special attention to this topic, since differentiating *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* is extremely difficult, because, wherever *aathmaa* is, there *ahamkaaraa* also is. *Aathmaa* is *chidhroopam* and *ahamkaaraa* is *chidaabhaasa roopam*. The *chith* and *chidaabhaasa* separation has to be done carefully.

But, the two cannot be separated physically, whatever *avasthaa* we are in – even in *thureeyaa* and *samaadhi*. In all *avasthaas*, there will be both *chith* and *chidaabhaasaa*. *Chidaabhaasaa* can never go away, as long as one is alive. During the entire life, whatever *avasthaa* we go through, *chidaabhaasaa* will be there. Physical separation of *chith* and *chidaabhaasaa* is, therefore, never possible. We have to do it only intellectually.

Sureswaraachaarya is giving various arguments in support of this 'separation'. Here, in this portion, he is establishing that *ahamkaaraa* is the attribute of only *sookshma sareeram* and not an attribute of *aathmaa*.

He had already given two arguments.

The first argument was '*dhrusyathvaath*'. To elaborate: *ahamkaaraa* is an object of experience. Applying the law that any experienced attribute should belong to an experienced object only and never to the 'experiencer' subject, *ahamkaaraa* can only be a part of *kshethram*, the *anaathmaa* and cannot belong to *kshethragnya*: /

The second argument given was '*anirmoksha prasanga*': If *ahamkaaraa* were an attribute of *aathmaa*, then *mokshaaa* itself will not be possible, because as long as *aathmaa* is there, so long *ahamkaaraa* also will continue; if *ahamkaaraa* continues, *karthruthvam* will continue; as long as *karthruthvam* continues, *thrividha karmaani* will continue; as long as *karma* continues, *samsaaraa* will continue. Therefore, if *ahamkaaraa* belongs to *aathmaa*, *mokshaa* will be impossible.

If, (to counter this line of argument), it is claimed, that *ahamkaaraa* does belong to *aathmaa*, but will go away during *mokshaa*, then also there is a problem. If and when, thus

ahamkaaraa goes away, it will bring about a change in the *aathmaa* itself, because of the important law '*upayan apayan dharma: vikarothi hi dharminam*'- 'when attribute comes and goes, the substance will have to necessarily undergo change'. If *aathmaa* is thus subject to change (because of initial association with *ahamkaaraa* and subsequent dissociation) it will be subject to death also and if it is subject to death, it will never have an eternal *mokshaa*. How can a mortal *aathmaa* have eternal *mokshaa*? This '*anirmoksha prasanga dosha:*' was the second argument.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving the third argument. What is the third argument?

"*Ahamkaaraa* is proved by *pramaanaas*; whereas, *aathmaa* is not proved by any *pramaanaa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is *pramaana siddha:*, while *aathmaa* is *svathas siddha:* And, therefore, they are totally different and therefore *ahamkaaraa* cannot belong to *aathmaa*" is the third argument, given in verse 37.

- **अहं द्रुशेः अवगम्यत्वात्** - Since, for *aathmaa*, the subject, *ahamkaaraa* is knowable / provable,

Aham – *ahamkaaraa:*; *dhrusi:* - *chaithanya svarooopa aathmaa* ; *dhruse:* - *chaithanyasaya* / *aathmana:* / of the *chaithanyam*.

Through what?

- **प्रमाणैः** - through different *pramaanaas*,

Ahamkaaraa: pramaana siddha: - *ahamkaaraa* is proved / established through different *pramaanaas*.

What are the *pramaanaas* which prove *ahamkaaraa*?

There are three *pramaanaas*, as explained below:

- (1) "*Prathyaksham*": *Ahamkaaraa* is revealed through 'I' thought; *ahamkaaraa:* is *aham prathyaya siddha:* During 'waker' stage and during 'dream' stage, 'I' thought is there; therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is known both during waking and dream stages. During deep sleep (*sushupthi*), 'I' thought is absent; therefore, *ahamkaaraa* also disappears. Therefore, 'I' thought is the first *pramaanam*. "*Saakshi prathyaksha pramaana siddha:*", is another manner in which, this is referred to, apart from "*aham prathyaya siddha:*"
- (2) "*Anumaanam*": *Ahamkaaraa* happens to be the *pramaathaa*, the knower principle, who is the agent operating all *pramaanams* – *prathyaksha*, *anumaana*, *saasthram*, *arthaapatthi* etc. In other words, all *pramaanams* are instruments operated by the

karthaa – the subject, the *pramaathaa ahamkaara:*. The *pramaathaa* can be inferred from the operations of the *pramaanam*; from the *pramaana vyaapaara* (operations), the 'operator' (*pramaathaa*) can be inferred. (This is similar to the fact that by seeing a car running, the driver of the car can be inferred.) *Pramaana vyaapaaraa* is the clue for knowing the *pramaatha*. This means, that, 'Anumaanaa' or 'inference' is the second *pramaanam* for the proof of *ahamkaaraa*.

In this context, the following should be carefully noted: From the *pramaana* instrument, one can infer the *pramaatha*. It should not be asked: "you can only infer the *pramaathaa*; but, we are talking about *ahamkaaraa* here". *Ahamkaaraa* is *pramaatha*; *pramaatha* is *ahamkaaraa*. Both are identical. *Pramaatha* inference is *ahamkaaraa* inference. That's why during *jagrath* and *svapna*, *pramaana vyaapaaraa* is there; therefore *pramaatha* is there. In *sushupthi*, *pramaana vyaapaara* is not there; *pramaatha* is also not there. *Yathra yathra pramaana vyaapaara:*, *thathra thathra pramaatha*. So, *pramaatha asthi pramaana vyaapaarathvaath*.

- (3) The third *pramaanam* for *ahamkaaraa* is *sruthi pramaanam*. The *sruthi* is *Brahadhaaranyaka Vaakyam* I.iv.1 – *Purusha vidha Brahmana:* - "aathma eva idam agra aaseeth purusha vidha: sa: anuveekshya na anyath aathmana: pasyath soham asmi ithi agre vyaaharath thatha: aham naama abhavath" etc. There, the *Upanishad* says *Brahmaji*, the Creator used the word 'aham', in the beginning and therefore, all the later beings, especially the humans following in the *paramparaa*, use the word 'aham' – 'aham naama abhavath'. Thus, from *sruthi pramaanam* also, we know that, there is *ahamkaaraa*, known by the word *aham*.

By these three *pramaanams* - *prathyaksha*, *anumaana* and *saasthra* - *ahamkaaraa* is known and therefore, *ahamkaara* is called *pramaana siddha:* - i.e. 'proved through a *pramaanam*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "In contrast, *aathmaa* is totally different. *Aathmaa* is not proved by any *pramaanaa*; on the other hand, *aathmaa* is self-evident, even before we plan to operate the *pramaanaa*."

The 2nd line of verse 37 –

- **प्रमाणानां राद्धिः यतः (भवति)** - Because of (that *aathmaa*, by) which the very *pramaanaas* themselves are proved,
Raadhvi: - proof / *siddhi:*; *yatha:* - literal meaning is 'because of which' and implied meaning, in this context, is 'aathmaa'.
- **कथं स तैः प्रसिध्यति** - how can that (*aathmaa*) be proved by those *pramaanaas*?

Ahamkaaraa is proved by *pramaanaas*; *aathmaa* is not proved by any *pramaanaa*. On the other hand, *pramaanaas* themselves are proved only by *aathmaa*.

Then the question arises: "If *aathmaa* is not proved by any *pramaanaa*, then what is the proof for *aathmaa*?" The answer is: "*Aathmaa* is self-proved; it is *svayam-siddha*:".

"Because of which *aathmaa*, all the *pramaanaas* are proved, how can that *aathmaa* be proved by *pramaanaas*? How can the 'prover' of the *pramaanaas*, be proved by the *pramaanaas*?" is the essence of the second line.

The conclusion drawn by the *Achaaryaa*: "*Ahamkaaraa* and *aathmaa* are totally different; therefore, *ahamkaaraa* cannot be an attribute of *aathmaa*".

(Repeated for emphasis: What is the difference, between *ahamkaaraa* and *aathmaa*? Ans: *Ahamkaaraa* is *pramaana siddha*:. *Aathmaa* is *svathas siddha*.)

In the second line, the words '*yatha*:' and '*sa*:' denote *aathmaa*, while the word '*thai*:' denotes *pramaanaas*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 38:

धर्म धर्मिणो :च इतर इतर विरुद्धात्मकत्वात् असङ्गतिः।

Further, the Self and ego are mutually opposed in nature and therefore that cannot be really related as substance and attribute:

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering the 4th argument. The 3rd argument was: "*pramaanaas siddha ahamkaara: svathas siddha aathmana: dharmas: na bhavathi*."- "the *pramaanaa*-proved *ahamkaaraa* cannot be an attribute of the self-proved *aathmaa*".

The 4th argument is almost similar to the 3rd argument: "*ahamkaara: and aathmaa* have got totally different natures; because of that reason, one cannot become the attribute of the other".

- इतर इतर विरुद्धात्मकत्वात् - Because of the totally opposite natures,
- धर्म धर्मिणो: - of the *ahamkaaraa* and the *aathmaa*,

'*Dharma*' (attribute) here refers to the *ahamkaaraa*, based on the stand of the *poorva pakshin*, though not accepted by the *Achaaryaa*. So also, the '*dharm*' (substance with the attribute) refers to *aathmaa*, again based on the stand of the *poorva pakshin* only; the *Achaaryaa* does not consider the *aathmaa* as the 'substance' possessing the 'attribute' of *ahamkaaraa*. The mere usage of the word *dharmas*, to denote *ahamkaaraa* and the word

dharmi, to denote *aathmaa*, does not mean that the *Achaaryaa* has accepted this view of the *poorva pakshin*. The usage '*dharmadharma*.' should be understood as addressed to the *poorva pakshin* as 'what you call *dharmadharma* and what you call *dharmi*.'

- असङ्गतिः - they can never be intimately associated as 'substance' and 'attribute'.

What is the 'opposite nature' referred to above? *Ahamkaaraa*, being an object of experience, is *jadam/ achethanam* in nature; and *aathmaa*, being the subject of experience, is *chethanam* by nature. Therefore, *chethana-achethana-roopa-virodha: asthi*. That is what Sankaraachaarya said in the *Adhyaasa-Bhaashyam* – Introduction itself. This is how the *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam* begins: "Yushamadhasmath prathyayagocharayo: vishaya vishayino: thama: prakaasavath viruddhasvabhaavayo." They (*aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*) are of opposite nature, like light and darkness – darkness cannot be the attribute of light; light cannot be the attribute of darkness, because they are totally different. Therefore, '*asamgathi*'.

This idea is further clarified in the *sloka*.

Chapter II: Verse 38 –

धर्मिणश्च विरुद्धत्वात् न द्रुस्यगुणसङ्गतिः ।

मारुतान्दोलितज्वालं शैत्यं न अग्निं सिसृप्सति ॥ ३८ ॥

Even as cold cannot belong to fire blazing by the aid of the wind, the attribute that belongs to the realm of the seen, cannot belong to the seer, for they are mutually opposed in nature.

What has been said in the Introduction, is more clearly presented in the *sloka*.

- धर्मिणःविरुद्धत्वात् - - Since *aathmaa* is totally opposed to

Dharmi – *Aathma*, the substance, which is supposed to possess the *ahamkaaraa* as attribute, according to the *poorva pakshin*.

- द्रुस्यगुणः - the nature of the *ahamkaaraa*,

Dhrusyam – object of experience and in this context refers to *ahamkaaraa*; *dhrusya guna*: - *ahamkaaraa guna*: (meaning *achethanathvam*).

- सङ्गतिः न (भवति) - association (between the two) is not possible.

Samgathi: - association. "Because they are of opposite natures, *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* cannot have association. In short, *chethana aathmaa* cannot have *achethana ahamkaaraa* as its attribute".

Sureswaraachaarya clarifies this through an example.

- शैत्यं अग्निं न सिस्नुप्सति - Coolness cannot even desire to join *agni* as an attribute,

Saithyam – Coolness; *na sisrupsathi* – does not desire to approach.

The root *srup* means 'to approach' or 'to go near'. Its 'desiderative form' (the dictionary meaning of 'desiderative form' is 'formed from another verb to express desire of doing the act denoted') is '*sisrupsathy*' meaning 'desires to approach'. *Na sisrupsathy* would, therefore, mean 'does not desire to approach'.

The *Achaaryaa* says *saithyam* cannot even desire to join *agni*, let alone joining. If coolness has to be an attribute of *agni*, it should be intimately present in *agni*. How would it be ever possible for coolness to be intimately associated with fire?

To give emphasis to the example, the *Achaaryaa* gives an adjective to *agni*.

- मारुत आन्दोलित ज्वालं - (adjective to *agni*) endowed with fierce flames, fanned by the wind.

Jwaalam - fierce flames; *aandholitha* – fanned / kindled / moved. *Aandholanam* – mass movement; *aandholikaa* – swing; the Carnatic *raaghaa*, *aandholikaa*, is supposed to be a swinging *raaghaa*, to put a child to sleep. '*Aandhole*' is the root for these words.

From this example, it should be understood that, '*ahamkaaraa* (similar to *saithyam* in the example) cannot even come near *aathmaa* (exemplified by the huge conflagration of fire) to become its attribute'.

Thus, '*viruddhasvabhaavathvaath'* is the fourth argument.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 39:

तस्मात् विस्रब्धम् उपगम्यताम् ।

Therefore, let this be confidently acknowledged:

- तस्मात् - Therefore (because of the four powerful arguments given by me),
- उपगम्यताम् - let it be accepted (by all the poorva pakshins)

- **विस्रब्धम्** - confidently / without any doubt.

Visrabdham is an indeclinable word.

What is to be understood?

"*Aathmaa* is ever the 'observer'; it can never become the 'observed'; *ahamkaaraa* is ever the 'observed' and can never become the 'observer'. Therefore, the two are never to be mixed up. They are, no doubt, in proximity. But, the 'proximity' should not lead to 'confusions'".

In fact, ultimately, the very *mokshaa* is determined by how one looks at oneself. The reaction or approach to any crisis that one faces in life, with regard to one's own health or with one's family or with one's occupation, is an indicator of whether one takes oneself as *aathmaa* or *ahamkaaraa*. If during such a crisis, one can confidently claim "I am the free *aathmaa*; I am not the *praarabhdaa*-tormented *ahamkaaraa*", then such a claimant has certainly advanced in his *Vedhaanthic* pursuit. *Aathma-ahamkaaraa vivekam* is very crucial and that's why Sureswaraacharya says "Let it be boldly accepted".

The *Achaaryaa's* exhortation (*upagamyathaam*) is further stressed in the verse.

Chapter II: Verse 39 –

द्रष्टृत्वं द्रुस्यता चैव नैकस्मिन् एकदा क्वचित् ।

द्रुश्य द्रुश्यो :न च द्रष्टा द्रष्टुर्दर्शी द्रुसिर्न च ॥ ३९ ॥

The self-same principle cannot be at once the seer and the seen. The seer is not seen by what is itself seen by him. The seen cannot see its own seer.

The following verses are only *upasamhaara slokaa*: - concluding verses. The *Achaaryaa* is not giving new ideas; but, reinforcing the idea that, "*ahamkaaraa* is ever the *dhrusyam*; *aathmaa* is ever the *dhrashtaa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is ever the object and *aathmaa* is ever the subject. You can never objectify the *aathmaa*."

- **एकस्मिन् (वस्तुनि)** - In one and the same entity called *aathmaa*,
- **एकदा** - at one and the same time/ locus,

Two opposite attributes cannot exist in one and the same entity, at one and the same time or locus. What are the opposite attributes here?

- **द्रष्टृत्वं** - the observer status / the nature of being the subject or observer
- **द्रुश्यता च** - and the 'observed' status / the nature of being the object,

The 'subject' status and the 'object' status can never exist in one and the same entity, at one and the same time.

- क्वचित् - under any circumstance
- न - is not possible.

Therefore, the conclusion is: "*Aathmaa* is ever the 'seer'; never the 'seen'".

All these are important, because many people practice meditation, waiting for the '*aathmaa* experience' to come. They either believe "*aathmaa* has not come; therefore experience has not come" or believe "*aathmaa* has come; but, the experience of *aathmaa* has not come" i.e. they are either waiting for *aathmaa* or for *aathmaa* experience. Both are wrong expectations. *Aathmaa* need not come, since it is ever evident as the recognized 'I'.

The experienced 'I' is present *ahamkaaraa*; the remembered 'I' is past *ahamkaaraa*; the recognized 'I' is neither the present *ahamkaaraa* nor the past *ahamkaaraa*. Because, In the recognized 'I', I am equating that past *ahamkaaraa* with this present *ahamkaaraa*; i.e. I say that 'past *ahamkaaraa* is the present *ahamkaaraa*'; whenever, thus, the present *ahamkaaraa* and the past *ahamkaaraa* are equated, what is done, is, that, the present attributes and the past attributes are removed. If the attributes are retained, the 'equation' cannot be done. At the time of 'equating', both the past and present attributes are removed and this "*ahamkaaraa* **minus** attributes" is the very *saakshi*.

Therefore, when is *saakshi* available? Not in *samaadhi* – but, all the time, as self-recognition *roopena*; not experience *roopena* nor remembrance *roopena*; but *prathyabhijnyaa roopena*.

Prathyabhijnyaa roopena nithya upalabdhi roopa: aathmaa.

"(This being the fact) why are you waiting for *aathmaa anubhava*?" asks Sureswaraachaaryaa.

Therefore, *aathmaa* can never be seen. This fact, the *Achaaryaa* presents in two ways:

- (1) "If *aathmaa* has to be seen, it has to be seen either by *anaathmaa* or by *aathmaa* (since, there are only these two divisions). Both are not possible".

द्रष्टा द्रुश्य द्रुश्यः न (भवति) - The subject can never become the object of the object (i.e. *aathmaa*, the subject can never become the object of *anaathmaa*, which is an object.)

If subject becomes the object of the object, the object will not be object any more; it will become subject and since, that is not possible, subject can never be objectified by any object including *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, we should not expect *ahamkaaraa* to experience *aathmaa*, in meditation, since, it amounts to attempting to 'objectify' the *aathmaa*, which is impossible, because '*aathmaa dhrusya dhrusya: na bhavathi*'.

(2) The second option or question: Can the *aathmaa* be seen by the *aathmaa* itself? This is also not possible. If the *aathmaa* is seen by the *aathmaa*, then the one and the same *aathmaa* will become both the 'seer' and the 'seen', which is not possible. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- द्रष्टुःद्रुशिः - The Consciousness of the *aathmaa*

Dhrusi: - *chaithanyam* or Consciousness; *Dhrashtu*: - of the *aathmaa*

- (द्रष्टुः) दर्शी न भवति - cannot become the 'seer' of the *aathmaa*.

It means that *aathmaa* can never see the *aathmaa* itself; therefore, *aathmaa* is neither seen by *anaathmaa* nor seen by *aathmaa* itself; and, therefore, *aathmaa* will never come under 'seen' category; it is ever the 'seer'.

'Dhrashtu: dhrusi: (dhrashtu:) dharsee na (bhavathi)'; in other words, '*aathmana: chaithanyam aathmana: dhrashtaa na bhavathi*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 40:

सर्व संव्यवहारलोपः च प्राप्नोति । यस्मात् ।

If the position is not accepted, life becomes impossible. Why?

Now, Sureswaraachaarya goes into more intricate details.

In the previous *sloka*, he asserted that two opposite attributes cannot exist in one and the same locus or substance, simultaneously i.e. at the same time; just as heat and coldness cannot exist in one locus simultaneously; but, they can exist in the same locus, at different times. For instance, water can be the locus of heat at a given time and at a later time, the same water, can be the locus of coldness. Based on this, the *poorva pakshi* can suggest: "Why don't we say that, *Aathmaa* becomes *dhrashtaa* for some time; and, thereafter becomes *dhrusyam*. When *aathmaa* is *dhrashtaa*, *ahamkaaraa* is *dhrusyam* and when *ahamkaaraa* is *dhrashtaa*, *aathmaa* is *dhrusyam*. Therefore, *aathmaa* becomes *dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam* alternatively".

Once the *poorva pakshin* proves that *aathmaa* can be both (*dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam*), he can say that *ahamkaaraa* can be an attribute of *aathmaa*, his aim being to somehow stress his view that *ahamkaaraa* is an attribute of *aathmaa*.

“But”, Sureswaraacharya says “that is also not possible”.

- **सर्व संव्यवहारलोप :च प्राप्नोति** - If *aathmaa* becomes alternatively or sequentially *dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam*, all the transactions will break down.

How? The *Achaaryaa* explains in the verse that follows.

Samvyavahaaraa - Transactions; *sarva* - all.

Sarva samvyavahaaraa means “*jnaana vyavahaaraa*” done with the help of *jnaanendriyaas* and “*karma vyavahaaraa*” done with the help of *karmendriyaas*.

Lopa: - means breakdown / destruction / disruption.

Yasmaath - for the following reason.

Chapter II: Verse 40 –

द्रष्टापि यदि द्रश्याया :आत्मेयात्कर्मतां धियः।

यौगपध्यम् अद्रश्यत्वं वैयर्थ्यं च आप्नुयात् श्रुतिः॥ ४० ॥

If the seer were to be objectified by the intellect, which itself is seen in relation to the seer, then both the seeing self and the seen intellect, should simultaneously be both seeing and seen. As both are seers, there should be no object of seeing. And *sruthi* would be useless in that case.

In the first line, Sureswaraacharya presents the *poorva pakshin's* supposition.

- **यदि** - Suppose
- **द्रष्टा आत्मा** - the ‘seer’ *aathmaa*
- **कर्मतां इयात्** - becomes the ‘seen’ *aathmaa*,

karmathaa – ‘seen’ / object; *ijaath* – becomes / attains.

In other words, ‘if the subject *aathmaa*, gets ‘objecthood’ status also’.

Object of what?

धियः - of the mind or *ahamkaaraa*,

If, as the *poorva pakshin* suggests, the 'seer' *aathmaa* becomes the object of perception of the *ahamkaaraa*, what will happen? Three *doshaas* will result: (1) *yougapadhya dosha*: (2) *adhruyathva dosha*: and (3) *sruthi vaiyarthya dosha*..

70. Chapter II, Verse 40 to 42 (06-10-2007)

In these verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is discriminating between *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*. What he wants to establish is: "*ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*; it is a property of *antha:karanam* i.e. the mind ; *ahamkaaraa* and the mind have no connection with *aathmaa* at all."

Therefore, the *samsaaraa* that is experienced by the *ahamkaaraa* will have no connection with *aathmaa* and therefore, *aathmaa* is *nithya asamsaari*.

On the other hand, the *poorva pakshin*, here, wants to maintain that *ahamkaaraa* is an attribute of *aathmaa*. Sureswaraachaarya argues: "If *ahamkaaraa* is an attribute of *aathmaa*, *ahamkaaraa* can never become an object of experience; because, if *ahamkaaraa* has to be a property of *aathmaa*, then, to experience *ahamkaaraa*, I have to objectify the *aathmaa* also. But, *aathmaa* being the 'observer' – the 'subject' – *aathmaa* can never be the 'object' of experience. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* cannot be an attribute of *athmaa*; it has to be an attribute of some other object only. This is based on the law, that, all experienced attributes belong to experienced objects and never to the experiencer 'subject'. *Aathmaa* is ever the 'experiencer' and never the 'experienced', whereas *ahamkaaraa* is ever the 'experienced' object only".

Thereafter, for the sake of argument, Sureswaraachaaryaa assumes that *aathmaa* also is an object of experience. This is called *abhyupedhya vaadha*: "let us assume for argument's sake, that, *aathmaa* is an object of experience". If so, *aathmaa* will have two statuses

- (1) experiencer – the '*dhrashtaa*' and
- (2) (according to the *poorva pakshin's* contention, temporarily accepted by the *Achaaryaa*, for argument's sake) an object of experience – *dhrusyam* also.

Thus, *aathmaa* will become both *dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam*. Of this, 'that *aathmaa* is *dhrashtaa*' is not disputed at all. Both the *Vedhaanthin* and the *poorva pakshin* accept this. The controversy is only on "along with the *dhrashtaa* status, does *aathmaa* have the *dhrusyam* status also?" The *Vedhaanthins* say that *aathmaa* never has the *dhrusyam* status (*dhrusyam* means 'object of experience'), while *poorva pakshin* says that *aathma* has *dhrusyam* status also. Sureswaraachaarya struggles to establish that it cannot be so.

In the 40th verse, the *Achaaryaa* is discussing the problems that arise, if *aathmaa* is accepted as a *dhrusyam* also. What will be the problems?

- यदि - Suppose we assume (indicating *abhyupedhya vaadha*;) that,

What is the assumption?

- **द्रष्टा आत्मा अपि धियः द्रश्यायाः कर्मतां इयात्** - the 'observer'/ subject *aathmaa* also becomes the object of the intellect, which intellect itself is an object of experience,

Karmathaa – the object.

“Suppose the subject becomes the object of the intellect, which intellect itself is an object”

The intellect is an object of experience and therefore, the *Achaaryaa* gives the adjective '*dhrusyaayaa:*' to '*dhiya:*' – '*dhrusyaayaa: dhiya:*' meaning 'of the intellect, which is an object'.

When such an assumption is accepted, there will be three problems. What are the three problems?

- **योगपथ्यम्** - the consequence of two opposite statuses being located simultaneously in one and the same locus ,
- **अद्रश्यत्वं** - the consequence of 'not being experienced',
- **छूतिः वैयर्थ्यं च आप्तयात्** - and the consequence of Upanishadic statements becoming invalid will result

To elaborate in detail, on the problems, one by one:

'*Yougapadhyam*': It has already been seen that opposite attributes cannot co-exist - i.e. exist simultaneously -, in one and the same object; if, for example, a given quantity of water is hot, the same water cannot be cold simultaneously. Hotness and coolness cannot have *yougapadhyam* in one and the same specimen of water. "Similarly", the *Achaaryaa* points out to the *poorva pakshin*, "if we concede your contention, *aathmaa* will then become simultaneously the 'observer' and the 'observed'. *Yougapadhyam* – i.e. simultaneous existence of 'subject-hood' and 'object-hood' in one and the same locus *aathmaa* - will result. But, the 'observer' and 'observed' are opposite attributes. Therefore, such a possibility is logically untenable". This is *doshaa* no. 1. (That such co-existence is not possible is proved by our own experience also – the eyes which are perceivers of everything can never become the objects of perception. Perceiver- hood and perceived-hood cannot co-exist in one eye.)

'*Adhrusyathvam*': This 2nd problem has to be comprehended carefully. Suppose the *poorva pakshin* says "opposite attributes cannot exist in one and the same place simultaneously ;

but, they can exist sequentially i.e. at different times. For example, water cannot be hot and cold simultaneously, I agree; but, it can be hot and cold at different times; when it is heated, it becomes hot water. When it is removed from the fire and placed in a refrigerator, it becomes cold water. This proves that opposite attributes can exist in the same object, at different times, though not simultaneously". "Why cannot we say, that, in the same manner" the *poorva pakshin* argues, "*aathmaa* is the *dhrashtaa* at one time, when the mind becomes *dhrusyam*; and after some time, reversing the roles, *aathmaa* becomes *dhrusyam* and mind becomes *dhrashtaa*? Thus, why cannot *aathmaa* become sequentially *dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam* - *dhrashtaa* during certain times and *dhrusyam* during other times - just like water being hot and cold, though at different times?" Sureswaraachaarya replies: "The problem is, when *aathmaa* is enjoying the *dhrashtaa* status, at that time, *aathmaa* will not be enjoying *dhrusyam* status. And, when *aathmaa* does not enjoy the *dhrusyam* status, how will you know 'I', the *aathmaa* am existent? How will I know the existence of myself, when I am not enjoying the *dhrusyam* status?"

In *Vedhaanthaa*, it can be said '*aathmaa* is self-evident'. But, for the *poorva pakshin*, *aathmaa* is not self-evident. The consequence: The non-self-evident *aathmaa*, when serving as *dhrashtaa*, cannot be *dhrusyam* or 'observed'; and, when it is not observed, the very existence of *aathmaa* will be unproved. Therefore, the problem is called *adhruyathvam* status. "When *aathmaa* is *dhrashtaa*, there will be no proof for the existence of *aathmaa*, because it is not seen, at that time". This *adhruyathvam* is the second *dosha*:

Sruthi: Vaiyarthiyam: This is the third problem. When, as assumed, *aathmaa* becomes *dhrashtaa* and *dhrusyam* in sequence, when it is *dhrusyam*, at that moment, *aathmaa*'s existence is proved by the mind. To elaborate: First, *aathmaa* was *dhrashtaa*; then *aathmaa* became a *dhrusyam*; when *aathmaa* becomes a *dhrusyam*, the *dhrusyam*'s existence is proved by some other *dhrashtaa* – mind or any other *dhrashtaa* (who the *dhrashtaa* is, is not very material for this argument). But, the very position that, "when *aathmaa* is *dhrusyam*, its existence is proved by some other *dhrashtaa*" would mean "*aathmaa* is non-self-evident". Whenever *aathmaa* is considered a *dhrusyam*, it will result in *aathmaa* being not self-evident. Any *dhrusyam*, for that matter, is not self-evident; somebody else has to prove its existence. What is the consequence of this conclusion? Sureswaraachaaryaa points out: "Once you say *aathmaa* is *dhrusyam* and (therefore), non-self-evident, you are contradicting the *Upanishadic* statement, which says '*aathmaa* ever being of the nature of Consciousness, is ever self-evident.' Consciousness need not be proved by something else; it is self-evident and ever evident. That *sruthi* statement will be contradicted, when *aathmaa* becomes *dhrusyam* and therefore, non-self-evident".

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out this third *dosham*: "*Vaiyarthiyam cha aapnuyaath sruthi:*". *Sruthi:*, here, refers to the *Brahadharanyaka Upanishad Vaakyam* "*Na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte:*

viparilopo vidhyathe avinaasithvaath – (*Svayamjothi Brahmanam*) , which means “the Consciousness of the *saakshi* is never lost. (Therefore Consciousness is ever associated with *saakshi*; therefore, *saakshi* is ever self-evident; therefore, never proved by anything else and therefore, never becomes a *dhrusyam*)”. This *sruthi vaakyam* will attain invalidity; it will become meaningless (if *aathmaa* were to become a *dhrusyam*).

The *Achaaryaa* explains the same further, in the next *sloka*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 41 :

कुत :। यस्मात् ।

The reason for this follows:

- कुत :- Why (do I say that the Brahadhaarnayaka vaakyam will invalid)?
- यस्मात् - Because of the following reason (explained in the sloka).

Chapter II: Verse 41 –

नालुप्तद्रष्टे :द्रुश्यत्वं द्रुश्यत्वे द्रुष्टता कुत :।

स्यात् चेत् द्रुक् एकं निर्द्रुश्यं जगद्धा स्यात् असाक्षिकम् ॥ ४१ ॥

What is characterized by inextinguishable seeing, can never be an object to be seen. If it is an object to be seen, how can it be the seer? Either there should be only the seer with nothing to be seen, or the world should be seer-less.

What is the concept here? When you say ‘a light is illumining an object’, the light is called ‘illuminator’ and the object is called ‘illuminated’. The moment you say ‘illuminator’, you should understand ‘illuminator’ is one which is associated with its own self-illumination/ original illumination / permanent illumination. In the same manner, the moment you say ‘illuminated object’, you should understand that an ‘illuminated object’ is that which borrows illumination from the illuminator and it gets temporarily associated with illumination.

An illumined object

- (1) does not have its own illumination
- (2) has a temporary association with illumination, and
- (3) has the illumination from the illuminator, temporarily spread over its body.

“In the same manner” *Vedhaanthaa* says “the moment you say ‘knower’, the ‘knower’ is always illuminator of objects and therefore, ‘knower’ is one who is permanently associated with the illumination called ‘consciousness’”. Therefore, ‘knower’ has to be permanently associated with Consciousness; in this example of light, the word ‘illumination’ is used; in the context of ‘knowledge’, the word ‘illumination’ should be replaced by ‘consciousness’.

Therefore, 'knower *aathmaa*' is ever associated with 'illumination consciousness'. What is the definition of 'known'? Just as an illumined object has got borrowed illumination, any 'known' object has got borrowed 'consciousness'. Therefore, the moment you say '*dhrusyam*', it means it has got 'borrowed consciousness'. "My consciousness, through my sense organs, is spreading over the inert objects of the world and when the Consciousness spreads over an object, the object becomes a *dhrusyam* and only when the object becomes a *dhrusyam*, its existence is known. Thus, a *dhrusyam* becomes known, because of borrowed Consciousness. And, if *aathmaa* becomes *dhrusyam*, it will mean that *aathmaa* is known because of borrowed consciousness. Sureswaraacharya says: "How can you say *aathmaa* has got borrowed consciousness, when *sruthi* proclaims that *aathmaa* has got un-borrowed original Consciousness? Therefore, *aathmaa* can never become a *dhrusyam*."

- आलुप्त द्रुष्टे: (आत्मनः) - For the *aathmaa*, which enjoys unbroken consciousness, as its very nature

Aaluptham – nithyam; dhrushti: - chaithanyam ; aluptha dhrushti: - nithya chaithanyam.

Why should the *Achaaryaa* use the term '*aluptha dhrushti:*', in place of '*nithya chaithanyam*', which is a simpler term? There is a significance. The *Achaaryaa* wants us to remember the *Brahadharanyaka Vaakyaa* "*na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilopo vardhathe*" - wherein the word '*lopa:*' appears; Sureswaraacharya wants us to remember this word '*lopa:*'; therefore, he uses the term '*aaluptha dhrushti:*'.

- दृश्यत्वं न (संभवति) – can never become an object of experience;

Because, to become an 'object of experience', it will have to borrow consciousness; but, why should *aathmaa* borrow consciousness? To understand this easily, consider the sun. The sun can never become an 'object of illumination', because to become an 'object of illumination', it should borrow 'light' from some other source; but, why should the sun borrow 'illumination', when it has its own, original and permanent illumination? In the same manner, *aathmaa* need not borrow consciousness, when it enjoys unbroken consciousness, as its very nature.

- दृश्यत्वे - Suppose the *aathmaa* has got *dhrusyathvam*,
- द्रुष्टता कुतः - it cannot be the *saakshi aathmaa*, (with permanent Consciousness).

Dhrashtruthaa – saakshi status.

If *aathmaa* is an object of experience (*dhrusyam*), it can never be the *saakshi aathmaa* with permanent consciousness; but, the *sruthi* says that *saakshi aathmaa* has permanent

Consciousness. Therefore, you will be contradicting the *sruthi*, if you say, that *aathmaa* is an object of experience.

These are very important portions, because, many *Vedhaanthic* students (mistakenly) look for *aathma anubhavam* even after a lengthy study of *Vedhaantha*. If a student claims "I have *aathma jnaanam*, because of long years of study of *Vedhaantha*; but, I have still not had *aathma anubhavam*", he is committing a major blunder, because, he is trying to make *aathmaa* an 'object of experience'. Sureswaraachaarya is struggling to make the seeker understand that *aathmaa* is never an object of experience, which means "*aathma anybhava* does not exist as an event in time". All these are established by this *sloka*.

In the second line of the verse, the *Achaaryaa* is establishing the *yougapadhya dosha*:, referred to, in the previous verse.

The *poorva pakshin* had suggested that *aathmaa* is the *dhrashtaa* (observer) and also *dhrusyam* ('observed'). He wants to say that everything in the creation is both 'observer' and 'observed' simultaneously. "*Yougapadhyam*" means *aathmaa* is 'observer' and 'observed' simultaneously ; and, once you say, *aathmaa* is 'observer' and 'observed' , the mind also becomes both the 'observer' and 'observed' ; then, by extension, everything in the creation, should have 'observer' and 'observed' status, by logic. So, "*Ghata: dhrashtaa dhrusyathvaath aathmavath*". Everything should become simultaneously 'observer' and 'observed". What is the consequence? Sureswaraachaarya says: "If everything in creation is 'observer' and 'observed' simultaneously, when everything in the creation enjoys 'observer' status, from that angle, there will be no 'observed' at all; there will be only 'observer'. There will be no 'object of experience'; there will be only total darkness. In like manner, when everything enjoys 'observed' status, there will be no 'observer' at all, which means there is no creation at all; since, to say 'there is a creation', there must be some 'observer'.

Therefore, either

- (1) there will be nothing in the world, when there is only 'observed' and no 'observer' or
- (2) there will be total darkness, when there is only 'observer' without having anything to be 'observed', if there is *yougapadhyam*".

- **(यौगपध्ये सति) एकं द्रुक् निर्दृश्यं स्यात्** - (When everything has got 'observer' and 'observed' status simultaneously) everything is observer, with nothing to be observed

Ekam dhruk (syaath) – There will be one collective observer; *nirdhrusyam (syaath)* – without anything for 'observation'.

According to *aashrama dharma*, *brahmacharins*, *vaanaprasthaas* and *sanyaasins* are supposed to live on *bikshaa*, while, the *grihasthaa* is supposed to be the pillar of the society supporting the other three *aasramaas*. He is not supposed to live on *bikshaa*. If the *grihasthaas* also are allowed to and choose to live on *bikshaa*, then, who will be giving the *bikshaa*?

Sureswaraachaarya's query here is similar: "If everything in the creation enjoys the 'observer' status, where will be the 'observed'?"

This is the first problem (of everything including *aathmaa* being the 'observer' and the 'observed' simultaneously), resulting from assuming everything as *dhruk*.

The second problem results from assuming everything as *dhrusyam*. What will happen? *Aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*, everything will become *dhrusyam* ('observed') and, when everything becomes the 'observed', there will be no observer at all. In such an eventuality, you cannot even talk about the existence of the 'observed', because, to talk about the 'observed', you need an 'observer'.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- जगत् वा - (Or) the entire universe (consisting of both *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*)
- असाक्षिकम् स्यात् - will be without a *saakshi* / an 'observer'.

In both cases, *sarva vyavahaara lopa: bhavathi* / If everything is '*dhruk*', there will be no *vyavahaaraa*. If everything is '*dhrusyam*' also, there will be no *vyavahaaraa*.

This is what the *Achaaryaa* said, in the introduction to verse 40 - "*sarva samvyavahaara lopa:*" – "all transactions will end, if everything is 'subject'; all transactions will end, if everything is 'object'".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 42:

उक्तयुक्तिं द्रुढीकर्तुं आगम उदाहरण उपन्यासः।

To confirm the reasoning fomulated, scriptural statements are advanced:

Now, Sureswaraachaarya says "I am giving all these arguments, only with the back-up of the *sruthi-pramaanam*".

- उक्तयुक्तिं द्रुढीकर्तुं - To reinforce all the reasoning, given before,
- उपन्यासः - (there is) the presentation (of)

- आगम उदाहरण – quotations from the sruthi.

Dhrudee karthum – to reinforce; *uktha yukthi* – the reasoning given earlier.

It should be noted, that, without the backing of the *Veda pramaanaa*, pure logic can never prove *Advaita*. For establishing *Advaita* or for establishing *aham brahma asmi* or for establishing *jagan mithyaathvam*, pure logic alone will not help. Logic will lead the seeker a long way to the goal; but, the final clinching evidence will be only *saasthra pramaanam*. Therefore, if a challenge is thrown "Can you establish '*brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa jeevo brahmaiva naapara*.' without taking recourse to *Veda pramaanam* in any manner?", such a challenge cannot be accepted.

For a *Vaidhika*, *Advaitam* is a fact and knowledge because of *Veda pramaanam*; for those, who do not accept *Veda Pramaanam*, *Advaitam* is, at best, a wonderful hypothesis, which science cannot negate nor prove. Such a person will be an agnostic, with regard to *Advaitam*. That's why, the *Upanishad* itself says: "*Naishaa tharkena madhi: aapaneeya*". This '*brahma sathyam-jagan mithyaa*' teaching can never be established with the help of pure logic or pure science; finally we have to take the support of *aagama udhaaharanam*. Hence, the *Achaaryaa* gives *sruthi* quotations.

Chapter II: Verse 42 –

आर्तं अन्यत् द्रुशे :सर्वं" नेति नेति "इति चासकृत् ।

वदन्ती निर्गुणं ब्रह्म कथं श्रुति :उपेक्ष्यते ॥ ४२ ॥

How can the *sruthi* be ignored which repeatedly asserts the attributeless *Brahman* and denies everything other than the seeing consciousness as insubstantial by saying 'Not this, not this' (B. U. II . iii. 6).

A relevant note: In his beautiful commentary to the 2nd *soothraa* of the *Brahma Soothraas*, "*Janmaadhyasya yatha*:", *Shri Sankara Bhagavadh Padaa* presents a discussion on "whether God can be proved through reasoning . Can God be proved logically or scientifically or not?". The *Nyaayaa* philosophers, who are great logicians, claim that God can be logically / scientifically proved. In their *Nyaaya saasthraa*, the logical proof is given, which is quite convincing to most interested students of the philosophy. But, *Sri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, addresses the *Naiyaayikaa*: "Oh! *Thaarkikaa!* you can give reasoning and prove God to other unintelligent people. But, we, intelligent *Advaitins* will prove that all the logical reasoning you give to prove the existence of God, is fallacious reasoning". He proceeds to establish the fallacies in the *Naiyaayikaa's* argument. And, he concludes "the *Advaitin's* view is, that, God can never be proved by science or logic". And, therefore, we should never enter into logical discussions on the existence of God but take *Veda* as the *pramaanam* for *Isvara*. If an opponent says "I do not accept *Veda pramaanaa*", the *Vaidhika* has to say "I

cannot otherwise prove God; if you do not accept God, you need not accept". The moment *saasthraas* are dropped, God also will become a blind belief. That we should remember here: "*Sruthi is pramaanam for Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa*".

Sureswaraachaarya presents the related *saasthra pramaanam*.

- **आर्त अन्यत् द्रुशे :सर्व** - Everything else other than *saakshi chaithanyam (aathmaa, the Observer)* is insignificant/ *mithyaa*

Aartham – insignificant (meaning *mithyaa*, in this context) ; *sarvam* – everything else; *dhruse: anyath* - other than *aathmaa*.

'Everything else' includes *ahamkaaraa* also. Therefore, from the *sruthi vaakyam*, we come to know, that, *ahamkaaraa* is also *mithyaa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is property of the mind; *ahamkaaraa*, the mind, the *chidh aabhaasaa* are all *mithyaa*. How can the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* be the property of the *sathya aathmaa*? The riches of the dream cannot become the attribute of the 'waker'. And, therefore, "*ahamkaaraa* is not the attribute of *aathmaa*", according to *sruthi pramaanam* also.

71. Chapter II, Verse 42 to 45 (13-10-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya, in these verses, is continuing with *ahamkaara-aathma-viveka*:. He wants to establish that *ahamkaaraa* is totally different from *aathmaa* and is not even a property of *aathmaa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is nothing but the *anaathmaa* mind, which is associated with the current body, because of *Praarabhdhaa*. The mind associated with the current body alone is responsible for the individuality; and that individuality alone gives an 'I' sense and that 'I' sense must be associated with *anaathmaa* alone – *kshekthram* alone.

Until now, the *Achaaryaa* gave logical reasons in support of that, the primary reason being, that, *ahamkaaraa* is an object of experience – '*dhrusyathvaath*'. The second and equally important reason is '*aagamaapaayithvaath*' - because *ahamkaaraa* arrives in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and *ahamkaaraa* dissolves in *sushupthi*. Because of this reason also, *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*; it is not 'I', the *aathmaa*.

Having given the reasoning, Sureswaraachaarya, is now giving *sruthi* support, in verses 42 (currently under discussion) and 43.

He started this portion with the introduction (*sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 42)

- *uktha yukthim dhrideekarthum* - To reinforce the reasoning,
- *aagama udhaaharana upanyaasa* : - the presentation of *Vedic* statements / quotations (is done).

The first quotation (given in verse 42) is '*artham anyath*'.

This is the well-known statement in *Brahadhaaranyakaa Upanishad* '*atha: anyath artham*'. It occurs in three places (III.iv.2, III.v.1 and III. vii. 23) in the *Upanishad*.

What is the meaning of this statement?

The word '*atha: anyath*' means 'everything other than **this**'. Naturally, the question "what does 'this' refer to?" will arise. For this, the context in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* is to be studied; we find, that, the *Upanishad* has described the ultimate observer Consciousness and; not only has it talked about the 'ultimate observer Witness Consciousness', but the *Upanishad* has also clearly said that the Consciousness can never become an 'object of experience' – *adhrushto dhrashtaa, asrutha: srothaa, amatho manthaa, nanyothosthi dhrashtaa nayothosthi srothaa* etc. – 'Consciousness is ever the observer, never the observed; ever the experienced, never the experienced' etc. Thus, Consciousness has been

presented as 'un-experiencable Experiencer', which is ever evident, whose 'evidence' does not require any evidence; but, which, on the other hand, is the evidence for everything else.

(If every evidence requires another evidence, there will be a problem – 'infinite regress' - i.e. one particular thing will have to be evident from a second thing and the second from a third and so on. Therefore, there will have to be one ultimate 'evidence' which will not require any more further evidence or proof. This ultimate evidence of everything is Consciousness, which itself does not / need not / should not require another evidence.)

Thus, Consciousness is brilliantly defined in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* III. iv- *Ushastha Braahmanam*. After that, the *Upanishad* states "atha: anyath aartham" – "other than this changeless Witness Consciousness, everything else is *mithyaa*".

Anyath – 'everything other than'; the literal meaning of '*artham*' is '*apam*' and in this context '*mithyaa*'.

Thus, the *Upanishad* clearly states that 'everything else, apart from Consciousness, is *mithyaa*'. When the *Upanishad* says 'everything else', the 'mind' is also included in the term 'everything else'. And, if the mind is included, the individuality sense also must be included. Therefore, the *ahamkaaraa* is also as much *mithyaa*, as any other object in the world.

Sureswaraacharya asks (the *purva pakshin*) "Are you not noting those powerful *sruthi* statements?"

- दुसे :अन्यत् सर्व आर्तम् - Everything else other than Consciousness is *mithyaa*.

Dhrusi: - Consciousness. What type of Consciousness? Which is *aviluptha dhrusti*:

Verse 41 also made a reference to a *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* statement. The term '*Na aluptha dhrushte*.' is a reference to IV. iii. 23 (of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*) part of which runs – "*na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilopo vidhyathe*", which means "the Consciousness of *aathmaa* is never subject to end".

This *sruthi* quotation, incidentally, is important from modern science angle also. Modern science is trying to find out how Consciousness is created out of matter; because, scientists believe, that, before life arrived upon this cosmos, matter was always there. Therefore, for scientists, matter is always fundamental and (according to them) there was a time when matter was present, but, Consciousness was absent. They believe, that, at a particular moment of time, matter got into an unique combination and in that unique combination, Consciousness was one of the products generated. They are, therefore, trying to find out

how to 'artificially' create Consciousness. *Vedhaantha* has an one-line answer to the scientists – this *Brahadhaaranayaka vaakyam* – '*na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilopo: vidhyathe*'- "Consciousness is as eternal as matter".

The scientists may then raise a query: "If Consciousness is as eternal as matter, how come, before life came on this earth, Consciousness was absent? Immediately after 'big bang', there was no life; there could have been no Consciousness because there was no life". For this query also, *Vedhaantha* has an answer. It says: "Even before life came, Consciousness **did** exist; when life arrived, Consciousness did not 'arrive' along with life. When life arrived, Consciousness only became 'manifest' in the matter. 'Manifest Consciousness' is the 'arrival of life'. Even before life arrived, *aathmaa*, the Eternal Consciousness was there. All 'living beings' were there; but, when certain particular *praarabhdha karmas* are ready, then alone the *karmaas* will 'ripen', then alone there is the condition for 'manifestation of life'.

Therefore, Consciousness is eternal and other than that, everything else is *aartham*.

What is the conclusion based on this? *Ahamkaaraa* is *mithyaa*; how can *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* be the property of *sathya, nithya aathmaa*, as claimed by the *poorva pakshir*?

Sureswaraacharya is refuting *ahamkaaraa* as an attribute of *aathma*, based on *sruthi*. His first reference is "*aathmaa* is *sathyam*. *Ahamkaaraa* is *mithyaa*. *Mithyaa ahamkaaraa* cannot be the attribute of *sathya aathmaa*."

"*Dhruse: anyath sarvam aartham*" is one *sruthi* quotation.

The second quotation (given by the *Achaaryaa*) :

- "नेति नेति "इति च – Not this, not this also.

In the previous quotation, the *Upanishad* said, that, everything else other than Consciousness is *aartham*; and the *Advaitin* defines *aartham* as *mithyaa* (in this context). Then, all the other philosophers, including the *Visishtadvaitins* and *Dvaitins* may vociferously protest. They may say "the dictionary meaning of the word '*aartham*' is '*alpam*'. The word *alpam* only means 'finite'. *Sruthi* only says that, others apart from Consciousness, are 'finite'. How or why do you interpret *alpam* as *mithyaa*? We will interpret the statement only as '*aathmaa* is *mahaa sathyam*; others are *alpa sathyam*'. Why do you say that they are *mithyaa*?"

Sureswaraacharya, in anticipation of such an objection, gives this quotation `nethi nethi'. He points out, that, not only does *sruthi* say `everything else is *alpam*'; *sruthi* negates them also.

`*Na ithi* - `*Na*' means `non-existent'; the statement is repeated twice – *na idham, na idham*. `*ithi* means `*idham*– *idham* referring to the objective universe, including the body, the mind and the *ahamkaara*. "All of them" the *Upanishad* says "are non-existent (*na asthi*)".

Whatever the *sruthi* negates, has to be *mithyaa*, because, what is *sathyam* can never be negated, since, if *sathyam* is also negated, ultimately, *aathmaa* also will be negated.

"Therefore", Sureswaraacharya says, "the statement `*nethi, nethi*' indicates `everything else is *mithyaa*'; therefore, *ahamkaara* is *mithyaa*".

`*Nethi, nethi* occurs in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (II. iii. 6) and is also repeated several times in the *Upanishad*. Therefore, *ahamkaara* is *mithyaa* – unreal – and can never be an attribute of *aathmaa*. And, therefore, the *Acharya* asks:

- कथं उपेक्ष्यते - How are you ignoring
- निर्गुणं ब्रह्म वदन्ती श्रुतिः - the Upanishadic statements revealing the attributeless Brahman?

Sruthi: - In this context, refers to the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* statements quoted ; *vadhantee* – revealing / those which reveal (adjective to *sruthi*- not a verbal form, but a noun, describing the *sruthi vaakyams* as `revealing') .

nirgunam – (adjective to *Brahman*) attributeless. The *purva pakshin* claims that *Brahman* or *aathmaa* has the attribute of *ahamkaara*. Since the *Acharya* does not agree, he uses the adjective "*nirgunam*", for *Brahman*, to stress his view.

Katham upekshyathe - How can such statements be ignored?

And, therefore, "I am not *ahamkaara* also" is the final conclusion, very difficult to accept and assimilate, but the absolute fact.

Chapter II: Verse 43 –

"महाभुतान्यहंकार "इत्येतत्क्षेत्रमुच्यते ।

न द्रुशे :द्वैत योगोस्ति विश्वेश्वरमतादपि ॥ ४३ ॥

The Lord says that the gross element, the ego etc., are constitutive of the field (Githa - XIII. 5 – 6). Even in His view the ultimate Consciousness does not get mixed up with the realm of duality.

In the previous verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa quoted *sruthi pramaanam*. In this verse, he quotes *smruthi pramaanam* - a support from the *Bhagavadh Githa*.

He says in the second line:

- विश्वेश्वरमतादपि – From the teachings of Lord Krishna also (we get the same conclusion).

Visweswara: - Lord of the Universe, meaning Lord Krishna (in this context); *matham* – teachings; *mathaath* – from the teachings.

What is the conclusion?

- द्रुशेः द्वैतयोगः न अस्ति – (that) for the witness Consciousness, 'association with ahamkaaraa' is not at all there.

Dhrusi: - The witness Consciousness (which is the real 'I'); *dhruse:* - For the Witness Consciousness .

The word '*yoga:*' means '*sambhandha:*' - 'association (as attribute)'. '*Dvaita yoga:*' means 'association with *dvaita prapancha*'. *Ahamkaaraa* also is an integral part of *dvaita prapancha* and therefore, in this context, '*dvaita*' must be understood as the *ahamkaaraa*, part of *dvaitam*. The final meaning of '*dvaita yoga:*', is, therefore, '*ahamkaara sambhandha:*' or 'association with *ahamkaaraa*'.

How and where does Krishna communicate this idea?

"महाभुतान्यहंकार" इत्येतत्क्षेत्रमुच्यते - (the Lord) says that the gross elements, the ego etc. are constituents of the objective universe (including the body)

The reference is to verses 5 & 6, of Chapter XIII, of the Bhagavadh Githa, in which, the Lord says – "*Mahaa bhoothaani ahamkaara: buddhi: avyaktham eva cha | Indhriyaani dhasaikam cha pancha cha indhriya agocharaa: || Icchaa dvesha: sukham dhu:kham samgaatha chethanaa dhruthi: | Ethath kshethram samaasena savikaaram udhaahrutham*" – "The five subtle elements , *Ahamkaaraa*, *Mahath*, *Prakruthi*, the ten sense organs, the mind, the five gross elements, desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, the body-mind complex, sentiency, fortitude – all this, enumerated above briefly, is *Kshethram* together with its modifications".

This is a very, very important quotation, since the *Advaita Vedhaanthins* refute the *Nyaaya-Vaisheshika* philosopher, with the help of these two verses.

Sureswaraachaarya, in this portion, uses the above two *Githa* verses to point out: '*ahamkaaraa: kshethram uchayathe*' - '*Ahamkaaraa* is presented as *kshethram*'.

In the quotation, the word *ahamkaaraa* is to be highlighted. Since *ahamkaaraa* is presented (by Lord Krishna) as *kshethram*, it has nothing to do with *Kshethragnya: - 'I', the aathmaa*.

To establish the fallacy in the notion '*ahamkaaraa* is an attribute or part of *aathmaa*', Sureswaraachaarya, elsewhere (in his *Brahadhaaranyaka Vaarthikam*), says: "Suppose the *ahamkaaraa* is an integral part of *aathmaa*, then one need not waste one's time working for *mokshaa*. All philosophies and all *moksha sashtraas* can be given up; instead, one's time may be fully utilized in the pursuit of worldly pleasures, as long as one lives; because, **if** *ahamkaaraa* is an integral part of 'I', *karma* also will be an integral part of 'I' and if *karma* is an integral part of 'I', *samsaaraa* also will be an integral part of 'I'. *Samsaaraa*, with its consequent problems will become eternal – one will continue for ever to be subject to *punar api jananam punar api maranam*."

Mokshaa is possible and attainable **only** when *ahamkaaraa* is **not** an integral part of 'I'. *Vedhaantha* firmly believes and establishes that *ahamkaaraa* is not an integral part of 'I'; but, it is a part of only the objective universe – "*ahamkaara: kshethram uchayathe*". *Kshethram* means 'objective universe'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 44:

अधुना प्रकृतार्थ उपसंहारः।

Now, the discussion on hand is being concluded.

- अधुना - Now (after giving so many arguments),
- उपसंहारः - I would like to consolidate
- प्रकृतार्थ - the topic under discussion.

What is the topic under discussion? *Aathma- anaathma viveka*::; particularly *aathma-sookshma sareera viveka*::; and, more particularly, *aathma-ahamkaaraa viveka*::. (The *Achaaryaa* says:) "I would like to consolidate this topic" (in the following *sloka*).

Chapter II: Verse 44 –

एवम् एतत् हिरूक् जेयं मिथ्यासिद्धं अनात्मकम् ।

मोहमूलं सुदुर्बोधं द्वैतं युक्तिभिः आत्मनः ॥ ४४ ॥

Thus, this world of duality, falsely presenting itself, phenomenal in nature, rooted in error and eluding rational scrutiny, must be clearly distinguished from the Self through reason.

So, what is the important idea to be noted, and should also be part of our *nidhidhyaasanam*? It is "I' am *sathyam*; 'I', the Experiencer am *sathyam* and whatever I experience, the entire *dvaitha prapanchaa* is *mithyaa*"; *dvaitha prapanchaa* includes three things - the world, my own mind and my own body. All of them are *mithyaa*. When the word *mithyaa* is used, two important messages should be noted.

- (1) The word *mithyaa* means 'beyond comprehension'. *Mithyaa* is logically undefinable. In fact, what is logically undefinable only is called *mithyaa*-beyond comprehension.
- (2) '*Mithyaa* is beyond control also'.

Whenever you are disturbed by an event and ask 'why did such an event happen?', the answer will be 'because of your *karma*'; if you persist in raising queries about *karma*, the explanation will be about your earlier *janmas*, the cause for the earlier *janmaas* being explained as *karma* in still earlier *janmaas* and so on; with the ultimate reply that Creation / *karma* etc. are *anaadhi* (beginningless). Human intellect is not able to get to the final answer; it meets a dead end, with the explanation - "*jeeva* is beginningless; *jagath* is beginningless; *samsaaraa* is beginningless; *karma* is beginningless; *Isvara* is beginningless" etc., which, the intellect does not seem to be able to appreciate also. That's why, it is said that all these are non-comprehensible and therefore beyond control also. After all, you can control a situation, only when you truly understand the situation.

Mithyaa being 'beyond one's comprehension' and 'beyond one's control' are the 'negative' facts about *mithyaa*.

The 'positive' fact (or saving grace) about *mithyaa* is: "Whatever happens in *mithyaa* field, irrespective of it being beyond my comprehension and my control, cannot, affect the real 'I'; *asangoham*, *asangoham*". If this fact is assimilated, life is an 'entertainment'; otherwise, life becomes a 'struggle'.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- **जेयं** – (This fact) should be ascertained repeatedly.

What fact?

- "एतत् द्वैतम् आत्मनः हिरुक्" – The entire *dvaitha prapanchaa* is distinct from the Self (*aathmaa*).

Hiruk – distinct; *bhinnam*.

What type of *dvaitha prapanchaa*? Brilliant descriptions are given.

- मिथ्यासिद्धं - It is falsely appearing.

One can never explain its (the *dvaitha prapanchaa*'s) appearance in a logical manner. The more it is probed, the more mysterious it gets.

- अनात्मकम् - It is different from *aathmaa*.

Dvaitha prapanchaa is an object of experience (in contrast to *aathmaa*, which is ever the 'experiencer' and never the 'experienced')

- मोहमूलं - Its only source is 'ignorance'.

What a powerful statement? It means, that, as long as you are 'ignorant' of *aathmaa*, the *dvaitha prapanchaa* will exist for you; when you clearly 'know' the *aathmaa*, the *dvaitha prapanchaa* will also be reduced to *aathmaa* only.

Moha: (in this context) means *ajnaanam* and *mohamoolam* means *ajnaana kaaryam* – "that, which is the result of ignorance".

Therefore only,

- युक्तिभिः सुदुर्बोधं - It is extremely difficult to be explained, through logic.

That's why the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* uses the words *maayaa*, *anirvachaneeyam* etc. to describe the world. Other philosophers criticize the *Advaitin* over this: "The words *maayaa*, *anirvachaneeyam* etc., are used by the *Advaitin*, only because he is not able to give proper explanations; *mayaa* is a crucial word in *Advaita* philosophy; but the *Advaitin* is unable to explain the concept in clear terms; instead, he describes it as *anirvachaneeyam* (as that which cannot be explained); this amounts to his acceptance of his inability to explain the Creation / Universe".

The *Advaitin's* reaction (as *Gouda Paadhaa* does in his *Maandookya Kaarika*) to this criticism of the other philosophers, is, to, in turn, ask *them* to explain *jagath*, *srushti* etc. satisfactorily. But, the other philosophies also find themselves unable to meet this challenge. Their attempts at logical explanations meet with endless problems and dead ends.

World/ creation can never be explained by any one, at any time, including modern science, which agrees that 96% of the world is 'dark matter' i.e. 'inexplicable contents'.

Advaita honestly accepts this fact, denoting it as *maayaa* and *anirvachaneeyam*.

The *dvaita prapancha* can never be explained logically, but, is perceptually available. "That *mithyaa prapancha* is different from 'me', may you understand" (says the *Achaaryaa*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 45:

कुतो मित्यासिद्धत्वं द्वैतस्य इति चेत् ।

How it is established that duality is a false presentation?

The *Achaaryaa* introduces Verse 45.

- कुतो द्वैतस्य मित्यासिद्धत्वं - "Why do you say that the clearly experienced *dvaita prapancham* is falsely established/ unreally existent?"
- Kutha: - Why? *Mithyaa siddhathvam* – falsely established / unreally existent.

'*Jagan mithyaathvam*' is a difficult proposition to understand, while '*brahma sathyam*' is more easily accepted by most people. This is true both at the intellectual and emotional levels. "When the *jagath* is tangible i.e. available for perception, how can it be *mithyaa*?" is the doubt at the intellectual level. At the emotional level, when pleasure or pain (especially pain) is experienced, the very suggestion that the experienced pleasure or pain is *mithyaa*, appears absurd. No system of philosophy, other than *Advaitam* and one branch of *Buddhism*, accepts the *mithyaathvam* concept. Because thus the unreality of the world is accepted by one branch of *Buddhism*, *Advaita* philosophy faces the further criticism of being dubbed as pseudo-*Buddhism*, by other philosophies.

इति चेत् - If such a question is raised (by the Poorva Pakshin),

What is the answer? It is in the *sloka* that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 45 –

न प्रुथङ् न आत्मना सिद्धिः आत्मनोन्यस्य वस्तुनः।

आत्मवत् कल्पितः तस्मात् अहंकारादिः आत्मनि ॥ ४५ ॥

Nothing that is other than the Self, is found apart from the Self, nor in the Self. Therefore phenomena like the ego are fictitious constructions wrongly imagined to be the Self.

Why do you say that the *dvaita prapancha* is *mithya*? Sureswaraachaarya says: "Because I am not able to clearly define the *dvaita prapancha* as different from the 'observer' or as identical with the 'observer'".

Is the world existing as different from the 'observer' or as identical with the 'observer' *aathma*? i.e. *dvaitam aathma bhinnam vaa aathma abhinnam vaa – bhinnam* means 'separately existing' and *abhinnam* means 'existing as identical'. The *Achaaryaa* says "when you try to probe into this, you meet with problems".

This alone *Adhi Sankaraachaarya* said in his famous *Viveka Choodaamani* verse: "*Sannaapyasannaapyubhayaathmikaa no. bhinnaapabhinaapyubhayaathmikaa no. saangaapyanangaa hyubhayaathmikaa no. mahaathbuthaa anirvachaneeya roopa*" – "*Maayaa* is neither existent nor non-existent nor both; neither same nor different nor both; neither made up of parts nor whole nor both. Most wonderful it is and beyond description in words" (Verse 109).

"Can you say the world is existing independent of the observer?" is the question. And, *Vedhaantha* says "you can never prove the existence of the world independent of the observer"; because, "the existence of anything is proved only when it becomes knowable to someone, at some place and at some time" (a very important law).

There cannot be a thing which is not knowable to any one at any place and at any time i.e. the existence of an 'unknowable' thing is not possible. The very fact that you talk about a thing proves the possibility of someone 'knowing' the thing, at some place and at some time. This is what was said in *Advaita Makarandhaa* – an important verse – "*nahi bhaanadruthe satthvam*" – "Existence presupposes knowledge". Therefore, anything can be said to be existent, only when it is available for some observer at some time and some place. There are millions of stars existing, not known to us, at the present moment. But, they can all become 'knowable' to someone, at some time in the future. Therefore, we accept their existence.

The criterion for existence, in short, is 'knowability'.

'Knowability' requires a 'knower'; and 'knower' means the 'observer – *aathma*'.

Summing up, “anything can become existent only when it is ‘knowable’ to the ‘observer’; it can never exist separate from the ‘observer’, away from Consciousness. Therefore you cannot say anything is *aathma bhinnam* – separate from observer.

Then, can you say, therefore, that, things are identical with the observer? You cannot say this also – because one is subject to change and *jadam*, while the other is *chethanam* and not subject to change. Therefore, *achethana, savikaara dvaitha prapancha* cannot be identical with *chethana, nir vikaara chaithanyam* also.

The conclusion: The world cannot exist as different from the observer; world cannot exist as identical with observer.

Modern science is coming closer to *Vedhaanthaa* – it says: “we are not able to clearly know an object, because when it becomes minute particles, the very process of observation changes the nature of the object”. Then, can the solution be: “If you want to know an object, do not observe it”? Obviously not, since without observation and study you cannot know an object. (“You can never, never define the world; it is *maayaa*” says *Vedhaanthaa*.)

What is the solution? How to know what exactly is the world? Your instruments can never observe and understand, because, the very observation changes the world. So, drop your attempt – we have got an *apouresheya pramaanam*, which tells you what exactly is this world. What is that *pramaanam*? You, yourself. You are the observer and you are the observed. There is only one *chaithanyam* playing the roles of the observer and the observed. What is the example? *Svapna*. We enter the dream, divide ourselves into the observer and the observed. The same is true about this world also, as Verse VIII of the famous *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Slokam* of *Adhi Sankara* asserts- “*Visvam pasyathi kaarya kaaranathayaa sva swami sambhandhatha: sishyaachaaryathayaa thathaiva pithru puthraadhi aathmanaa bhedhatha: svapne jaagrathi vaa esha: purusha: maayaaparibrahmitha:*” – “He, who is the *Purushaa*, whirled in *maayaa*, sees in himself, the world of cause-effect diversely related as possessor and possession, father and son, and as teacher and taught, both in the states of waking and of dreaming”

72. Chapter II, Verse 45 and 46 (27-10-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is dealing with the topic of *aathma-anaathma viveka*; there also particularly *aathma-sookshma sareera viveka*; and there also particularly *aathma-antha:karana viveka*; and there also particularly *aathma-ahamkaara viveka*.

Within *anaathmaa* is *sookshma sareeram*; within the *sookshma sareeram* is the mind; and within the mind is *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* also comes under *anaathmaa* only, and, therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa is taking pains to differentiate *ahamkaaraa* from *aathmaa*.

This, he said, in verse 44, "*ethath aathmana: hiruk jneyam*" (this world of duality is different from the Self) – he used a peculiar expression *hiruk*, meaning *bhinnam* or 'different'. *Anaathmaa* including *ahamkaaraa* should be understood as different from *aathmaa*.

Thereafter, the *Achaaryaa* makes an incidental point, but a very important point to be noted in the course of acquiring *advaita jnaanam*, which is this : when we clearly distinguish *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* and establish that they are two totally distinct entities, we have partially achieved the goal of *aathma-anaathma viveka*: / But, in the process, we have created a new problem; since we have clearly accepted the existence of two independent and separate entities – one is *aathmaa* and the other is *anaathmaa* - and we are taking pains to differentiate them, it might appear that we ultimately accept *dvaitam*. To avoid arriving at such a wrong conclusion, the *Advaitin* has also to take pains to realize and say, that, even though *anaathmaa* is different from *aathmaa*, it does not mean it is independently existent; just as in the rope-snake example, though the rope-snake is different from the rope, the rope-snake does not exist separate from the rope.

Rope-snake is different from the rope, but, cannot exist separately from the rope; dream is different from the 'waker', but, dream cannot exist separate from the 'waker'; mirage water is different from the dry sand; but, mirage water cannot exist separately from the dry sand. In the same manner as in these examples, though the *anaathma-prapancha* is different from me (I am the 'observer' and the world is the 'observed'; the 'observed' world is different from 'me'), it cannot exist independent of or separate from 'me'.

"Though *anaathmaa* is different from *aathmaa*" the *Advaitin* has to realize and assert "*anaathmaa* is not existent separate from or independent of *aathmaa*".

Whatever is different but not separately / independently existent is called *mithyaa*; therefore, the world is *mithyaa*.

Since the world/ *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa* and though, thus, there is one *sathya aathmaa* and another *mithyaa anaathmaa*, the *sathya vasthu* is *advaitam*. In other words, though the *sathya vasthu* and *mithyaa anaathmaa* are seemingly 'two', since *anaathmaa*, though separate from 'me', cannot separately exist from 'me', I have to count only the *aathma vasthu* as *sathyam*. Therefore, the *anaathma prapanchaa* is called *anirvachaneeyam*.

This *anirvachaneeyathvam* – the 'inexplicability' – of *anaathmaa*, is presented by the *Achaaryaa* in the 45th verse, in a technical language.

The *Achaaryaa* says (in verse 45): "*Anaathmaa* is different from *aathmaa*; but, at the same time, it is not separately existent from *aathmaa*; therefore, you cannot say that *anaathmaa* is *bhinnam* from *aathmaa*; nor can you say it is *abhinnam* from *aathmaa* – because of this, it is *anirvachaneeyam* - '*bhinaa-abhinnathvaabhyaam anirvachaneeyam*'".

- आत्मनः अन्यस्य वस्तुनः - Any entity other than the *aathmaa*
- प्लुतक् न सिद्धिः - does not exist separate from *aathmaa*;

At the same time:

- न आत्मना (सिद्धिः) - it does not exist as identical with *aathmaa* also.

Why do we say that *anaathmaa* does not exist as identical with *aathmaa*? Because,

- (1) *anaathmaa* is *jadam* ; *aathmaa* is *chethanam*;
- (2) *anaathmaa* is *savikaaram*; *aathmaa* is *nirvikaram*, and
- (3) *anaathmaa* is *saavayavam*; *aathmaa* is *niravayavam*.

Since, thus, their *svaroopaas* are of different natures, just as natures of darkness and light are different, *anaathmaa* and *aathmaa* cannot exist as identical - "*thamas prakaasavath viruddha svabhaavayo: na aathmanaasiddhi:*"

At the same time, you cannot say it is separate also, because it does not exist separately.

- आत्मवत् - Unlike the *aathmaa* (in this context, 'unlike' is the interpretation; **not** 'like' or 'similar to')

"Unlike *aathmaa* which is independently existent, *anaathmaa* is not independently existent" is the essence. Therefore, what is the conclusion?

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- अहंकारादिः आत्मनि कल्पितः : - the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* , beginning with *ahamkaaraa* is superimposed on *aathmaa*.

"Superimposed on *aathmaa*" means "superimposed on myself".

That's why Swami Dayananda Saraswathi makes an important observation. There is a popular meditation verse, known as '*nirvaana shadkam*', which many *Vedhaanthic* students learn by heart and use for meditation. That *sloka* says: "*Mano bhuddhi ahamkaara chitthaani na aham; na cha srothra jihve na cha ghraana nethre*" etc. – "I am different from the *pancha kosaas*". Thereafter, the *sloka* goes on to say: "I am different from the *pancha bhoothaas* also". Thus, consistently, the *Vedhaanthic* meditator says: "I am different from all of them (*anaathma vishayaani*)". Though there is truth in the statement, because, 'I', the *aathmaa*, is different from the entire *anaathma prapancham*, this meditation can create a serious problem also. Because I am separating myself from the world, this meditation can create a sense of isolation (from the world) and consequent limitation (to oneself).

"Therefore", Swami Dayananda Saraswathi suggests "this meditation should be followed by another compensatory meditation. Whichever object in the Creation, you have separated yourself from, should be brought back into your meditation and you should claim '*maayeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathishtitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi*' – implying 'the whole world is not away from me; it is included in me; it is superimposed on me'".

"I am different from the world" is one meditation it should be compensated by the equally important meditation "the whole world is rising from me / existing in me / resolves in me".

In fact, the whole world is nothing but 'I' + different *naamaas* and *roopaas*; and therefore, "I, myself, am the mind also", contrary to the earlier statement "I am not the mind". "*aham annam; aham annaadha.; aham slokakrith; aham bhoomi.; aham aapa.; aham **eva** idhagum sarvam*". *Maithrayee Brahmanam (Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad - II.Iv.6)* asserts "*idhagum sarvam yadhayam aathmaa*" – "this all are this Self".

Thus, there are two meditations: 'I am different from all', followed by 'I, myself, am all'. And, when I say "everything is resting in me", I should add "even though everything rests in me, I am not affected by anything – either my body or mind - by whatever happens to my body (old age or pains) or by whatever happens in my mind. In fact, I am appearing in the form of mind with *naama roopa* and whatever happens in my mind cannot touch me". In short, the consolidated meditation is: "I am different from all; I am all".

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says: "*ahamkaaraadhi: aathmani kalpitha:*", implying, "do not run away from the mind. Comfortably include the mind in you, without being disturbed by thoughts." Only when everything is included, the problems of isolation and limitation will be resolved. Therefore, it is very important to realize "*(idham saravam) aathmani **kalpitha:***" – "(all are) **superimposed** on me". "*Mathsthaani sarvabhoothaani – na cha mathsthaani*

bhoothaan' – (As the Lord said in the Bhagavadh Githa – Ch. IX – verses 4 & 5). This meditation *is* a *seeming* contradiction – but, has to be done.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 46:

तस्मात् अज्ञानविज्जुम्भितम् एतत् ।

Therefore, all this is the display of ignorance:

- तस्मात् - Therefore (since the entire *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa* / unreal)

Anything unreal is a product of ignorance. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- एतत् - the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* (is)
- अज्ञानविज्जुम्भितम् - projected by / generated by / created by *ajnaanam*.

The only difference is: the *praathibhaasika prapanchaa*, the 'illusory rope-snake / mirage water' etc. are created by the ignorance of worldly things like rope, dry sand etc., i.e. *anaathmaa* ignorance causes the illusory rope-snake etc., whereas the world (*vyaavahaarika prapanchaa*) is projected by *aathma ajnaanam*. In the context of this *sambhandha gadhyam*, the word *ajnaanam* should be understood as *aathma ajnaanam*, which is otherwise called *moolaavidhyaa* or *maayaa*. 'Ignorance of the waker' projects the dream world; 'ignorance of the *thureeyam*' projects the waker's world. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says: *ajnaanam* / *aathmaa ajnaanam* / *thureeya ajnaanam*, (otherwise called *moolaavidhyaa*, otherwise called *maayaa*) **alone** projects this *anaathma prapanchaa*.

Chapter II: Verse 46 –

द्रुश्या :शब्दादय :क्लुप्ता द्रष्टु च ब्रह्म निर्गुणम् ।

अहं तदुभयं बिभ्रदभ्रान्तिमात्मनि यच्छति ॥ ४६ ॥

The objects are false constructions. The seer of them, namely, the Brahman is attributeless. The ego, which bears within itself both of them, sets up illusions within the Self.

So, since *aathmaa* is *sathyam* and *anaathma prapanchaa* is *mithyaa*, the existence and continuity of *anaathma prapanchaa* need not bother us; because, the continuation and existence of *mithyaa* cannot affect *sathyam*.

We talk about *videha mukthi*, freedom from *punarjanmaa* etc., only to a 'beginning seeker'. Because, in the beginning stages, the seeker is afraid of *punar janmaa*, *sareeram*, *prapanchaa* etc., because for such a seeker, the *sareeram* and *prapanchaa* are *sathyam*; but, ultimately, when a student clearly understands *Vedhaanthaa*, that, everything other

than *aathmaa* is only *mithyaa*, his fear of *punar janmaa* and fear of the continuity of the universe should totally go away. *Videha Mukthi* should become irrelevant.

In other words, while the student is called to the study of *Vedhaanthaa*, with the promise of *Videha Mukthi*, ultimately, the teaching is complete only when *Videha Mukthi* becomes irrelevant, with the student losing his fear of *sareeram* or *prapanchaa*, when he is convinced of their *mithya* nature and their consequent inability to affect him in any manner. In fact, the *prapanchaa* turns into an entertainment, when its *mithyaa* nature is assimilated by the advanced seeker. For him, the *anaathmaa* can continue; *sareeram* can continue; *prapanchaa* can continue; even *punar janmam* can come. He need not worry about anything, since he has the conviction that *aathmaa* alone is *sathyam* and *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*.

The *prapanchaa* will bother one only as long as one is not able to give up the *sathyathva buddhi* in the *mithyaa prapanchaa*.

Even though this is the truth, problems are created, where there are no problems, by the mind alone. The mind alone is combining the 'un-combinable' *sathyam* and *mithyaa* and is worried about the *anaathmaa* affecting the *aathmaa – sathyam*. Therefore, "*mana: eva manushyaanaam kaaranam bhandha mokshayo:*" – "the mind alone is the cause for the bondage or freedom of the individual".

That's why, during sleep, when the mind is resolved temporarily, no problems are experienced.

Since the problem is in the mind, the solution is also only in the mind.

Now, the question is: "How is the mind creating problems"? This is being diagnosed.

- शब्दादयः द्रुश्याः क्लुप्ताः - The external universe is **ever** a distinctly demarcated object (and never a subject)

Sabhdhaadhaya: dhruasyaa: - the external universe (consisting of *sabhdha*, *sparsa*, *roopa*, *gandha* etc.); *Klupthaa:* - Well defined objects / clearly distinguished objects / distinctly demarcated objects.

- निर्गुणम् ब्रह्म - The attributeless Consciousness(is)
- द्रष्टु च - (on the other hand) clearly, eternally and distinctly the Observer / subject.

Consciousness is distinctly the subject; the world is distinctly the object. Consciousness never becomes the object and the world never becomes the subject. The difference is clear (black and white).

Where does the 'grey' area come?

- **अहं तदुभयं बिभ्रत्** – The mind which carries both (Objecthood & Subjecthood)

Aham – the mind / the *ahamkaaraa* (in this context); *ubhayam* – both objecthood and subjecthood / *dhrusyathvam*, *dhrashttruthvam cha*; *bibhrathu* – that carries / that bears within itself.

"The mind is the carrier of both (creating problems)" is the statement. This has been interpreted by two different commentators in two different ways. Both interpretations are beautiful and therefore, both deserve study.

The difficult approach is taken up first: What do you mean by 'the mind carrying both'? Sureswaraachaarya says "the mind has got the reflection of both *aathmaa*, the subject (which is clearly the subject) and also the reflection of world, the object". This is a new concept; but beautiful. How do you say so? *Aathmaa* is reflected in the mind as *chidaabhaasaa*. *Chidaabhaasaa* is *aathmaprathibhimbha*: / And, the external world is reflected in the mind, in the form of the worldly thoughts. Every object forms a relevant thought in the mind, shown as *vishaya aakhaara vritthi*: / "If I am experiencing all of you, how does the experience take place?" Shri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, brilliantly discusses this topic in a particular chapter *Buddhi Arooda Prakaranam* in his *Upadesa Saahasri* – "really speaking, I am not perceiving you directly; but, what is happening is, that, when my eyes are open, you are entering my mind in the form of thoughts. The *aakhaara vritthi* – in the form of men, women, furniture etc. - is formed in the mind. The *vritthi* is the reflection of the (perceived) object, in the mind."

Thus, *vritthi roopena anaathma prapancha*: *prathibhimbhitha*: and *aabhaasa roopena aathmaa prathibhimbhitha*: - the mind carries the reflections of both *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. *Aathmaa* reflection is *aabhaasaa*; *anaathmaa* reflection is *vritthi* (meaning 'thought').

These two *aathma prathibhimbha* (the *chidaabhasaa*) and *anaathma prathibhimbha* (the *vritthi*) are intimately present in one mind – a common framework. And, because both of them are intimately present in the mind, we think that *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* have got a *sambhandha*.

Actually speaking, *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* – *sathyam* and *mithyaa* – *asangha chaithanyam* and *jada prapanchaa* - do not have any connection (*sambhandha*) at all. But, when they are present in one 'sheet' of mind, there seems to be a connection. Thus, *bokthru-boghya* - 'experiencer-experienced' relationship - is falsely created.

An example is a photograph of an individual taken along with a statue of a celebrity, which photograph creates a false impression that the individual and the celebrity **in person** have been photographed together. The film carries *ubhayam – asangathve api sasanghavath*. The celebrity in the example is the *aathmaa*, the individual is the *prapanchaa* and the film is the mind - even though there is no *aathma-anaathma sambhandhaa*, in the film called the mind, the *chidhabhaasaa* (the *aathmaa* statue) and the *vritthi* – which is the picture of *prapanchaa* - co-exist and hence the false claim is made "I am the *bokthaa* and the world is *bhogyam*", resulting in perception of problems.

The *Achaaryaa* says: "The problems are in the mind – (in the film of mind)". But, why the problems? Because the mind has got the capacity to carry both. *Bhagavaan* is a cosmic photographer, who has created this particular possibility.

Therefore:

- अहं – The mind (in this context)
- बिभ्रत् – holding / containing / carrying / possessing
- तदुभयम् – Dhrustruthvam (in the form of *aathma prathibhimbaa*, as *chidhaabhaasaa*) and *dhrusyathvam* (in the form of *anaathma prathibhimbaa* as *vritthi*),
- आत्मनि भ्रान्तिम् यच्छति - (and) creates a confusion regarding the real *aathmaa*.

Carrying the images of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, the mind creates confusion/ gives a delusion regarding the real *aathmaa* – *bhraanthim yaacchathi*. What is the confusion? "Even though the real *aathmaa* has no connection with the world as *bokthru-bhogya-sambhandha*, the mind creates a feeling 'I have relationship with the world'. The consequence: Many 'relationships' are struck, resulting in mental disturbances, even though 'I' am *asangha*: - "*asangoham asangoham na maathaa na pithaa na bandhu: na puthram na guru: na sishya:*"

This is one interpretation of '*ubhayam*'.

There is a second interpretation, relatively simpler, (discussed elaborately in an earlier *Upadesa Saahasri* class).

Originally speaking, 'I', the *aathmaa*, am the Subject / illuminator / observer Consciousness, and mind is the 'object' of my experience; i.e. 'I' am the 'observer' / 'subject' and the mind is the 'observed' / 'object'. But, when I am observing the mind, through the observation, I do another job; I lend my reflection- the 'chidhaabhaasaa' - to the mind and when my reflection is formed in the mind, the inert mind becomes a sentient mind; and, once the mind becomes sentient, the mind is capable of observing the world.

'I' am not observing the world ; 'I' am observing the mind only; and, while 'I' am observing the mind, the mind gets the *chidhaabhaasa* and with the *chidaabhaasa*, mind becomes the 'observer' and mind observes the world; in effect, the mind becomes the 'subject' and the world becomes the 'object'.

Thus, the mind is standing in between 'I' and the world and the mind being an intermediary entity, it has got both the 'object' status and the 'subject' status. From the standpoint of 'I', the *aathmaa*, the mind is the 'object' and from the standpoint of the world, mind becomes the 'subject'. It is therefore both 'subject' and 'object'.

To understand this, an example can be cited: The moon on a full moon day, when the bright moon illumines the earth; but, does the moon have 'brightness' or 'light' of its own? It is a well known fact, that, the moon does not have an illumining capacity of its own; it only has borrowed illumination from the sun. Therefore, the sun is illumining the moon and when the moon is illumined by the sun, it borrows the light from the sun and becomes the illuminator of the earth. So, if the query 'is moon an object of illumination or subject?' is made, it has to be clarified 'from which standpoint?'. From the standpoint of the sun, moon is the 'illumined object' and from the standpoint of the earth, the moon is the 'illuminator subject'. Therefore moon *ubhayam bibhrathu*. Just as the moon, in the example, has got twofold characteristics, the mind also has got twofold statuses – it is *dhrusyam*, as well as *dhrushtaa*.

So what? The mind is *dhrashtaa* with borrowed Consciousness; *aathmaa* is also *dhrashtaa* but with original Consciousness. Thus, within the body, there are two 'observers' – one is *aathmaa*, the 'observer' of the mind, with original Consciousness and the second is the 'mind', the 'observer' of the world, with borrowed Consciousness – similar to two illuminators – the sun and the moon – being in the sky. "*Ritham pibhanthau sukruthasya loke guhaam pravishtau parame paraardhe; chaayaa thapo brahmavidho vadhanti*" – "The knowers of *Brahman* say, that, *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, which are like shade and light, have entered the intellect within the supreme abode of *Paramaathmaa*, experiencing the result of their own actions in the body" (*Kathopanishad* – I. iii.1); "*dvaa suparnau sayuja sakaayaa*" – "Two birds with beautiful wings, which are close friends" (*Mundakopanishad* – III. I. 1) – all such *Upanishadic* statements refer to the two observers – (1) *aathmaa* and (2) the mind.

Because both of them are 'observers', 'confusion' results. We get confused between the secondary 'observer', the mind and the primary 'observer', the *aathmaa*. Wisdom consists in 'discrimination' between the two. This is the essence.

73. Chapter II, Verse 46 to 49 (03-11-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya, in this 46th verse, is pointing out that the mind is the cause of all the problems; because, the mind happens to be the intermediary entity which stands between *aathmaa*, the eternal *dhruk* / 'observer' and the external world, which is eternally the 'observed'.

With regard to the *aathmaa* and the world, their statuses are well defined and distinct. *Aathmaa* – the Consciousness, is ever the 'observer'; the external inert world is ever the 'observed'; whereas, only the mind, which is the intermediary entity, is enjoying the dual status of both the 'observer' and the 'observed'.

This dual status of the mind is responsible for the creation/emergence of *ahamkaaraa*, the pseudo-self/ the false self/the secondary self, otherwise called the ego. And, this ego, the secondary self, alone is causing the havoc, which is called *samsaaraa*. Therefore, until we clearly understand the pseudo-self and dismantle it properly, the problems of *samsaaraa* will not be solved.

Now, the next question is: "how does the mind enjoy the dual status?"

We have already seen that the mind also happens to be as inert as the external world and therefore, the mind should really come under *dhrusyam* – an object of observation only. For 'me', the *aathmaa/ saakshi*, the mind is *dhrusyam* – an object of observation/experience. But, even though the mind is really a *dhrusyam* and therefore, must be as much part of the world as a table or a chair or a pot, the mind enjoys another status also.

What is that status?

In the proximity of the primary Self ('I', the *aathmaa*) the mind not only gets illumined/experienced; but, since the mind is capable of borrowing 'consciousness' from 'me', 'I' lend 'consciousness' to the mind, as even as 'I' become aware of the mind. This is not a job that 'I' do; but, by 'my' mere presence, the mind not only gets awared or experienced; but also borrows *chaithanyam* from 'me'. With this borrowed *chaithanyam*, known technically as *chidhaabhaasaa* or *prathibhimbha chaithanyam*, the mind, which is intrinsically inert, becomes, for all practical purposes, a sentient entity – so sentient, that it is capable of becoming 'observer' no. 2 – the second or pseudo-self. To cite an example, the moon, which is intrinsically non-luminous, in the presence of the self-luminous sun, becomes bright and also acquires the capacity to illumine the earth. In a similar manner, the mind borrows sentiency from the primary Self and with this borrowed sentiency, the mind (the

pseudo self) becomes capable of functioning as the secondary 'observer', which is called *ahamkaaraa*. It is this mind which operates through the five sense organs and perceives the world.

Thus, within every individual body, there are two observers – one is the primary observer, which is the non-localized all-pervading Consciousness and the other is the secondary observer, which is the localized pseudo *ahamkaaraa*.

This primary 'I' and the secondary 'I' are *very* elaborately discussed by Adi Sankara, in his treatise, *Upadesa Saahasri*, in almost every chapter, even to the extent of tiring the student with the subject, since he considers it extremely important for the *Vedhaantic* seeker to differentiate between the *saakshi* 'I' and the *ahamkaaraa* 'I'.

The two – the *saakshi* 'I' and the *ahamkaaraa* 'I' - are physically inseparable. The nearest experience of the primary 'I', unadulterated with the pseudo 'I', is in the 'deep sleep' state - *sushupthi avasthaa*. In the 'deep sleep' state alone, one remains as the primary 'I', the *saakshi* 'I', the non-localized 'I', the non-individualized 'I', the *akartha-aboktha-asanghaa* 'I'. But, the moment one wakes up, the pseudo secondary 'I' also rises and the primary 'I' gets mixed up with the rising, the problem-causing pseudo secondary 'I'. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, one experiences a mixture of the real 'I' and the pseudo 'I'.

Sureswaraachaarya says, that, it is this *ahamkaaraa*, enjoying the dual status of (1) *dhrusyam*, i.e. the 'observed', from the point of the primary 'I' and (2) *dhruk*, the 'observer', from the standpoint of the world, that is causing the problems:

- अहं तदुभयं बिभ्रत् - The mind /the *ahamkaaraa* / the pseudo 'I', carrying the dual status (and in the process missing the original 'I'- described in the *Maandookya Upanishad* - verse 7 - as *na antha: pragnyam na bahi: pragnyam* etc.)
- भ्रान्तिं यच्छति - becomes the cause of confusion/ delusion,
- आत्मनि - with regard to the primary Self.

Ahamkaaraa can be a blessing, if it is utilized deliberately with the knowledge 'it is a temporary *vyaavahaarika* medium that I am using'. If with the firm knowledge and conviction 'it is the pseudo I and not the real I', one uses *ahamkaaraa*, then one is a *jeevan-muktha*: | Every transaction / *vyavahaaraa* – even *Vedhaanthic* study – requires *ahamkaaraa*. Using *ahamkaaraa* with wisdom is *jeevan mukthi*: / Messing up with *ahamkaaraa*, because of confusion, is *samsaaraa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 47:

ततः एव अयं अभिन्नस्य आत्मनः भेदबुद्धिः ।

It is by virtue of this that there is the idea of plurality with reference to the Self, though intrinsically it is absolutely one and undivided:

ततः एव - Because of this alone /the delusion caused by the pseudo Self alone (is the following problem).

What is the problem?

If the questions "Is 'I', the *aathmaa* singular or plural? How many *aathmaas* /Selves are there?" are raised, if one is aware of the primary Self/ the *aathmaa* / the *saakshi chaithanyam*, such a *jnaani* will reply: "*aathmaa* is only one, even though bodies are many". And not only would such a *jnaani* have *aathma advaita darsanam*; this *advaita darsanam* would lead to *aathma samathva darsanam* also.

Verse 29 – Ch. VI of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, "*sarvabhoothastham aathmaanam sarvabhoothaani cha aathmani eekshathe yoga yukthaathmaa sarvathra samadarsana:*" – "One whose mind is disciplined through meditation perceives the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self. He has the same vision everywhere" and Verse 18–Ch.V. "*Vidhyaa vinaya sampanne braahmane gavi hasthini suni chaiva svapaake cha pandithaa: samadarsina:* - "The wise see the same *Brahman* in a *brahmin* who has knowledge and humility, in a cow, in an elephant, in a dog and in a dog-eater", are both relevant and may be recalled, in this context.

Advaita darsanam and *sama darsanam* will be the consequences of 'knowing the primary Self'.

If, on the other hand, the primary Self is lost sight of and one is carried away by the pseudo secondary self, then, for such an individual, *aathmaa* will not be One, but will be plural. *Advaita darsanam* will be overpowered by *dvaita darsanam* and *sama darsanam* will be overshadowed by *visama darsanam*. The *dvaita, visama darsanam* is the cause of all the mischief in the mind; the tendency for comparison with others, jealousy, attachment, hatred etc. are all results of this *dvaita-visama darsanam*. *Adi Sankara*, in his *Bhaja Govindam*, remarks: "*thvayi mayi cha anyathra eko Vishnu: vyartham kupyasi mayi asahishnu:*" - "In you, in me, everywhere, there is but one *Vishnu*. Unable to bear with me, you get angry with me in vain". "*Eko Vishnur mahadbhootham pruthangboothanyanekasa: threen lokaan vyaapya bhoothaathmaa bhungthe visvabhugavyaya:*" is another well-known *sloka*, conveying a similar message.

Sureswaraachaarya says, that, all these are lost sight of, because of ignorance of the primary Self (*thatha: eva*).

- **आत्मनः इयं भेदबुद्धिः** - there is this misconception of plurality and divisiveness, with regard to aathmaa, the Self,

Iyam – this (a pronoun and adjective to beda buddhi:); Beda buddhi: - sense of plurality and divisiveness.

- **अभिन्नस्य** - (which Self is , really speaking) undivided / indivisible .

This is further clarified in the verse that follows.

Verse 47 – Chapter II :

- द्रुक् एका सर्वभूतेषु भाति द्रुश्यैः अनेकवत् ।
- जलभाजनभेदेन मयूकसूक् विभेदवत् ॥ ४७ ॥

Consciousness, which is one, appears as manifold owing to association with the multiplicity of objective phenomena. It is like the same sun appearing many owing to reflection in many vessels of water.

- **सर्वभूतेषु द्रुक् एका** - In all physical bodies, the original Self / the observer is only one.

The 'observer' talked of here, is the *Kshethragnya:*, mentioned in Ch.XIII, of the *Bhagavadh Githa* - "*Idham sareeram kshethram ithi abhidheeyathe; ethath ya: vetthi tham thadhvidha: kshethragnya: ithi praahu:*"- " This body is known as *Kshethram*. There is a conscious principle, which knows this body. Wise men declare that knower principle to be *Kshethragnya:*" (verse 2) and "*Kshethragnyam cha api maam viddhi sarvakshethreshu*"- "May you also know this *Kshethragnya:* to be Myself obtaining in all the bodies" (verse 3 – part).

The observing, changeless Consciousness is the only one 'Self'. But, even though the *chaithanyam* is only One,

- **अनेकवत् भाति** - (It) appears as though pluralistic / many / divided,

Who is responsible for this aberration?

- **द्रुश्यैः** - because of the mind which is really an object only.

Though the mind is only an 'object', it appears as a 'subject', because of *chidh aabhaasaa* ; instead of 'perceiving' the all-pervading 'Original Consciousness', the individual has a tendency to turn his attention to the localized 'Reflected Consciousness' in the mind, which is limited and subject to arrival and departure etc.

Why does the mind create the problems, but, the external objects do not? Because, the external objects do not have *chidhaabhaasaa*, while the mind has.

An example is given by the *Achaaryaa*, for this phenomenon.

- **मयूकस्सक् विभेदवत्** – (This is) similar to the (apparent) plurality of the sun,

Mayookam – *rasmi*: / beam of light / ray of light; *sak* – *maala* / garland ; *mayookassrak* – the one that is wearing the *maalaa* of beams of light and, therefore, meaning 'the sun']
Vibedham – plurality.

- **जलभाजनभेदेन** - caused by reflections in many vessels of water.

Jalabhaajanam – vessel of water.

Even though the original sun is *ekam* (only one), its reflections can be *anekam* (many).

In the treatise *Hasthaamalakeeyam*, the author, *Hasthaamalakaa*, an immediate disciple of *Adi Sankara*, teaches the entire *Vedhaanthaa* - conveying all important topics - in just twelve verses, with the single *dhrushtaantham* of the sun and its reflections.

(An incidental note: On this well-known simile of the sun and its reflections, Swami Chinmayananda brings out a fact in a humorous manner. When the sun gets reflected in a bucket of water, the bucket can be compared to the *sthoola sareeram*, the water to the *sookshma sareeram*, the sun to the Original Consciousness/ the *chaithanyam* and the *soorya prathibhimham* in the water to the *chidhaabhaasaa*. If the bucket is kicked and the water disturbed, the reflection of the sun is obviously lost, but, the real sun is, of course, not affected. Punning on the phrase 'kicking the bucket', "when death occurs", Swamiji points out, "the *sthoola sareeram* loses the *sookshma sareeram*/ the mind – and consequently the *chidhaabhaasaa*. But, just as the physical action of 'kicking the bucket' disturbs only the reflection of the sun and not the original sun, the metaphorical 'kicking the bucket' (used in the sense 'occurrence of death') does not affect the existence of the original Consciousness / *chaithanyam*, but only the *chidaabhaasaa*").

In the example given by Sureswaraacharya, in this verse, the plurality of the containers, is transferred to the *soorya*, which itself is really not plural. *Aathma bahuthvam* is also a similar misconception. This confusion is not only for lay-people; it is maintained even by certain other systems of philosophy. *Saankhyaa* talks about pluralistic *aathmaa*. *Pathanjali Maharishi*, who is considered to be a great philosopher, who has given the *Yoga soothraas*

and who has talked about *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, also talks of *aathma darsanam* in *samaadhi*; but, the *aathmaa* he talks about is pluralistic *aathmaa*. *Nyaayaa*, *vaiseshikaa*, *poorva meemaamsaa*, *dvaitha darsanam* of *Madhvaachaaryaa* and *visishtaadvaita darsanam* of *Ramaanujaachaaryaa* – all of them talk of 'many' *aathmaas*. In *Advaita* alone, *Aathma ekathvam* is stressed, plurality being accepted by *Advaitam* only in relation to *chidhaabhaasa*, the fake *aathmaa*/pseudo self.

The example "in spite of the plurality of the reflection, the non-duality of the sun is continuing", also stresses "the *dvaitha aathmaa* **need not become** *advaitam*; *advaitam* is not a goal to be accomplished; but, the 'oneness' is an established fact, and will continue, in spite of the seeming plurality at the level of the pseudo self".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 48:

- यथोक्त अर्थस्य प्रतिपत्तये दृष्टान्तः ।

To facilitate the understanding of the principle enunciated, an analogy is offered:

- **दृष्टान्तः** - ('I shall give you', the *Aachaaryaa* says,) 'an example',
- **प्रतिपत्तये** - for the clear understanding
Prathipatthi: - *jnaanam*
- **यथोक्त अर्थस्य** - of the above-mentioned idea (the non-duality of *aathma*, in spite of the plurality of the *chidhabhaasaa* / reflection).

"Plurality of *ahamkaaraa* cannot disturb the non-duality of the real 'I'" is the message, which Sureswaraachaarya wants to establish/clarify with an example. The *Aachaaryaa* gives the example in the verse following.

Chapter II: Verse 48 –

मित्रोदासीनशत्रुत्वं यथैकस्यान्यकल्पनात् ।

अभिन्नस्य चित्ते :तद्वत् भेदोन्तःकरणाश्रयः ॥ ४८ ॥

The same individual becomes a friend, a stranger and an enemy, in relation to three classes of other individuals. Even so, the same undivided consciousness appears divided owing to association with a plurality of minds.

What is the example? Imagine a particular person observed by different people; each one judges/assesses the person according to one's own *raagha-dvesha* (we are judged by people all the time; we can never stop others from judging / categorizing / labeling us – since 'judging' is the job of human intellect – especially intellects which are not otherwise employed); each observer gives a label to the observed person. Sureswaraachaaryaa says "whatever labels the others give me, are not going to affect me at all".

- **यथा** - In the same manner as
- **मित्र(त्वं)** - feeling of friendship (or)
- **उदासीन(त्वं)** - feeling of indifference (or)
- **शत्रुत्वं** - feeling of enmity
- **अन्यकल्पनात्** - is superimposed by different people,
- **एकस्य** - on one and the same individual,

Whatever be the 'labels' given by others to a particular individual and however much the 'labels' differ, there is no real *bedha* or difference in the individual himself. His personality will be the same. If the 'labels' really belong to the individual, he will have to have inconsistent attributes, which is logically not possible. One and the same locus cannot have opposite attributes. *Mithrathvam* and *sathruthvam* cannot co-exist; they are not the individual's attributes; but are only super-impositions – *mithyaa* attributes, which cannot cause any difference in the locus. (This fact will have to be applied to the *aathmaa* also).

In to-day's context, marriages and divorces furnish typical examples. Even as a married couple push for a divorce, because of misunderstanding between the two, there may be suitors waiting to marry the divorcee, proving that one and the same person evokes different feelings in different people. Also incidents are not lacking, where a love-marriage ends in a divorce and separation – proving that the *same* person can have *different* feelings towards his/her spouse at different times.

(An incidental moral: One cannot be carried away by others' opinions about oneself, since others' opinions will necessarily be very varied and one cannot please all others. The best option is to live according to *saasthric* injunctions, turning a blind eye to others' reactions.)

- **तद्धत्** - in the same way,
- **भेदः** - differences
- **अभिन्नस्य चित्तेः** - of one and the same chaithanyam,
- **अन्तःकरणाश्रयः** - are all attributes belonging to the mind (but are transferred to 'I').

Looking at the properties of the reflected Consciousness (*chidhaabhaasaa*), we have a tendency to transfer the attributes of the *chidhaabhaasa* to the *chith*, which is the real 'I' and which is free from all attributes – *Na me dvesha raaghau, na me lobamohau, madho naive me naive maascharya bhaava: na dharmo na chaartha na kamo na moksha: chidhaanandha roopa: sivoham sivoham*. Because of the *antha:karanam* – the mind – we transfer or super-impose attributes to the attributeless *chith*.

Even an advanced *Vedhaanthic* student sometimes says: "I know I am *Brahman*, but, I have got *vipareetha bhaavanaas* which I have to remove. I have to do *vaasanaa kshayam*". But this statement is fallacious. *Vipareetha bhaavanaas* and *vaasanaas* belong to *anatha:karana* only and once the student has disengaged himself from the *anatha:karana* (as he claims he is *Brahman*), how can he talk about *vaasanaa kshaya* and *vipareetha bhavaanaa nivritthi:?* Such a statement will only show that *saasthraas* have not still been properly internalized and that more intensive *sravanam*, *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are called for.

Chapter II: Verse 49 –

अपहारो यथा भानो :सर्वतो जलपात्रकै :।

तत्क्रियाकृतिदेशाप्ति :तथा बुद्धिभि :आत्मन :॥ ४९ ॥

Just as the sun is taken possession of, as it were, by several vessels of water and seems to enter into the place, form and operations of each of them, so it seems to happen to the Self, in relation to the minds.

Here, Sureswaraachaarya says "*ahamkaaraa* is fake self and the fake / false self consequently should have no power and the original / real Self must be strong. i.e. normally speaking the 'weak' fake self, should not have the capacity to overshadow the 'strong' real Self. But, because of *maayaa*, the *ahamkaaraa* which is really *mithyaa*, becomes so powerful as to overshadow the real, free 'I'; the result: what is prevalent is the *samsaari* 'I', the *ahamkaaraa* only". In day-to-day transactions, the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* robs the real 'I'.

- **यथा** - Just as
- **भानो: अपहार:** - the 'taking away' (hiding) of the real sun
- **सर्वत:** - totally (takes place)
- **जलपात्रकै:** - by the bowls of water,

How do they (the bowls of water) do that? They create reflections – 'pseudo' suns; and we are absorbed in the 'pseudo' suns and consequently miss the original sun.

The sun, which has now 'descended' to the bowl (the fake sun), borrows the attributes of the holder.

- **तत् क्रिया आकृति देशाप्ति:** - by the sun acquiring the movements, the shapes and places of each of the containers,

When the bowl is moved from one place to another, the sun (reflected in the bowl) also seems to move from place to place.

In the same manner, when the *chidaabhaasaa* goes from one place to another, the real 'I' also seems to go from one *janma* to another. In reality, 'I' am incapable of *punarjanama*, which, in essence, is 'traveling from one body to another', which is possible only for the

chidhaabhaasa – the pseudo 'I'. The real 'I' does not go from one *janma* to another and therefore does not require *videha mukthi*. An informed *Vedhaanthin* will not, therefore, desperately work for avoidance of *punar janma*. Such an attempt would be similar to remove poison from the rope-snake.

- **तथा** - in the same manner

The *sthoola sareeram* is the vessel; the *buddhi* is the water in the bowl ; 'I' am the original sun – not the temporary reflection.

- **बुद्धिभिः** - because of the minds / intellects,
- **आत्मनः (क्रियाकृतिदेशाप्तिः भवति)** - for the Self, (the acquiring/ borrowing of the shape, form and locus of the *chidhaabhaasaa* occurs)

Really speaking 'I' am *sathyam, jnaanam, anantham brahma*.

74. Chapter II, Verse 49 to 52 (10-11-2007)

In these verses, Sureswaraachaarya points out that *ahamkaaraa* is the cause of all the problems.

In this context, by the word *ahamkaaraa*, we mean the 'mind with *chidaabhaasa'* - especially the mind. Though in *Thathva Bodhaa*, *ahamkaaraa* is defined as a particular type of thought, known as 'I' thought, here, the word *ahamkaaraa* does not mean the 'I' thought, but, means the object of 'I' thought.

The object of 'I' thought is the *ahamkaaraa*, which is the 'mind plus *chidaabhaasa'*. And, in this also, the *Achaaryaa* is concentrating on the mind, which is the cause of all problems.

Sureswaraachaaryaa also gives the reason for that, the reason being "mind is standing in between the *aathmaa* and the world". The world is always an 'object' for me; *aathmaa* is always *saakshi*, the 'subject'; *aathmaa* is **ever** the *dhruk* and the world is **ever** the *dhrusyam*; the intermediary mind, like the doorsill, is in between the *dhruk* and the *dhrusyam* and because of this intermediary status, it enjoys both the subjecthood as well as the objecthood. From the standpoint of *aathmaa*, the *saakshi*, the mind becomes the object and from the standpoint of the world, the mind becomes the subject. Thus, the mind is 'observed' by the *saakshi* and is the 'observer' of the world. This 'observer' makes the cause for the confusion. How does this confusion come? Because the mind also serves as observer, there are two observers within the individual – one is the original observer, the *aathmaa - saakshi* and the second is the mind which has got the observer status, blessed by the *aathmaa*. And, because of the proximity of the two observers, the attribute of one observer is transferred to the other - similar to water, added to milk, acquiring the colour of the milk, because of its proximity to the milk. The attributes of the secondary observer, i.e. the mind, are transferred to the *aathmaa*, the primary observer. Thus, there is an interaction between the *aathmaa* and the mind - *aathmaa* lends *chaithanyam* to the mind and the mind seemingly lends its attributes to the *aathmaa*. What are the attributes transferred? The limitation of the mind is transferred to the limitless *aathmaa*; the modifications of the mind are transferred to the non-changing *aathmaa*; the plurality of the mind is transferred to the non-dual *aathmaa*. Because of these 'transfers' (the attributes are not really transferred; but, appear transferred because of confusion) the original *aathmaa* is obscured, since we lose sight of the original *aathmaa*, just as the screen is lost sight of, when we are lost in the movie.

Sureswaraachaarya gives the well-known example: "just as the original sun is forgotten, when we are absorbed in the images of the sun reflected in containers of water and the

attributes of the reflecting media are transferred to the sun, even though the sun does not have these attributes". He mentions (in verse 49) three attributes of the reflecting media, that are transferred to the sun – (1) *kriyaa* – motion (2) *aakruthi* – shape and (3) *desa* - location. The motion, the form and the location of the water containers are transferred to the sun. In the same way, the attributes of the mind (comparable to the water containers) get transferred to the *aathmaa* (comparable to the sun).

Does that mean that the essence of the teaching is 'to abolish or ban the secondary observer, the mind?' No; we need not, in fact, should not destroy the *ahamkaaraa* / mind, since transactions are possible only through the mind. The concept of *mano naasam* is self-deception. "Keep the mind; but, understand that the attributes of the mind do not belong to 'me'". This is called *aathma – anaathma viveka*: |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 50:

न च विरुद्धधर्माणाम् एकत्र अनुपपत्तिः। किं कारणम् ।

There is no impossibility in contradictory attributes co-inhering in the same substratum. Because:

Sureswaraachaarya foresees an objection: "If *aathmaa* is the limitless entity, how can the attribute of 'limitation', belonging to the mind, be transferred to the *aathmaa*? One of the attributes of the mind is limitation and if 'limitation' is transferred to the *aathmaa*, then, in that event, *aathmaa* will have two opposite attributes – the original attribute of 'limitlessness' and the transferred attribute of 'limitation'. How can one and the same *aathmaa* possess two opposite attributes? How can both *parichchinnathvam* and *aparichchinnathvam* co-exist in one *aathmaa*? Similarly, how can plurality and non-duality co-exist in one and the same *aathmaa* - non-duality being the original nature of *aathmaa* and plurality, an attribute transferred from the mind? There is a law that 'opposite attributes cannot co-exist in one locus'. And, therefore, how can totally opposite attributes be transferred from the mind to the *aathmaa*?"

Sureswaraachaarya says "I will answer".

- **विरुद्धधर्माणाम् एकत्र अनुपपत्तिः** - Co-existence of contradictory attributes in the same locus/substratum

Viruddha dharmaanaam – of contradictory/ opposite attributes; *ekathra* – in one and the same substratum/ locus; *anupapatthi*: - co-existence.

"*Viruddha dharmaanaam ekathra anupapatthi*:" - "(Is this) co-existence of opposite attributes in the same locus (possible)?" - is the doubt of the student.

The teacher's answer is:

- न च - Such a doubt need not be entertained .

In the case of *aathmaa*, these opposite attributes - such as '*advayathvam* – *sadhvayathvam*' – can co-exist. Why? Because, one attribute is *sathyam* and the other is *mithyaa* (super-imposed). Super-imposed opposite attribute can happily co-exist with the *sathya* original attribute. The dry sand can have mirage water flowing over the sand – the sand can continue to be dry and the mirage water can continue to flow over the dry sand. If a question 'how can dry sand and wet water co-exist?' is raised, the reply will be 'the water is *mithyaa*, while the sand is relatively *sathyam*. Therefore, the sand can continue to be dry, in spite of the *mithyaa* water flowing over it'. The 'limitlessness' of *aathmaa* can co-exist with the super-imposed 'limitation', because the super-imposed 'limitation' is *mithyaa*, while the 'limitlessness' of *aathmaa* is *sathyam*.

- किं कारणम् - Why (is there no problem in this co-existence)?

The answer is given in the following verse.

(Chapter II): Verse 50 –

कल्पितानां अवस्तुत्वात् स्यात् एकत्र अपि संभवः।

कमनीया असुचिः स्वाद्वी इति एकस्यां इव योषिति ॥ ५० ॥

Fancied constructions, even if contradictory, can very well be referred to the same locus. The same maiden may be looked upon as charming, impure and delicious.

When it is said, that, the 'limitation' of the mind is transferred to the *aathmaa*, it is not really transferred; but, because of delusion, it is 'imagined' as transferred to *aathmaa* ; in other words, *aathmaa* acquires only 'imaginary' limitation; so also plurality of *aathmaa*, which is also only 'imaginary'.

- कल्पितानां अवस्तुत्वात् - Because of the *mithyaa* nature of the imagined /superimposed attributes,

Avasthu – *mithyaa*; *Avasthuthvam* – nature of being *mithyaa*; *kalpithaa*: – what are imagined or superimposed.

An example is the mirage water.

Therefore only:

- **एकत्र अपि संभवः स्यात्** - (they) can co-exist in the same substratum

Ekathra – in one and the same locus; *sambhava: syaath* - is possible.

An imaginary attribute can co-exist in the same substratum with the real nature of the substratum, even if the imaginary attribute is opposite/ contradictory to the real nature.

Sureswaraachaarya gives an example; a similar example has been given earlier (in verse 48): 'one and the same person is looked upon as a friend by someone and as an enemy by certain others'. "Enemy status' and 'friend status' are opposite attributes; how can one and the same person simultaneously enjoy these opposite statuses? Is it not illogical? " If such a question is asked, the answer is "both statuses are not intrinsic properties / attributes present in a person, unlike height, weight etc. of the person (which are intrinsic), but, they (*sathruthvam* and *mithrathvam*) are superimposed by others; i.e. they are mental projections of others. Therefore, they can co-exist in one and the same person".

Here, in this verse, a slightly different example is given by the *Achaaryaa*.

- **एकस्यां इव योषिति** - In one and the same woman, *Yoshiith* – *sthree* / *naaree* / woman.

In one and the same innocent woman, three different personalities are seen.

- **कमनीया** - (One person sees) a woman worthy of being loved / deserving to be loved.
- **अशुचिः** - (Another person, having developed an aversion for worldly desires, sees her as) a filthy person.
- **स्वाद्धी** - (A dog sees the woman as) delicious food.
- **इति (स्यात्)** - Such a thing happens.

The body of the woman itself does not have any one of these attributes as intrinsic ; but, from the different viewpoints of the different viewers, it 'acquires' the three different attributes and even though the attributes are of contradictory / opposite nature, they co-exist in the same person. *Kamaneeyaa* and *asuchi*: respectively denote lovability and filthiness – which are of opposite nature; but, co-existing in the same person. This is because they are imaginary mental projections – *kalpithathvaath*.

In the same manner, though *aathmaa* does not have attributes of its own ("na me *dvesharaagau na me lobhamohau madho naiva me naiva maathsaryabhaava: / na dharmo na chaartha na kaamo na moksha: chidaanandaroopa: sivoham sivoham*" – *Nirvaana*

shatkam of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadaa*) attributes are transferred to it from *ahamkaaraa* - as *raaghee*, *dveshee* etc. Even *mokshaa* is the attribute of the mind only; confused mind is *baddha:* and enlightened mind is *muktha:*; *aathmaa* is neither *baddha:* nor *muktha:* |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 51:

न च अयं क्रिया कारक पलात्मक आभास ईषदपि प्रमार्थवस्तु स्पृशति तस्य मोहमात्र उपादानत्वात् ।

This fictitious presentation of the nature of action, factors involved in action and the result of action, do not affect ultimate reality in the least, being solely the products of delusion.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is leading the student to the 'binary format' perception, since, if one develops the 'binary format' perception, one's problems cease.

What is meant by the term 'binary format' perception? The conviction: "I am the *saakshi-aathmaa* and everything observed by 'me' is *anaathmaa*". 'Binary' means 'dual' or 'consisting of two' – (1) *aathmaa* - 'I' and (2) *anaathmaa* – everything else, the world, which is 'observed', the body, which is 'observed' and the mind, which is also 'observed'. This entire *anaathmic prapanchaa*, consisting of the world, the body and the mind, is only *aabhaasa:/mithyaa* / of a lower order of reality. Compared to the *aathmaa/thureeyam*, mind is of a lesser order of reality and is called *vyaavahaarika sathyam*.

- अयं – This entire universe
- आत्मकः - which is in the form of the three components,

What are the components?

- कारका(णि) – various objects which are used for performing *karma* / accessories for *Karma*

Kaarakam is an expression used in the *saasthraas* to denote objects that are used for performing action; body is a *kaarakam*, since it is used for *karma*. Mind is a *kaarakam*, used for *karma*; sense organs are also *kaarakaani*, used for *karma*. Even family members are *kaarakaani*, used for *samashti karma*.

When the *kaarakaani* join together, what is born?

- क्रिया - Varieties of *karmaani* – *loukika* or *vaidika* / actions – secular or sacred (whether *kaayikam*, *maanasam* or *vaachikam*)

The '*kriyaa-kaarak'* in the text is consciously has been changed as '*kaaraka-kriyaa'*, while interpreting, since *kriyaa* is born out of *kaarakam*. *Kaaraka janyaa* is *kriyaa*.

And, *kriyaa janyam* is *palam* i.e. action produces result. Varieties of actions produce varieties of results.

- पलानि - results.

This body itself is a *palam* of *poorva janma karma*, and will become a *kaarakam*, with regard to the next *janma*. Thus, every object is both *kaarakam* and *palan*. The whole *dhrusya prapancha* is, therefore, *Kriyaakaarakapalaathmaka*: - of the nature of (1) factors involved in action, (2) actions and (3) the results of action.

Such an universe is,

- आभासः - *mithyaa* (from the standpoint of *thureeya chaithanyam* – the *aathmaa*).

If the question "Is the world real or unreal?" is raised, it cannot be answered straightaway. It has to be countered: "Is the question from the stand-point of the body-mind or from the standpoint of *aathmaa*?" If it is from the standpoint of the body, the world is *mahaa-real*, since whatever happens in the world affects the body; from the standpoint of the mind also, the world is very real, since events in the world influence the mind also. From body-mind standpoint, the world is, therefore, real. From the *thureeyam* standpoint only, the world is unreal. In the un-enlightened stages (when the perception is the triangular format of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*), the world would be real; but, when the binary format (of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*) is reached, the universe is *aabhaasa*: / *mithyaa*.

But, why is it *aabhaasa*: / *mithyaa*? Sureswaraachaarya points out:

- मोहमात्र उपादानत्वात् - Because, it is created by *avidyaa* or *maayaa*.

It is a product of ignorance; at the *samashiti* level it is a product of *maayaa*.

- *Moham* (in this context) – *ajnaanam* / *moolaavidhya* / *maayaa*
- *Upaadhaanam* – *Kaaranam*.

The universe is projected by ignorance and is therefore *mithyaa*.

If, then, the question "how do you call this tangible / perceived / useful world as *mithyaa*?" is raised, the answer can be found in the *Maandookya Kaarika*, where Goudapaadaachaarya has discussed this elaborately, by giving the example: "Just as a dreamer, *in dream*, will never accept the dream as unreal, in a similar manner, the ignorant,

during ignorance, will never accept the world as unreal. But, on waking up, i.e. on getting enlightened, the world will be perceived as *mithyaa*." (The reference is to *Kaarikaa* 16 – *Aagamaprakaranam – Maandookya Karikaa*: "anaadhimaayaya suptha: jeeva: prabudhyathe ajam anidram asvapnam advaitham budhyathe" – "having slept, due to beginningless *maayaa*, when the individual wakes up, then, he knows the non-dual Self, which is birthless, dreamless and sleepless".)

The conclusion: "'I', the *aathmaa*, is *sathyam*; the *anaathmaa*, including the mind is *mithyaa*; therefore, the *anaathmaa* cannot affect me in any manner. 'I' am *asanga*."

- ईषदपि - even a little bit / even in the least (just as the mirage water cannot wet the dry sand, even a little bit)
- न स्पृशति - cannot taint or affect,

What cannot taint? The *kriyaakaarakapalaathmaka prapancha*: - the world including the mind.

Cannot taint what?

- परमार्थ वस्तु - the absolutely real entity (called *aathmaa*) .

That's why, it is pointed out, that, if a seeker makes a statement: " I know I am *aathmaa*; but, I have to do long *nidhidhyaasanam* – I have to practice meditation - to remove my *vipareetha bhaavanaa* or for *vaasana kshayam*", such a statement is considered fallacious, since, obviously the seeker has not realized that *aathmaa* has no *vaasanaas*. It is true, that, the *mind* has *vaasanaas*; but, neither the mind nor the *vaasanaas* of the mind can touch 'me'. Claiming this i.e. "'I' am untouched by *vaasanaas*" is the 'meditation' to be done. 'Removing the *vaasanaas*' is not the meditation required. Sureswaraachaarya explains this in the verse following.

Chapter II: Verse 51 –

अभूत अभिनिवेशेन स्वात्मानं वञ्चयति अयम् ।

असत्यपि द्वितीयेर्धे सोमशर्मपिता यथा ॥ ५१ ॥

Even though there is nothing second to the Self, the world deceives itself by interesting itself in the unreal, just as the father of Somasarman did.

Abhootha abhinivesa: is an idiom used by Goudapaadhaachaarya in his *Mandookya Kaarikaa* – Chapter IV (verses 75 and 79). The expression means 'a strong feeling that there is a real world existing outside me'. This intense notion /obsession – is called *abhinivesa*; *abhootha*: means 'even though it is not there'. (This is similar to 'megalomania', due to which, a perfectly healthy individual, after reading about a health disorder, gets a strong notion, that

he is affected by that disorder, because 'fear' can project non-existent things; greater the fear, greater the projection; and the unreal projection may become a reality, even creating the disorder.)

Sureswaraachaarya says: "There is no world outside you really existing; but, the *abhinivesa*, that, 'there is a real world existing outside me' is strongly there. In effect, I, myself, give existence to this world; and having provided existence to the world, I, myself, am persecuted by the very same world. I project the world – I empower the world – I get persecuted by the world – I complain – I cry out '*Hey Guro ! thraahi maam ! rakasha maam durvaara samsaara davaagni thaptham*'. This is the drama called *samsaaraa*".

This fact seems to be unbelievable; but, can be better appreciated by the example of the dream. Out of my own *vaasanaas* /my own *samskaaraas*, I, myself, project a dream world, I give existence / reality to the unreal dream world and I feel persecuted by my own dream and pray to *Bhagavaan* for *dhussvapana naasanam*.

- **अभूत अभिनिवेशेन** - By the strong projection of the non-existent/ because of the obsession with regard to the non-existent

This is similar to a game played by children. One child presses a coin hard on the forehead of another and quietly removes the coin, leaving the second child with the feeling, because of the pressure exerted, that the coin is still on its forehead. Then the first child will make an offer to the second, that, if the second child is able to make the coin fall down by a hit on the rear of the head, the coin will become the property of the second child; the first child will also generously offer three chances. Obviously, the second child cannot win the stake, though, in the process, it gets three self-inflicted violent hits on the back of its head.

- **स्वात्मानं अयं वञ्चति** - an individual fools/ cheats himself (doing varieties of *loukika* / *vaidhika* / *vedhaantha parihaaraas* for solving non-existent problems),
- **द्वीतेये अर्थे असति अपि** - even though there is no second entity other than 'me', the *aathmaa*,

This should be carefully understood: From the standpoint of the mind, second entity **is** there – the world **is** separate from the mind; but, from the *aathmaa* standpoint, there is neither the mind, nor is the world separate from the *aathmaa*.

But, even though a second entity is not there, the 'ignorant' continue in self-delusion and as a result continue to harm themselves. Sureswaraachaarya gives the example from a well-known, traditional story, of a *brahmachaari*, who lived on *bikshaa* collected from various households. One afternoon, after collecting *bikshaa*, the *brahmachaari* felt drowsy and

sitting under a tree, indulged in day-dreaming of his future: "After *brahmacharyam*, I will become a scholar, get married and also become a father of a boy, whom I will name Soma Sarma. And, if, any time, my wife ill-treats my dear child, I will kick her". While thus imagining, he really kicked out violently ; the kick landed on the mud-pot in which he had collected his day's *bikshaa*, breaking the pot and spilling out all the *bikshaa* also. Thus, he landed himself into a real problem, because of imaginary circumstances.

- **सोमशर्मपिता यथा** - in the manner of the father of the (non-existent /imagined) Soma Sarma.

Just as the father of the non-existent Soma Sarma got into a problem, because of his imagination, the 'ignorant' also are hurting themselves through imagination of non-existent entities (the world / body / mind etc.)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 52:

वस्तु याथात्म्य अनवबोध पटल अवनद्धाक्षः सन् ।

One whose vision is blocked by the non-apprehension of Reality –

The idea is almost repeated here, with another example. What the *Achaaryaa* wants to emphasize is, that, the whole problem is one of ignorance. Because of ignorance alone, the secondary observer mind, the *ahamkaaraa*, has become real. The *ahamkaaraa*, which, in reality, is unreal, is causing all the problems. To solve the problems, one need not destroy the *ahamkaaraa*, but only 'understand' the *ahamkaaraa* and learn to 'use' the *ahamkaaraa*. Understand that the *ahamkaaraa* is only a *veshaa* and that you are only taking part in a 'drama', while, in reality, you are the *saakshi aathmaa*. Live the life of the *saakshi*, with *ahamkaaraa veshaa*, when life appears as an entertainment; on the other hand, if one loses sight of the *saakshi* nature and 'becomes' the *ahamkaaraa*, then life also 'becomes' a struggle. This is the only solution, the *Achaaryaa* says.

- **अवनद्ध अक्षः** - With the eyes of wisdom covered,
Avanadaa – covered. By what?
- **अनवबोध पटलः** - by the film of ignorance,
Patalam – membrane / film; anavabodha – ignorance. Ignorance of what?
- **वस्तु याथात्म्यं** - of the real nature of things.

What is meant by the real nature of things?

That, I am a composite entity, consisting of two components (1) 'I', the Real *saakshi* and (2) the unreal *vesha ahamkaaraa*. And, that, I am playing the drama of life, with *ahamkaara vesha*: |

One should watch events in life, as one watches a movie or play; you get engrossed with the characters in the movie/play, but, never forget that they are only imaginary characters in the movie / play. Even a *jnaanai* can cry; but, should have the capacity to rise himself to the binary format, at will.

75. Chapter II, Verse 51 to 54 (17-11-2007)

Verse 52 – Chapter II:

सुभ्रूःसुनासा सुमुखी सुनेत्रा चारुहासिनी ।

कल्पनामात्र संमोहात् रामेति आलिङ्गते असुचिम् ॥ ५२ ॥

Embraces, under the delusion born of mere fancy, a thing impure, calling it a beautiful woman, with eyebrows, nose, face and smiles all charming.

Sureswaraachaarya is talking about the nature of *ahamkaaraa* – how it is only *anaathmaa* and how this *ahamkaaraa* is becoming the cause of *samsaaraa*.

First, he points out, that, *ahamkaaraa* is the pseudo 'I' / the false 'I', when the mind, the *anaathmaa* is mistaken as 'myself'.

The mind is mistaken as 'myself', because of a reason, which is a legitimate reason. And, what is that? Sureswaraachaarya said: "Mind is nothing but an 'object' of my experience only; and it is *jadam* only; and it is also made up of the *pancha bhoothaas*, like the external world; and, the mind is illumined by 'me', the *aathmaa*, by 'my' mere presence. Illumination is **not** a job that 'I' do; but, in 'my' presence, the mind gets illumined. And, the mind has got a subtle and refined nature, because it is made of *sookshma bhoothaani*, and, therefore, while the mind gets illumined by me, it also receives a reflection of 'me', the Consciousness, which reflection is called *chidhaabhaasa*:. Thus, 'I' illumine the mind and lend *chidhaabhaasaa* to the mind simultaneously. 'Illumination' and 'lending *chidhaabhaasaa*' are both simultaneous, which 'jobs' 'I' do, without 'doing' anything, without willing/ wishing / planning / desiring / acting etc., but, merely by 'my' presence. The moment the mind receives *chidhaabhaasaa*, the mind also gets the capacity to illumine the external world; the mind, the 'illumined', also becomes an 'illuminator', though 'secondary'. Thus, the mind has a dual status – it is 'illumined' by 'me', the *aathmaa* and it is the 'illuminator' of the world. Because of this reason, there are two illuminators within the body – one is 'I', the original illuminator, *aathmaa* and the second is the 'secondary illuminator', the mind – *dhrashtaa* 1, the primary and *dhrashtaa* 2, the secondary. And, because the mind functions similar to *aathmaa*, in being a *dhrashtaa*, it can be said to 'imitate' the *aathmaa* in being a *dhrashtaa* / an illuminator/ a sentient observer; And, because the mind imitates the *aathmaa*, the mind is mistaken as 'I', the *aathmaa*'.

The mind is thus the pseudo 'I' and since it is the pseudo 'I', it is called *ahamkaaraa*: - the suffix '*kaaraa*' indicating that, it is the pseudo 'I' and not the real 'I'. The real 'I', the *aathmaa*, in reality, has no connection with the *bhogyaa prapanchaa*. Therefore, the original 'I' / the real 'I', being the *asanga aathmaa*, is not a *bokthaa*, whereas, the mind/ the *ahamkaaraa* / the

pseudo 'I', has got connection with *bhogya prapanchaa* – is a *sasangha*: - and is, therefore, a *bokthaa*. But, because of the confusion as explained above, I have taken the *ahamkaaraa*/ the pseudo 'I', as the real 'I' and look upon myself as a *bokthaa* and claim *sambhandha* with *boghya prapanchaa*. Having thus mistaken 'me' as a *bokthaa* and mistakenly claiming *sambhandha* with *boghya prapanchaa*, I commit a third, the most dangerous blunder – of concluding that I get *aanandaa* through *boghya sambhandha*.

The blunders are, thus, (1) conversion of an *abokthaa* into a *boktha* (2) creation of a non-existent *sambhandha* with the *boghya prapanchaa* and (3) concluding that *boghya sambhandha* gives happiness.

The consequences of the third - the most dangerous - blunder above, are (1) the perpetuation of *bokthaa* and *bhogya sambhandhaa* and (2) seeking of *aanandaa* from the world.

According to *Vedhanthaa* (though Sureswaraachaaryaa does not mention it here), the *boghya prapanchaa* does not have any *aanandaa* to be given to 'me'; all the *aanandaa* belongs only to the original 'I' ; and, this original *aanandaa* **alone** gets manifested, when certain *boghya vasthus* – objects of enjoyment - serve as 'mirrors'. For every person, depending upon innumerable factors, including *praarabhdaa*, different objects serve as 'mirrors' and when those 'mirrors' are looked upon, the *aanandaa* of 'I' get reflected in / manifested by/ appear in those 'mirrors'; but, the wrong conclusion is reached that the objects themselves possess the *aanandaa*, as absurd as concluding that, when one looks into a (real) mirror, the mirror has got one's 'face'. Every enjoyment is only a manifestation of the intrinsic *aanandaa* of the Self. But, the *samsaaree* commits the blunders (1) becoming *boktha* (2) developing *boghya sambhandhaa* and (3) concluding that *aanandaa* comes out of the *boghya sambhandhaa* and (4) therefore, struggling to retain that *sambhandhaa* – all the blunders resulting from the basic mistake of considering the pseudo 'I' / the *ahamkaaraa*, as myself.

This is what has been concisely expressed by the *Achaaryaa*, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 52, as "*vasthu yaathaathmya anavabodha patala avanaadha aksha:*" – "blinded by the thin membrane of ignorance of the *svaroopam* of the *aathmaa*".

"*anava bhoda patala avanadda aksha:*" means "blinded by the veil/membrane of ignorance", similar to "*Ajaana thimira andha:*" (from the *Guru Sthothra*). *Patalam* and *thimiram* are synonymous. Ignorance of what?

Vasthu- Reality / *aathma*

Yaathaathmyam means `svaroopam`.

The *svaroopam* of *aathmaa* is *aanandam*. *Vasthuyaathaathmyam* means *aathma aananda svaroopam*. The ignorance of the fact "I am the **only** source of *aananda*" is the problem. Because of this, the 'ignorant' consider themselves as *bokthaas* and look for *bhogya vasthus*.

In this verse 52, the *Aachaaryaa* is talking about one's wife, as the *bhogyam*.

- सुभ्रूः - One with beautiful eyebrows,
- सुनासा - One with beautiful nose,
- सुमुखी – One with beautiful face,
- सुनेत्रा - One with beautifully eyes,
- चारुहासिनी – One with charming/ endearing smiles.

The *ajani samsaari*, who takes the pseudo I / *bokthaa* / *ahamkaaraa* as himself and relates to the *bhogya pathni*, looks upon his wife, as endowed with beautiful eyebrows, nose, face, eyes and smiles and therefore considers her as a *raamaa* / *sukha hethu*: / source of happiness.

- रामा इति – Considering (the wife) as *sukha hethu*: / source of happiness,

This is *sammoha*: - 'delusion'. The belief "the wife gives *aananda*" cannot be true, because, 'wife' is *anaathmaa* and *anaathmaa* does not have even an iota of happiness of its own. At best, the 'wife' serves as a mirror, (reflecting the intrinsic *aananda* of the Self). Not knowing this,

- कल्पना मात्र संमोहात् - because of the delusion caused by wrong perception,

Kalpanaa – sobhanaadhyaasa: / wrong perception / superimposition / perception of a non-existent (object / situation). The 'wife' may be existent ; but, the perception that the 'wife' is *raamaa* (a 'source of happiness/ peace/ security') is only a wrong perception – *kalpanaa maathram*.

Then, what is the source of happiness? *Aathmaa* alone is *raama*: - *aathmaa raama*: *aananda ramana*: | The only *raamaa* is *aathmaa*; nothing else in the creation deserves the title *raama*: or *raamaa*.

But, because of this *kalpanaa maathra sammoham*, the wrong perception that 'wife' is a source of happiness, the *ajnaani*,

- **आलिङ्गते अशुचिम् (देहं)** - embraces (the body), a thing impure.

The body which he embraces as *sukha hethu:*, is nothing but a container of all kinds of filth, carefully covered.

(The invention of perfumes and the success of perfume industry declare the *Vedhaanthic* truth, that, the body is not *raamaa*.)

All these are results of considering oneself as the *ahamkaaraa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 53 :

सर्वस्य अनर्थजातस्य जिहासितस्य मूलं अहंकारः एव तस्य आत्म अनात्म उपरागात् । न तु परमार्थतः आत्मनः अविध्यया तत्कार्येण वा संबन्धः अभूत् अस्ति भविष्यति वा तस्य अपरिलुप्तद्रष्टिस्वाभाव्यात् ।

The root-cause of all the evil in the world, hated by creatures, is the ego, for it brings together in itself, the Self and the non-Self. In reality, the Self transcends all connection with nescience and its effects in the past, present and future, for the self has as its essential nature pure consciousness that is eternal and inextinguishable.

Sureswaraachaaryaa comes back to his topic: therefore, the kingpin, who is the cause of all problems, is the *ahamkaaraa* only.

What is the meaning of *ahamkaaraa* (in this context)? It does not have the meaning in which the word is used in *Thathva Bodha*, where, it is a name given to a particular thought which is invoking the individuality. In this portion of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, *ahamkaaraa* does not refer to the thought, but, refers to the entire *antha:karanam*, along with the *chidhaabhaasa*.

Because of the *chidhaabhaasaa* alone, the mind has become sentient and has also become the locus of 'blunders'.

- मूलं - The root cause,
- सर्वस्य अनर्थ जातस्य - of all the multitudes of problems,

Jaatham means *samooha:* / collection / bundle / multitude (does **NOT** mean 'born' , in which meaning it is used in the famous Bhagavadh Githa *sloka* – *jaathasya hi dhruvo mrithyu:*); *Anartha* means problems / evils / pains / sufferings; *Anartha jaatham* means 'multitude of problems' .

- **जिहासितस्य** - which every human being is universally struggling to get rid of / which is desired to be given up, by everybody

Jihaasitham - That which everybody wants to give up. In this verse, it is used as an adjective to anartha jaatham.

With regard to the problems of samsaaraa, the response is universal – every human being wants to get rid of the problems. Therefore, the Achaaryaa uses the description / adjective 'jihaasithasya' to 'anartha jaathasya'

- **अहंकारः एव** - is only ahamkaaraa (which means, the mind with chidaabaasaa),

Why is the mind the *moolam* (the root cause)?

Because, the mind or the pseudo 'I' has got dual status.

- तस्य आत्म अनात्म उपरागात् – because of its (the mind's) connection with aathmaa also and with anaathmaa (the world) also.

How is the mind connected to *aathmaa*? The mind is an 'object' of observation by the *aathmaa*; i.e., the mind is connected to *aathmaa*, as a *dhrusyam*; and, in addition, the mind also receives *chidaabaasaa* from the *aathmaa*.

How is the mind connected to the world? The mind forms the thoughts of various objects in the world; by forming the thoughts, *ghata vrutthi*, *pata vrutthi*, *manushya vrutthi* etc. By receiving the thoughts from the world, the mind becomes an observer of the world and is thus connected to the world as 'observer' – as *dhrashtaa*.

Thus, the mind is *dhrusyam* from the standpoint of the *aathmaa* and *dhrashtaa* from the standpoint of the world. Therefore, it seemingly has connection with both and also seemingly brings together the two.

But, what is the truth?

- तु - But,
- परमार्थतः आत्मनः - for the real supreme 'I',
- संबन्धः न अभूत् – there had never been any connection at all in the past,
- (संबन्धः न) अस्ति - there is no connection at all in the present (and)
- (संबन्धः न) भविष्यति - there can be no connection at all in the future,
- अविध्यया वा तत्कार्येण वा - either with ignorance or with the products of avidhya/maayaa.

Avidhyaa – Ignorance.

Aathmaa is *asanga*: Just as space cannot have any connection with anything, so also *aathmaa* cannot have *sambhandha* with anything.

Why is there never any connection between *aathmaa* and *avidhyaa*? Because, *aathmaa* is *paaramaarthika sathyam* and *avidhyaa* is *vyaavahaarika sathyam*. Their degrees of reality vary – 'I' belong to a higher order of reality and *avidhyaa/maayaa* belongs to a lower order of reality. That is why, Krishna said, in the 13th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*jyothishaam api thajjyothi: thamasa: paramuchyathe*" – "It (*Brahman / aathmaa*) is the light of all lights : it is said to be beyond ignorance" (verse 18).

Therefore, 'I', do not have connection with *avidhyaa / maayaa*.

Thath kaaryam – the products of *avidhyaa / maayaa*.

What are the products of *avidhyaa / maayaa*? The entire *jaagrath* universe and the entire dream universe are both products of *maayaa* only. Everything, including the mind, is a product of *avidhyaa* only. And, since *avidhyaa*, the cause itself is of a lower order of reality (*vyaavahaarikam*), it follows, that, **all** its products also, including the mind / the body/ the family can only be *vyaavahaarikam*.

Therefore, there can never be any connection between *aathmaa* and the products of *avidhyaa* also.

In *Ashtaavakra Githa*, Ashtaavakraa makes a startling statement: "The very idea of *sanyaasaa* is born out of ignorance". In all the other *Vedhaantha* scriptures, *sanyaasaa* is glorified and is presented as the goal of life/ the ultimate *saadhanaa / the 4th and final Aashrama*, to be taken to, by every seeker, whereas, Ashtaavakraa seems to effortlessly brush aside this view, when he says " whoever wants to take *sanyaasaa* is an *ajnaani*". His view is based on the logic "If I have relationships, I can renounce them; but, when I do not have any relationship at all, even to begin with, how/ why / what can I renounce?" The real *sanyaasaa* is, therefore, the 'understanding' that 'I' am a *nithya asangha: - na maathaa/ na pithaa/ na bhandhu: etc.* The 'wise' person is ever a *sanyaasi*.

Sri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadaa also, in his *Brahma Jnaanaavali Maalaa* declares: "*asangoham, asangoham, sachidaananda roopoham*".

The use of *abhooth, asthi* and *bhavishyathi*, by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*, is to indicate the past, the present and the future respectively.

The *Achaaryaa* succinctly gives the reason (as to why there can be no relationship for the *aathmaa*):

- अपरिलुप्त द्रष्टिस्वाभाव्यात् – Because of the nithya chaithanya nature
- तस्य - of the real 'I'.

In contrast, *avidhyaa* and all the products of *avidhyaa* are neither *nithyam*, nor of the nature of *chaithanyam* (the *Achaaryaa* does not mention this specifically here).

Apariluptham - *nithyam* / unbroken; *dhrushti*: - *chaithanyam*; *apariluptha dhrushti*: - *nithya chaithanyam* ; *svaabhaavyam* – *svaroopam*.

Apariluptha dhrushti svabhaavyam – *nithya chaithanya svaroopam*.

In *Hasthaamalakeeyam*, Hasthaamalakaa talks about *nithya chaithanya svaroopaa aathmaa*, in the following manner (verse no. 7): "*mana: chakshuraadher mana: chakshuraadhi: mana: chakshuraadher viyuktha: svayam ya: mana: chakshuraadher mana: chakshuraadhir mana: chakshuraadher agamyasvaroopasya nithyopalabधि: svaroopoham aathmaa*".

The *Achaaryaa* uses the term "*apariluptha dhrushti*:", intentionally, instead of the simpler term *nithya chaithanyam*, to remind the student of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – *Svayamjothi Braahmana Vaakyam*, "*na hi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilopo vidhyathe avinaasithvath*".

Chapter II: Verse 53 –

द्रुस्य अनुरक्तं तद् द्रष्टुं द्रुस्यं द्रष्टुनुरञ्जितम् ।

अहंश्रुत्योभयं रक्तं तन्नाशेऽद्वैतमात्मनः ॥ ५३ ॥

That seer is conjoined to the seen and the seen is conjoined to the seer. Both of them are conjoined in and through the functioning of the ego. On the elimination of the ego, the Self abides in perfect non-duality.

In the introduction to this verse (in the first line), Sureswaraacharya said that the mind has got dual *sambhandha* - with the *aathmaa*, as the 'observed' and with the world as 'observer'. Thus the mind has *aathma anaathma uparaagaa*, similar to a door/window sill, which has got connection with the outside world and the inside of the building. It is difficult to say whether the door/window belongs to the outside or inside. In the same manner, *ahamkaaraa* lies between *baahya prapanchaa* and *anthara aathmaa*. "Therefore" the *Achaaryaa* had said "*antha:karanam has ubhaya sambhandha*". He explains this statement further in the verse.

- तद् - That ahamkaaraa / the mind
- द्रष्टु (भवति)- (becomes) the observer
- द्रश्य अनुरक्तं - which is related to the external universe (as a perceiver)

When the mind is connecting itself with the external universe, through the five sense organs – (“*paraanchi khaani vyathrunath svayambhoo: thasmaath paraang pasyath!*” – “The Lord destroyed the sense organs, by making them extrovert; therefore, every one perceives outside” – *Kathopanishad* – II.1.1) the mind enjoys the status of the observer; it has ‘observer’ – ‘observed’ relationship with the world.

Dhrusyam - *baahya prapancham* / the external world; *anuraktham* – *sambhandham*/ connection.

Thadh (antha:karanam) dhrusyaa anuraktham (sath) dhrashtru (bhavathi) – That (mind becomes) the ‘observer’ when it is connected to the external world.

Whereas,

- (तद् एव) द्रश्यं (भवति) द्रष्टु अनुरञ्जितम् - (that very same mind becomes) the ‘observed’ (object) when it is connected to the *aathmaa*.

Dhrusyam - observed object; *anuranjitham* – *sambhandham* / connected; *dhrashtru anuranjitham* – when connected to *aathmaa*.

When is the mind connected to the *aathmaa*? When it is illumined by the *aathmaa* and when it receives *chidhaabhaasaa* from *aathmaa*. As a ‘borrower’ from *aathmaa* it becomes *dhrusyam* and as ‘lender’ of consciousness to the external world, it is a *dhrashtaa*.

Between the *aathmaa* and the mind, there is an ‘observer-observed’ connection and similarly between the mind and the external world, there is an ‘observer-observed’ connection. But, between the *aathmaa* and the world there is no direct connection at all; there is only an indirect connection, brought about by the intermediate entity called the mind or *ahamkaaraa*. This is similar to the connection between a husband / wife and his/ her in-laws, through the spouse, the intermediary entity.

Thus, the *aathmaa* has no direct connection with the *bhogyaa prapanchaa*; through the mind alone, the *aathmaa* seemingly has connections with the *bhogyaa prapanchaa*.

The *Achaaryaa* says:

- **अहंवृत्त्या उभयं रक्तं** - By means of *ahamkaaraa*, the mind (which serves as the linking factor) the *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* (the *baahya prapancham*) are linked.

Ahamvrutthyaa - By means of *ahamkaaraa*; *ubhayam* – both (*aathmaa* and the *baahya prapancham (anaathmaa)*); *raktham* –*sambhandham* /linked/ connected.

How is this proved?

It can be very easily demonstrated: during *jaagrath* and *svapna*, the mind, the linking factor, is alive and active and therefore, the world is experienced; all kinds of experiences are received and consequently *samsaaraa* is active. In deep sleep, when the mind is resolved, the linking factor is gone; "I am no more a *bokthaa*; I am *abokthaa aathmaa*; that's why *sukham aham asvaaptham*".

In *Aathmabodhaa* of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, using *anvaya vyathirekha* logic this fact is established – "*raagha ichha sukha dhu:kaadhi buddhau sathyaam pravarthathe sushupthau naasthi thanaase thasmaath budhesthu naathmana.*" - "Attachment, desire, pleasure, pain etc., arise when intellect is present. They do not exist in deep sleep, when intellect is absent. Hence they are of the intellect and not of the *aathmaa*" (verse 23).

That's why it is said, "*mana: eva manushyaanaam kaaranam bandha mokshayo:*" and "*bandhaaya vishayaa sattham mukthyai nirvishayam smrutham*".

- **तन्नाशे (सति)**- When the mind / *ahamkaaraa* is destroyed,
- **आत्मनः अद्वैतं (सिद्धयति)** - the *advaita* (non-dual) *aathmaa* alone is left.

But, it should be carefully understood, that the mind can never be physically destroyed; that, *mano naasa:* is only a figurative expression; that, it only means *mano mithyaathva nischaya:* - i.e. firmly understanding that the mind belongs to a lower order of reality, from the standpoint of the real 'I'. This understanding alone is called *mano naasa:* | There can be no other *mano naasa:* |

"*Manasa: mithyaathva nischaye sathi aatmana: advaitam bhavath*"(is the essence).

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 54:

इह केचित् चोदयन्ति योयं अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां अनात्मतया उत्सारित अहंकार वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तये सोयं विपरीतार्थः संवृत्तः।

Here, some raise this objection: The ego has been discarded as the non-Self, by reasoning, for the sake of comprehending the meaning of the *Vedhaanthic*

sentence 'I am *Brahman*'. But, the upshot comes to be contrary to the purpose on hand.

Here, Sureswaraachaarya is introducing a possible doubt, which he had briefly mentioned before, in verses 28 and 29. He is re-introducing the same doubt for further clarification.

- **इह** - In this context,
- **केचित्** - some people
- **चोदयन्ति** - raise an objection.

What is the objection? They say : "In all your teachings, you have been saying that mind is the *ahamkaaraa* and *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*, only to facilitate the understanding of *mahaa vaakyam* – your original purpose being *thvam pada vichaara and thath pada vichaaraa*, to clearly understand the *mahaa vaakyam 'thatvam asi'* . But, instead of facilitating /supporting the *mahaa vaakya jnaanam*, your teaching is only counter-productive. Without your realizing it, you are arguing against your own final conclusion".

- **अहंकार :उत्सारितः** - Ahamkaaraa is negated (by you)
- **अनात्मतया** - as anaathmaa
- **वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तये** - for the sake of knowing mahaa vaakyam.

Vaakyartham – mahaa vaakyartham; prathi patthi: - jnaanam.

सोयं विपरीतार्थः संवृत्तः - (But) all of them have become counterproductive / they will only obstruct the knowledge of the mahaa vaakyam.

76. Chapter II, Verse 54 to 56 (24-11-2007)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 54, 55 and 56:

इह केचित् चोदयन्ति योयं अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां अनात्मतया उत्सारित अहंकार :वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तये सोयं विपरीतार्थ :संब्रुत्त :यस्मात् अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति ब्रह्महंपदार्थयो :सामानाधिकरण्यश्रवणात् अनात्मार्थेन सामानाधिकरण्यं प्राप्नोति । वक्तव्या च प्रत्यगात्मनि तस्य वृत्तिरिति सोच्यते प्रसिद्धलक्षणागुणवृत्तिभिः ।

Here some raise this objection: This ego has been discarded as the non-Self by reasoning, for the sake of comprehending the meaning of the Vedhaanthic sentence: 'I am Brahman'. But the upshot comes to be contrary to the purpose on hand. In the sentence, 'I am Brahman', the imports of 'I' and 'Brahman' are identified and that would amount to an identification of Brahman with what is other than the Self. For clearing the position, how the term 'I' signifies the innermost Self must be explained, by a consideration of the three types of signification, i.e., the primary reference through implication and reference through attributive affinity. This is going to be done now:

Until now, Sureswaraachaarya established that the *ahamkaaraa*, which is referred to, by everyone, as 'I' or *aham*, is the cause of all the problems and that, this *ahamkaaraa* or I is *anaathmaa* only, because it is nothing but the mind with borrowed *chidhaabaasaa*. The mind becomes sentient because of the presence of *aathmaa* and because of the borrowed sentiency, the mind becomes the observer / experiencer of the universe; and, because, the mind has got the observer/ experiencer status, it is referred to as I, the *ahamkaaraa*; and in reality, it is only *anaathmaa*.

When this much was established, a serious objection is raised by the *poorva pakshin*. "If you say the meaning of the word *aham* is *ahamkaaraa*, if you say that the meaning of the word *aham* is the 'mind with *chidhaabhaasaa*' and if you say that the meaning of the word *aham* is only *anaathmaa* (i.e. *aham* = *ahamkaaraa*; *aham* = *chidhaabhaasa sahitha antha:karanam*; *aham* = *anaathmaa*), then, how do you explain the famous *mahaa vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi*'? Because (in the light of your above statements), '*aham*' is *anaathmaa*, whereas, *Brahman* is **not** *anaathmaa*; how, then, do you explain the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* or equation obtaining between *aham* the *anaathmaa* and *Brahman*?"

Sureswaraachaarya has to give a convincing answer to this *poorva paksha vaadam*.

- **इह केचित् चोदयन्ति** - In this context some students / people raise an objection.

What is the objection?

- **अयं अहंकारः** - This ahamkaaraa
- **उत्सारितः** - has been negated (by you)
- **अनात्मतया** - as anaathmaa (jadam / maayaa kaaryam/ mithyaa etc.)
- **अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां** - by using the arguments of anvaya (that which is subject to change) and vyathirekha (that which is not subject to change).

The *poorva pakshi* concedes to the *Achaaryaa*: "All this you have done with a noble motive". What is the motive?

- **वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तये** - For the generation of knowledge / *jnaanam* of the meaning of *mahaa vaakyam*

Prathi patthi: - *jnaanam* / knowledge.

- **(यः) सः** - (But) all this (effort that you have undertaken)
- **विपरीतार्थः संबुद्धः** - has only become counterproductive (because this topic will not assist 'understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam*; on the other hand, will only obstruct the 'understanding')

Vipareethaartha: - counterproductive; *samvruttha*: - has become.

- **यस्मात्** - The reason is this (why do I say that your teaching is counterproductive?)

The *poorva pakshin* explains:

- **अहं ब्रह्मास्मीति (महा वाक्ये)** - In the *mahaa vaakyam* 'aham brahma asmi' (*Brahadaaranyaka Upanishad* 1.4.10)
- **ब्रह्म अहं पदार्थयोः सामानाधिकरण्यं श्रवणात्** - since an equation between the words *brahma* and *aham* is declared,

Saamaanaadhikaranam - can be understood as 'equation'

Therefore, what is the problem?

- **अनात्मार्थेन सामानाधिकरण्यं प्राप्नोति** – *Brahman* attains equation with the meaning of *ahamkaaraa*, which is *anaathmaa*.

Anaathmaroopa: *artha*: - *anaathama artha*: |

According to the arguments so far presented by the *Achaaryaa*, the meaning of the word *aham* is *ahamkaaraa* and *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*. Therefore, it would follow, that, *Brahman* has been equated with the *jada anaathmaa*; in which case, *Brahman* would also become *jadam*, *savikaaram* etc. Then, how can be there *mokshaa* through *mahaavaakya jnaanam*?

Thus, the essence of the *poorva pakshin's* question is this: "Scriptures declare that *Brahman* is *sathyam*, *chaithanyasvaroopam*, *nirvikaaram* etc. And, you have now elaborately established that *aham* is *ahamkaaraa*, *aham* is the mind, *aham* is *mithyaa*, *aham* is *savikaaram* etc. In short, '*Aham*', (from your statements) has a diagonally opposite nature to that of *Brahman*. How can, then, there be equation between the two? *Yushmath asmath prathyayo: thamas prakaasavath viruddha svabhaavayo: saamanaadhikaranyam katham bhavathy?* "

The situation can be saved only by giving a new meaning to the word *aham*. The conventional meaning of the word – the *vaachyaartha* – is '*chidhaabhaasa sahitha mana: '*. A different meaning has to be given to the word *aham*, by which the equation will be salvaged and also will benefit all the seekers.

- तस्य - For the word *aham*
- वृत्ति: वक्तव्या - a new implied meaning has to be given.

What type of meaning? That new meaning should not refer to any one of the *anaathmaa*, because once it refers to *anaathmaa*, *aham-brahma-eikyam* will not be possible. The new meaning should refer to the *chethana thathvam* behind the *anaathmaa*.

- प्रत्यक् आत्मनि – For the inner self / svaroopaa aathmaa (also)
- वृत्ति: (वक्तव्या) - connotation / indication / significance is to be given.
- इति - thus (the objection has been raised)

Up to this is the *poorva pakshin's* question.

Sureswaraachaarya answers:

- सा उच्यते - (if the student raises such an objection) I will answer.

What is the new meaning of the word *aham*?

The word *aham* can be used to denote the *chaithanyam* also - the *chaithanyam*, which (1) is not a product or part or property of the body (2) is an entity entirely independent of the body; but, pervading the body and lending sentiency to the body (3) is not limited by the boundaries of the body; but, extends beyond the body – thus not limited by SPACE (4) continues to survive even after the fall of the body and thus, not limited by TIME also and (5) though, continues to survive even after the fall of the body, is not available for transactions, in the absence of the medium, the body.

The *Achaaryaa* has to establish that the word 'aham', in the *mahaa vaakyam* refers to that *chaithanyam*, by the appropriate interpretation.

And how does he derive this new meaning? How is it going to be said?

- **प्रसिद्ध लक्षणा गुणवृत्तिभिः** - By the (three) methods known as *prasiddha vrutthi*, *lakshanaa vrutthi* and *guna vrutthi*.

Vrutthi – can be interpreted as 'method' (of connotation for the word *aham*) ; *Prasiddha (vrutthi:)* - otherwise called *mukhya vrutthi:*, is one method of communication; *Lakshnaa (vrutthi:)* - 'method of implication' is the 2nd method; *Guna (vrutthi:)* – is the 3rd method of communication.

The *Achaaryaa* himself elaborates the methods in the next three verses.

Verse 54 – Chapter II :

न अजासिषं इति प्राह सुषुप्तात् उत्थितः अपि हि ।

अयोदाहादिवत् तेन लक्षणं परमात्मनः ॥ ५४ ॥

One who wakes up from deep sleep says 'I did not know anything in sleep'. Here the term 'I' signifies the pure Self, as the ego is suspended in sleep. When we say that the iron burns, we mean that fire, by which the iron has become red-hot burns, and not the iron as such. Similarly in the sentence 'I am Brahman', the term 'I' signifies the Self and not the ego.

The method of communication referred to, in this verse, is '*lakshanaa vrutthi:*', which is also known as *jahath lakshanaa* or *jahathi lakshanaa*, by which the primary meaning of the word is rejected and the secondary meaning, which is closely associated with the primary meaning, is taken. And, Sureswaraachaarya gives an example for this practice.

- **अयो दाहादिवत्** - Similar to the 'burning' by 'iron',

An iron ball has been kept in the fire for some time; somebody, by accident, touched the red-hot iron ball and said "the iron ball burned my hand". On analysis, this statement is incorrect, since iron does not have the capacity to burn. What do we understand by this statement? The meaning of the word '*aya:*', in this context, is not the iron; but the fire principle which had been associated with the iron, in and through. In effect, the word '*aya:*', by *lakshanaa*, means '*agni:*' ; *aya: sabdasya agni: ithi artha:* The sentence can become meaningful only through this interpretation. In this example, *agni* happened to be intimately associated with the iron, lending 'heat' to the iron, which is not an intrinsic quality of the iron.

Similar to the iron ball, in the example, not possessing 'heat' as its intrinsic quality, but, borrows it from the fire, because of close and intimate association with the fire, the body-mind complex does not have sentiency of its own, but, borrows sentiency from the Self.

The word *aham* primarily refers to the sentient body-mind complex; but, when the *Upanishad* or a *jnaani* says "*aham brahma asmi*", the word '*aham*' cannot refer to the body-mind complex, since the body-mind complex is finite and *Brahman* is not. Therefore, the word '*aham*' should refer to something which is in and through the body-mind complex, but, which is distinct from the body-mind complex and which is not limited by the body-mind complex ; therefore, in the *vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi*', for the meaning of the word '*aham*', the body is rejected by *jagathi lakshanaa*, the mind is rejected by *jagathi lakshanaa*, even the *chidhaabhaasaa* is rejected by *jagathi lakshanaa* – the *chidh*, the Consciousness principle alone is retained as meaning of the word *aham*. '*Aham*' (in the *vaakyam*) therefore, is the *chaithanya svaroopam*.

Citing the example of the 'iron burning', Sureswaraachaarya says "the word '*aham*' can refer to the body-mind complex, which is 'located' and can refer to the 'unlocated' Consciousness also".

The next question is "Is there such an usage in our day-to-day life?". The example used, 'iron burns ' is quite commonly said; in fact, even 'burning' by 'water' , is quite a common incident and statement. Is there a *loutika prayoga*: (a common usage) , in a like manner, in which the word 'I' refers to the Consciousness principle, and not to the body-mind complex?

Sureswaraacharya claims "such an usage *is* there in common parlance". Where?

When a person wakes up from a deep sleep state, he says "I slept well, I did not know / experience anything". What is the meaning of 'I' in this context? It cannot refer to the localized *ahamkaaraa* or the localized mind, because, during sleep, the *ahamkaaraa* or mind is resolved. If the mind and *ahamkaaraa* had been active in sleep, the sleeper would have felt 'localized' in sleep; but, in sleep, the sleeper does not have a localized entity; but an unlocalized Consciousness alone. And, therefore, the person waking up from the deep sleep, in his statement "I slept well; I did not know anything", is using the word '*aham*' for the unlocalized Consciousness only. This means, that, '*aham*' has got a primary meaning – 'localized mind' and a secondary meaning – 'unlocalized Consciousness' also. Therefore Sureswaraachaarya says

- सुषुप्तात् उत्थितः - one who wakes up from deep sleep
- इति प्राह - declares thus:

- न (अहं) अजासिषं - "I did not know anything / I did not function as the knower 'I' or the 'observer' I (the ahamkaaraa 'I' function has resolved; I existed in sleep as unlocalized Consciousness only)"

The person who had woken up from the sleep, not being a *Vedhaanthin*, does not explicitly say "I existed as unlocalized Consciousness only"; but, what he means/ implies is "I was unlocalized Consciousness ; I did not function as 'knower', because the mind was resolved; I am the *chaithanya svaroopaa*."

Such a statement, the *Achaaryaa* points out, is exactly like a person claiming that he was burnt by red-hot iron - *ayo daahadhivath (ayo dahathi ithivath)* - , though, in reality, what burnt him was the fire principle.

- तेन - Because of this reason,
- अहं (शब्दः) परमात्मनः लक्षणं (भवति) - (the word 'aham' will be) the *lakshanam* for *paramaathmaa*.

Briefly, *Achaaryaa's* contention is as follows: "The word 'aham' can be used for pure Consciousness, which is inherent in the body, just as the word 'iron' can be used in the sense of the 'fire' principle, which is inherent in the red-hot iron; when you mean the fire principle by the use of the word 'aya:' , in the statement 'aya: dahathi', the iron part is rejected , because iron does not have burning power; similarly when I say 'I am Brahman' , I mean the inherent Consciousness principle by the word 'I' and reject the body-mind complex, because the body-mind complex does not have *Brahmathvam*. There is absolutely no difficulty or logical fallacy in such an understanding".

In this portion of this treatise, this is taken as *jahathi lakshanaa*; In *Vedantha saaraa*, it is taken as *Bhaaga Thyaaga Lakshanaa*. Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa makes a subtle difference and interprets it as *Jahathi lakshanaa*.

Chapter II: Verse 55 –

प्रत्यक्त्वात् अतिसूक्ष्मत्वात् आत्मद्रष्टि अनुशीलनात् ।

अतो वृत्ती :विहाय अन्या :हि अहंवृत्त्या उपलक्ष्यते ॥ ५५ ॥

Secondly, as the ego is inwardly felt, is very subtle and is blended with the conception of the Self, the Self is conveyed by the concept of the ego, abandoning the concepts of 'that' (and 'thou').

Sureswaraachaarya gives another method of interpretation here, called *gounee vrutthi*: / *Gounee vrutthi*: is another method by which a word conveys a different meaning. The famous example given in the *Saasthraas*, is, '*simho maanavaka*:' - 'the student is a lion'. Here the words 'student' and 'lion' are equated ; strictly speaking the equation is not correct,

because the primary meaning of the word 'student' is a human being and the primary meaning of the word 'lion' is an animal; they are totally different, but, are equated in this statement. People, nevertheless, accept the equation, even though they know that the lion and the student can never be equal. How do they understand the sentence / equation, when they accept the statement? When the words Lion and student are used in this equation, people do not take the 'complete' meanings of the words; but, take only the common characteristics, which are there between the student and the Lion. The common characteristics between the two are called *saamaanya dharma:* or *saamaanya gunaa:* and, if there are, thus, common characteristics, one particular word can be used to convey another meaning, because of the commonness of characteristics.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The word 'aham' normally does not mean *Brahman* ; it refers to the *chidhaabaasa sahitha* mind only ; it is *ahamkaaraa* only ; it is *anaathmaa* only. Really speaking, therefore, the word 'aham' cannot be used for *aathmaa* or *Brahman*, just as the word 'lion' cannot be used for a 'student' ; but, it has been so used in the example '*simho maanavaka:*'; because of some common characteristics between the lion and the student. Similarly, the word 'aham' can be used for *aathmaa*, because there are some *saamaanya gunaa*s between *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*. In context, you understand 'aham' as 'aathmaad', because of some common characteristics existing between *aathmaa* and the mind, just as there are some common characteristics between the lion and the student."

This gives rise to another question. The common characteristics between a lion and a student may be courage, majesty etc. But, what are the common characteristics between the mind and *aathmaa*? Sureswaraachaaryaa lists them out:

- प्रत्यक्त्वात् – Because both of them (*aathmaa* and mind / *ahamkaaraa*) are internal, with regard to the body and sense organs;

Prathyakthvam – nature of being internal (*aathmaa* is called the 'inner' self); this is one common characteristic between *aathmaa* and the mind.

- अतिसूक्ष्मत्वात् – Because both *aathmaa* and mind are very subtle in nature;
Athisookshmathvam – nature of being very subtle.

Aathmaa and the mind are both invisible / not *indriya gocharam*; in fact, they are not even *mano gocharam*.

Can the mind be objectified by the mind? This is not a topic commonly discussed in the *Vedhaantha*; but, in the *Vichaara Sagaraa* this question is raised "Can the mind be objectified by the mind?" and also answered with appropriate supporting logic: "Never, mind can never see the mind."

Both the mind and *aathmaa* are *indriya agocharam* and *mano agocharam*. Both are, therefore, extremely subtle.

This is the reason, that, scientists do not accept the existence of a mind which will survive the death of a body or brain. They do not accept a mind other than the brain; whereas, in the *Saasthraas*, the word 'mind' does not mean the brain, but, a principle which will survive even after the body and the brain perish and are cremated. According to the *Saasthraas*, the mind is even supposed to 'travel'. As for science, no scientific instrument has so far perceived a mind that *leaves* a dead body. This establishes, that, the mind is beyond observation. So is the *aathmaa*. Both are *athisookshmam*. This is the second common characteristic (*saamaanya dharma*) between the *aathmaa* and the mind.

What is the third common characteristic?

- आत्मद्रुष्टि अनुशीलनात् - Both of them (*aathmaa* and the mind) have got sentiency;

Aathma dhrushti – svaroopā chaithanyam; anuseelanam - resemblance / imitation.

The mind resembles the *aathmaa*, in the sense, that both have sentiency and both are eternally sentient. The difference, of course, is that, mind has got eternal '*borrowed*' sentiency, while *aathmaa* has got eternal '*original*' sentiency. The use of the word *anuseelanam* – imitation/resemblance – emphasizes this distinction.

The mind 'imitates' the *aathmaa* in being sentient; nevertheless, both are sentient. Thus, 'sentiency' ('original' in the case of *aathmaa* and 'borrowed' in the case of the mind) is the third common factor.

This third common characteristic, in fact, is the most important, since, only because the mind is a conscious entity, one mistakes oneself to be the mind. This misconception has a further consequence – the worry of what happens to an individual after death? Where does he/she head? There is a well-known prayer: "I want to have *Vedhaantha* as *pramaanam* in every *janma* and Sankaraachaaryaa as *guru* in every *janma*". This prayer is resorted to, even by a student of *Vedhaantha*, obviously because the *vedhaantha vichaaraa* has not been fully effective on the person who prays thus; such a person obviously takes himself / herself as the 'mind' and not as the *chaithanyam*, because of the 'resemblance' between the sentient localized 'I' (*ahamkaaraa*) and the sentient non-localized 'I' (*chaithanyam*).

- अतः अन्याः वृत्तीः विहाय - Therefore (because of these three common characteristics), rejecting all other thoughts,

Anyaa: - all other (adjective to *vrutthee:*); *vrutthee:* - thoughts ; *vihaaya* – rejecting / setting aside.

- अहं वृत्त्या - by the 'I' thought,
- अहं शब्देन च - also with the help of the word 'I' / *aham*)
- उपलक्ष्यते - *aathmaa* can be referred to (in the *mahaavaakyam*).

"There is no logical fallacy in so understanding, because of this reason also" the *Achaaryaa* asserts.

- अतः अन्याः वृत्तीः विहाय - Therefore (because of these three common characteristics), rejecting all other thoughts,

Anyaa: - all other (adjective to *vrutthee:*); *vrutthee:* - thoughts ; *vihaaya* – rejecting / setting aside.

- अहं वृत्त्या - by the 'I' thought,
- (अहं) शब्देन च - also with the help of the word 'I' / *aham*)
- उपलक्ष्यते - *aathmaa* can be referred to (in the *mahaavaakyam*).

"There is no logical fallacy in so understanding, because of this reason also" the *Achaaryaa* asserts.

Gounee vritthi: is translated as 'attributive affinity' in English, which is, in fact, more difficult to comprehend than the original *Sanskrit* word.

Chapter II: Verse 56 –

आत्मना चाविनाभावमथवा विलयं व्रजेत् ।

न तु पक्षान्तरं यायादतस्चाहंधियोच्यते ॥ ५६ ॥

Thirdly, the ego either fuses with the Self or simply disappears (unlike other presentations which may occur apparently independent of the Self). The ego has no third alternative and hence the ego-sense signifies the Self.

What is covered in this verse is what is called *mukhya vrutthi:*; means even the primary sense, we can take and the word 'I' can refer to the Consciousness part in the individual. The all-pervading Consciousness has to pervade the body –mind complex also and all the pervading Consciousness exists inseparably in every body and inseparably in every mind.

The body or the individual has got several components; the sense organs are there, which go wherever the individual go. The mind / the legs / the hands and such so many other components are there in every individual, which do not stand separately, but are integrally

in the individual. And, in that group, *chaithanyam* is also there, non-separable from the individual.

Now Sureswaraachaarya points out, that, we use the word '*aham*' to any component of the individual. For example, when one claims 'I am writing', one uses the word 'I' not for one's whole body, since, obviously the whole body is not writing, but, it is only the hand that is writing – that too, not even the whole hand but only a particular part of the hand. Still it is only the word 'I' which is used to denote (in the context of writing) that particular part of the hand which is writing, because that part does not exist separately from the individual. This only shows that the word '*aham*' can be used to refer to any part / component of the individual. In fact, it is only very rarely, that, the word '*aham*' / I is used to denote to all the five *kosaas* of the *sareeram* put together. The word 'I' is used to denote any one of the *kosaas* or any one part of any one of the *kosaas*, because they are inseparable from the individual.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "In that group *chaithanyam* is also there. *Chaithanyam* and *ahamkaaraa* being non-separable, the word '*aham*' can refer to *chaithanyam* also. Who can question that?" He says:

- (अहंकारः) आत्मना अविनाभावं (प्राप्नुयात्) - *Ahamkaaraa*, during its existence (i.e. during *jagrath* and *svapna avasthaas*, when the *ahamkaaraa* is functional and active) has got 'non-separation from the *aathmaad*, in other words, 'intimate association with *chaithanyam*'

Avinaabhaavam – Intimate association / non-separate existence.

Like what? Like any one of the *kosaas*; just as the word 'I' includes the *pancha kosaas*, it includes *chaithanyam* also. In fact, one cannot use the word 'I', if *chaithanyam* is not there.

When the *ahamkaaraa* is resolved, we do not use the word '*aham*' / 'I'.

- अथवा (अहंकारः) विलयं व्रजेत् - When *ahamkaaraa* is in a resolved state, i.e during deep sleep (*sushupthi*) state,

What the *Achaaryaa* is trying to communicate is this: "Either *ahamkaaraa* exists in association with *chaithanyam* or it does not exist at all. There is no condition / a third alternative, in which *ahamkaaraa* can exist, without association with *chaithanyam*". Therefore, whenever *ahamkaaraa* is, consciousness is also an integral part of that. Therefore, the word '*aham*' can be used to refer to *chaithanyam*, just as it (*aham*) can be used to refer to any component of *ahamkaaraa*.

-
- न तु पक्षान्तरं यायात् - There is no other alternative for *ahamkaaraa* (an alternative in which *ahamkaaraa* exists without association with *chaithanyam*)
 - अतः - Therefore,
 - अहंधिया – with the help of 'I' thought and 'I' word
 - उच्यते - *aathmaa* can be referred to (through primary sense itself – even *lakshana vrutthi* or *guna vrutthi* need not be used)

The subject *ahamkaara:* is to be supplied to all the three sentences:

(1) *ahamkaara: aathmanaa avinaabhaavam (praapnuyaath)*

(2) *athavaa ahamkaara: vilayam vrajeth* and

(3) *ahamkaara: pakshaantharam na yaayaath.*

The justification given in this verse for the word '*aham*' to be interpreted as *aathmaa*, in the *mahaavaakyam*, is called *mukhya* or *prasiddha vrutthi*.

77. Chapter II, Verse 56 to 58 (01-12-2007)

As a part of *aathma-anaathma viveka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa established that *ahamkaaraa*, or the individuality is also a part of *anaathmaa* only. In fact, this is evident, because this individuality exists only during *jaagrath* and *svapna*, while, during *sushupthi*, it gets resolved. It is, thus, subject to arrival and departure; and in *mokshaa*, it is subject to total destruction also. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa* only, *aathmaa* being ever-existent and non-destructible.

When this much was said, a *poorva pakshin* raised a question: "If *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*, the word *aham*, which refers to *ahamkaaraa*, should refer to *anaathmaa* only; i.e. the word *aham* or 'I', is, ultimately, connected to *anaathmaa*, according to you. If, thus, the word *aham* refers to *anaathmaa*, how can you explain the *mahaa vaakyam`aham brahma asmi`? How can the jada mithyaa anaathmaa and Brahman be equated? Prove the mahaa vaakyam,`aham brahma asmi`."*

Sureswaraachaarya gave the answer to this question of the *poorva pakshin*, in the three verses 54, 55 and 56. He said: "Even though the word *aham* generally refers to *ahamkaaraa*, it can, in context, refer to *saakshi chaithanyam* also. The unlocalized Consciousness can be referred to, by the word *aham*, through *lakshanaa* or implication". And, pointed out: "This we regularly do, whenever we talk about our own sleep. When we use the word 'I', in the sentence 'I slept well', in that context, the word 'I' is referring to the unlocalized Consciousness only, rid of its individuality. Therefore, by implication `aham' can refer to the *chaithanyam*."

He supported his contention (that `aham' can refer to *chaithanya aathmaa*) by two other methods also, known as *gounee vrutthi:* and *mukyaa vrutthi:*, *mukyaa vrutthi:* meaning 'direct method'.

For the use of the *mukyaa vrutthi:* , the *Achaaryaa* gave his argument in verse 56: "The word 'I' generally refers to *ahamkaaraa* only; but, since, the pure Consciousness is ever in association along with *ahamkaaraa*, the word *aham* can also refer to the inseparable Consciousness, which is in and through the *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, the *mahaa vaakyam`aham brahma asmi` is very much valid (when the word `aham' is interpreted as chaithanyam)".*

This (i.e. establishing, that 'aham' can mean 'aathmaa' also) is only an incidental topic. The main / primary topic is: "ahamkaaraa is anaathmaa". The incidental topic was discussed at length, because the *poorva pakshin* had raised an objection here.

While on the incidental topic, Sureswaraachaarya also wants to give the meaning of the word *Brahman*, which is revealed through the word 'aham'. That *Brahma lakshanam*, the Achaaryaa gives in the next *sloka*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 57:

कीदृक्पुनर्वस्तु लक्ष्यम् ।

What is the nature of the principle thus signified indirectly?

The *Achaaryaa* gets into the subject with an assumed question from the *poorva pakshin*: "In the *mahaa vaakyam*, 'aham brahma asmi', if the word *aham* reveals not *ahamkaaraa*, but is revealing the *brahma vasthu* only, then, tell me what is that *brahma vasthu*, revealed indirectly through the word 'aham'."

- कीदृक् वस्तु – What is the nature of that entity,
- लक्ष्यम् - which is indirectly revealed (through the word 'aham') ?

The *poorva pakshin's* question: 'ekaathmaa prathyaya saaram kim?'

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "That's the subject of all the *Upanishads*. I will give you an example."

Chapter II: Verse 57 –

नामादिभ्यः परो भूमा निष्कलोऽकारकोऽक्रियः ।

स एवात्मवतामात्मा स्वतस्सिद्धः स एव नः ॥ ५७ ॥

The principle, that transcends the empirical determinations like name, is infinite, partless, not involved in any action as a factor therein and is actionless, is the Self for those who have mastered themselves. It is self-established for us.

The *Achaaryaa* says: "It (the word 'aham') reveals the Consciousness principle, which is not a part, product or property of the body; which is not limited by the boundaries of the body; (that's why it is called *brahma*, the very word *brahma* meaning not limited by space); and, which is not limited by time also (and therefore Consciousness continues to exist even after the disintegration of the body-mind medium). This pure Consciousness, not limited by time or space is called *brahma*; the very word *brahma* means *anantham*; this *ananthachaithanyam* is revealed by the word 'aham', in the *vaakyam* 'aham brahma asmi'".

This *ananthachaithanyam* is the subject matter of all the *Upanishads*. Sureswaraachaara takes *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* to give an example in this context. In *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, there are eight chapters; the last three chapters deal with *Brahman*. In the 6th chapter, *Brahman* is revealed as *sadhroopa brahman* - as "pure existence"; in the 7th chapter, it is revealed as "Pure *Aananda*" (*aananda roopa*); and, in the 8th chapter, it is revealed as "pure Consciousness (*chith roopa*)". The five principles which are applicable to the *aathmaa*, are applicable to *sath* (existence) also, to *aanandaa* (happiness) also and to *chith* (consciousness) also.

In the context of *aananda*, the five principles apply as follow:

- (1) happiness is not a part, product or property of the mind;
- (2) happiness is an independent entity which pervades and manifests in *modha* and *pramodha vrutthis*;
- (3) happiness is not limited by the boundaries of the mind;
- (4) happiness continues to exist, even after the destruction of the mind, and
- (5) pure happiness, in the absence of mind, is not recognizable .

In short, *aanando brahmethi vyajaanaath*.

Aanandaa exists even before the Creation was born; happiness is not something generated in your mind; *aanandaa* is the *jagath kaaranam*; from *aananda*, the *pancha bhoothaas* are born (*aanaandaath hi eva kalu imaani bhoothaani jaayanthi*).

In other words, happiness is not an adjective qualifying the mind; but, is a noun which is "pure existence"/ "pure Consciousness". This *aananda* - pure *aanaanda*/ non-experiential *aanandaa* - is called *Bhooma* in the 7th chapter of the *Chandhoghya Upanishad*. (That's why, the 7th chapter of *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, is, itself, called "*Bhooma Vidhyaa*".)

Sureswaraachaarya refers to that *Bhooma Vidhya* here.

भूमा पर :नामादिभ्यः - Brahman is the pure *aananda* or *chaithanyam* which is beyond the entire Creation, starting with *naamaa*;

In the 7th chapter of the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, the Creation is referred to, with the help of 15 entities, beginning with *naamaa*.

First, the teacher says “*naamaa* is infinite. *Naamaa* being name, is infinite, because there is name everywhere; because every object is associated with some *naamaa* or other. Therefore, *naamaa* is infinite.”

Then, the teacher introduces *vaak*, which is bigger; then, he introduces *mana:*, which is still bigger; thereafter, he goes on to *sankalapa:*, *chittham*, *vijnaanam* etc. Thus, the teacher *Sanathkumara* goes through 14 stages of teaching to *Naaradaa*, beginning with *naamaa* (*naamaadhibhya:*), and, finally comes to the 15th stage, called *bhoomaa*, which is “pure Consciousness” or *aanandam*.

Declares the teacher: “*Yo vai bhoomaa thath sukham na alpe sukham asth*” – “No object in the Creation can be happiness / no object in the Creation can have happiness, because every object is *alpam*; *alpam* cannot have *sukham*; happiness is an entity beyond the universe, beyond time and beyond space, which gets reflected in the mind; the experiential happiness is *prathibhimbha aanandaa* ; *bhimbha aanandaa*, which is called *bhoomaa* can never be experienced”.

Then, when the student eagerly asked: “Where is that unexperientable *bhimbha aananda?*”, the teacher replied “*thath thvam asi* – you **are** that original limitless happiness”.

At best, you can only get a reflected version of that original happiness, an example being one’s own face, which one can never look at directly; but, has to be satisfied with a reflection through a mirror.

“I am the original *aananda*, which can never be experienced. I have to be satisfied, with a reflected pleasure, which is subject to arrival and departure” is the teaching of *Sanathkumara* in the *Chaandhogya Upanishad*.

Therefore, “*Paro bhoomaa*” in this verse 57, means *aananda svaroopaa:*, which is ‘infinite’, which is :

- **निष्कलः** - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) without divisions.

Pure happiness does not have divisions as ‘my joy’, ‘your joy’ etc. It is only *eka:* | “*Sa ya:schaayam purushe ya:schaavaadhithye sa eka:*”. Original happiness is one indivisible whole.

- **अकारकः** - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) not one of the entities which is used for transactions.

The very question “how to experience that pure Bliss?” is fallacious, since the moment one ‘experiences’ any bliss, it will not be pure bliss, because it has become one of the

entities of the creation / an object of experience. *Aananda aathmaa* is beyond all transactions / experiences.

- **अक्रियः** - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) not a *kriyaa* or action / unassociated with any action.

Whatever is applicable to Consciousness is applicable to *aananda* also.

- **सः एव**— That pure *aananda aathmaa* / *chaithanya aathmaa*
- **आत्मवतां आत्मा** — is the essential nature of all living beings.

It follows, therefore, that, whenever somebody says "I am unhappy", the 'unhappiness' referred to, can only mean the "unmanifested happiness". In other words, the statement should only be: "I **am** happiness; but, my mind is not serving as an ideal reflecting medium; therefore, in the disturbed mind, happiness is not manifest. But, even when it is not manifest, I am *aananda aathma svaroopā*: alone".

What is the proof for that *aananda aathmaa*?

स्वतस्सिद्धः (स एव) - (That pure *aananda*) is always self-evident (in the form of pure *Chaithanyam*).

Because "*sath eva chith, chith eva aananda:*", we do not require a separate proof for *aananda* - existence is ever evident, Consciousness is ever evident, that alone is the proof for *aananda* also, because *aananda* is *chaithanyam*.

In the *Kathopanishad* also, *Nachikethas* asks: "How can that pure *aananda* be known or experienced by me?" – "*Thad ethath ithi manyanthe anirdesyam paramam sukham katham nu thadh vijaaneeyaam kimubhaathi vibhaathi vaa*" (II.2.14) and the teacher *Yamadarmaraja* replies "*Na thathra suryo bhaathi na chandrataarakam na imaa: vidhyutha: bhaanthi kuthoyamagni: | thameva bhaanthamanubhaathi sarvam thasya bhaasaa sarvamidham vibhaath!*" (II.2.15), which verse implies "Pure *aananda* can never be experienced, because it is in the form of the 'experiencer' Consciousness principle".

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says "*svathasiddha: sa: eva*" – "That is always self-evident". For whom (is it self-evident)?

नः - for all of us.

And, this *Brahmaananda* alone is revealed through the *mahaavakyam*, '*aham brahma asmi*'; and, in that *mahaavaakyam*, the word '*aham*' does **not** refer to *ahamkaaraa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 58:

अज्ञानोत्थबुद्ध्यादिकर्तृत्वोपाधिमात्मानं परिगृह्य एव अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां अहं सुखी दुःखी चेत्यहंकारादेः
अनात्मधर्मत्वं उक्तं केवल आत्म अभ्युपगमेऽशक्यत्वात्पलाभावाच्च । अथेदानीमविध्यापरिकल्पितं
साक्षित्वमाश्रित्य कर्तृत्वाध्यसेषपरिणामप्रतिषेधायाह ।

Accepting the Self, as conditioned by the mind, agency etc., which are emanations of ignorance, that the ego and such other phenomena involved in feelings like pleasure and pain, are other than the Self has been demonstrated, through reasoning. Such a procedure would be impossible and purposeless, if only the unconditioned Self were attended to. Similarly, now, taking our stand on the fact that the Self is the witness, which fact itself is a projection of nescience, we are going to deny of the Self, all the transformations of the nature of being an agent in action etc.

In this involved passage, Sureswaraachaarya is trying to convey an important message: "The pure *aathmaa*, which is eternal and all-pervading, is never available for any transaction; therefore, it is not even available for teaching or communication, since, communication is also only a form of transaction".

That's why, it is said: "*Yatho vacho nivarthanthe apraapya manasaa saha*" – "Words, along with the mind, return without reaching that" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Brahma Valli – 4*).

The all-pervading *aathmaa* is *avyavahaaryam*; therefore, beyond communication; therefore, in the course of *Vedhaanthic* teaching, for the sake of communication, "*aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind (*buddhi upahitha aathmaa*)" is first talked about, since "*buddhi upahitha aathmaa*" is *vyavahaaryam* / i.e. "*aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind" is available for some form of communication. In effect, a compromise is made and the "enclosed *aathmaa*" is *initially* talked about, with the hope, that, the student will *ultimately* understand the "un-enclosed *aathmaa*".

This is somewhat similar to the well known fact, that, pure all-pervading space is not useful in any manner and that only enclosed space (enclosed, as a room or as a container) can have utility.

Since pure *aathmaa* is *avyavahaaryam* – therefore, not available even for communication - the teacher first brings in the *sopaadika aathmaa*, which is revealed in the first stage as the 'experiencer' of everything, as in verse 23, Ch. XIII of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*Upadrashtaanumanthaa cha barthaa bokthaa maheswara: paramaathmethi cha api uktha: dehesmin purusha: para:* " – "The supreme *Purushaa* in this body is said to be the close witness, the supporter, the sustainer, the expereincer, the great lord and the supreme Self".

That all-pervading *aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind, is revealed as the experiencer 'I'-*dhrashtaa aathmaa*. Who is *dhrashtaa*? **Not** the all-pervading *aathmaa*, but, the *aathmaa* enclosed in the *buddhi*. Even this is a compromise made by the teacher, who comes down and calls the *aathmaa* a *dhrashtaa*.

To repeat: as a first step, the teacher says "You are the *aathmaa*, which is *dhrashtaa* and everything else is *dhrusyam*- the *anaathmaa*." Thus, in the initial stages, *aathma-anaathma viveka* is in the form of *dhrashtru-dhrusya viveka* / experiencer-experienced distinction.

The teacher further says: "The world / body / mind / thoughts are all *anaathmaa*. But, who are you? You are the experiencer – the *aathmaa*".

This is the first level of teaching called *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* or *dhrashtru-dhrusya-viveka*.

But, in this teaching, there is a problem, even though there are advantages. The advantages are: Through this teaching the world is negated; the mind is negated; the body is negated; the thoughts are negated and the conviction "I am the pure experiencer of even the blank mind" is instilled. But, there is a problem.

What is that problem? The moment you use the word 'experiencer', the very word creates an impression that *aathmaa* is doing the action of experiencing; since, the suffix 'er' added to any verb, refers to an agent doing the action indicated by the verb – examples being talker, speaker, walker etc. etc.

So also, in the word 'experiencer', we have added the suffix 'er' to the verb 'experience' and have thus presented *aathmaa*, as the 'experiencer' principle.

The moment you understand *aathmaa* as a *dhrashtaa* – experiencer – action is implied; and, once action comes, modification is involved, because any action results in *vikaaraa*. Therefore, the word '*dhrashtaa*' conveys *savikaarathvam*; and once you talk about the modification on the part of *aathmaa*, then the question 'if *athmaa* has modification, who is 'watching' the modification?' rises. Such a question cannot have answers, the result being 'confusion' instead of 'clarity'.

Therefore, in the second stage of teaching, the word 'experiencer/ *dhrashtaa*' is abolished. Initially, the word is used as a compromise, which, the teacher knows will create a doubt and therefore, later, replaces the word 'experiencer' by the word *saakshi*. What is taught initially as the 'experiencer', is, later, taught as '*saakshi*', the 'witness' principle. Once you use the word '*saakshi*', the confusion is cleared, since a 'witness' is that which is not

involved in any activity; which is impartial; which is only a bye-stander spectator. 'Witnessing' is **not** a job done by the 'witness'. The incident falls within the range of the witness, who does not 'look' into it."

Therefore, the word '*saakshi*' would indicate '*nirvikaara dhrashtaa*'; it is not an 'experiencer'; it is the pure Consciousness principle, *in whose presence*, things are known; but, *it is not a 'knower*'.

Aathmaa is not a 'knower'; but, in its presence, things get known; therefore, you call it a 'knower', though no 'knowing' action is involved on the part of the *aathmaa*. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadaa* gives the beautiful and apt example of 'fire' to this fact.

When we say 'fire burns paper'; we use the verb 'burn', as though fire is doing the action of 'burning'; while, in fact, fire does not will to/ does not plan to/ does not do, the action of burning; because, if 'burning' is an action done by the fire, the 'action' will have a beginning and an end; but, the reality is "fire **is** ; and, in the presence of fire, the paper gets burnt". Because of this, from the standpoint of paper, fire is said to be a 'burner'- though the suffix 'er' does not convey an action. In a similar manner, do we say : "Consciousness is a knower/ an experiencer".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Consciousness does not 'know'; it does not 'experience'; it simply **is**; but, in its presence, mind gets known; thoughts get known; and, through the thoughts, the world also gets known. And, to this Consciousness, which is actionless experiencer, a different name should be given and that name is *saakshi*".

Previously *aathmaa* was named *dhrashtaa* and *anaathmaa* was referred to as *dhrusyam*; now, in the advanced stage, *aathmaa* is called *saakshi* and *anaathmaa* as *saakshyam*. The term *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* is also dropped; *saakshi-saakshya-viveka* is the term used.

And, who am 'I'? 'I' am not a knower or experiencer; 'I' **am** and in 'my' presence things get experienced / known / awared.

This is the change of topic now: *Dhrashtru-dhrusya-viveka* to *saakshi-saakshya-viveka*.

In this portion, not only is the topic complex; the language used is also complex.

- **अहंकारादेः अनात्मधर्मत्वं उक्तं** - Until now, it had been taught, that, *ahamkaaraa* etc. are the attributes of *anaathmaa* / that, individuality is not the attribute of *aathmaa*.

What type of individuality?

- अहं सुखी (अहं) दुःखी च इति (अहंकारादेः) - (the *ahamkaaraa*) which expresses in the form of 'I am happy' / 'I am unhappy' etc.

By what method was this established?

- अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां - By using the reasoning of *anvaya* and *vyathirekha*.

'*Anvaya*' means 'continuity' and '*vyathirekha*' means 'discontinuity'. 'Continuity' is of the *dhrashtaa*, the experiencer and 'discontinuity' is that of the *dhrusyam*, the experienced. In 'I', the experiencer, there is '*anvaya*' and in whatever is experienced, there is '*vyathirekha*'. As in verse 13 – Ch. II of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: '*Dehino asmin yathaa dehe kaumaaram youvanam jaraa*' – *kaumaaram*, *youvanam*, *jaraa* are all *vyathirekhaa* ; 'I' am *anvayaa*. By using this method, *ahamkaaraa* has been separated.

On what basis, were all these done?

- आत्मानं (द्रष्टारं) परिग्रह्य - By taking the *aathmaa* as the experiencer / *dhrashtaa*.

The word '*Dhrashtaaram*' is understood. *Parigrhya* – by taking / assuming.

"*Aathmaa* is the 'experiencer'" is a compromised definition.

What type of *aathmaa*? Not the pure, un-enclosed, all pervading *aathmaa*, which cannot be the experiencer. The *aathmaa* enclosed within the *buddhi*, is the experiencer-*aathmaa*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- बुद्ध्यादि कर्तृत्वोपाधिं - The *aathmaa* which is enclosed within the *buddhi*, which gives the *aathmaa* the qualification of the 'experiencer'

'*Karthruthva upaadhi*' means the medium (the mind) which gives *aathmaa* the 'experiencer' status.

What type of mind?

- अज्ञान उत्थं - which is born of pure ignorance.

'*Ajnaana uttham*' is an adjective to the mind. Ignorance here means the *thaamasica* aspect of *maayaa*.

The *Achaaryaa* uses this adjective for the mind, since, only as long as 'I' am enclosed within the mind 'I' can be called an 'experiencer' and when *jnaanam* comes and the mind is negated 'I' cannot be called 'experiencer'. Finally, *aathmaa* cannot have any of these statuses. Only to indicate this fact, Sureswaraacharya uses this adjective '*ajnaana uttham*'. This *aathmaa* (enclosed by the *buddhi*) has been talked about, so far. Why? The *Achaaryaa* answers:

- **केवल आत्म अभ्युगमे** - If the pure un-enclosed, all-pervading *aathmaa* has been taken,

Kevala aathmaa – pure un-enclosed, all-pervading *aathmaa*.

This pure, all-pervading *aathmaa* is not available even for communication, just as pure space is not utilitarian in any way. Even an open land has to be enclosed at least by a fence, to be claimed as one's property; thereafter, space has to be further enclosed to be utilized as a house / rooms etc. 'House' is the name of 'enclosed space'; so also is 'room', 'hall' etc. Somewhat in a similar manner, *dhrashtaa* is the name of 'enclosed *aathmaa*'; the pure *aathmaa* is, as *Gouda Paadhaacharya* declares in his *Maandookya Karika – Advaita Prakaranam* – Verse 36, "*na upachara: kathanchana*" – "There is no transaction at all, with regard to the Self".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- **अशक्यत्वात्** – since, it is not possible to teach / communicate (about pure *aathmaa*)
- **पल अभावात् च** – and also since the *aathmaa* cannot enjoy the benefit of being known about

Palam – indicates 'knowledge', in this context; "'knowledge' (of *aathmaa*) is not possible" is the essence.

Aathma can be neither taught about; nor can it be known. Neither teachable nor knowable.

Therefore, we have compromised and we are communicating the 'enclosed *aathmaa*' as *dhrashtaa*.

But, in this method, as mentioned earlier, there is the following problem: "Once you say *aathmaa* is a *dhrashtaa*, it seems to be doing the action of experiencing"

"Therefore" the *Achaaryaa* says "I want to go to a different method". What is that?

- **अथ इदानीम्** - Therefore, hereafter,

- साक्षित्वं आश्रित्य - by resorting to the *saakshi* status (to the *aathmaa*, after knocking off the *dhrashtaa* status),
- कर्तृत्वादि अशेष परिणाम प्रतिषेधाय – to negate all modifications, including the modification involved in the action of experiencing,

Asesha parinaama – all modifications without exceptions

- आह - this is being said (in the following verse)

The word 'experiencer' conveys the 'action of experience'; that 'action of experience' (*dhrastruthvam*) is called '*karthruthvam*' in this context. That 'experincerhood' involves 'experiencing' modification. That modification also, the *Achaaryaa* wants to negate, by pointing out that the *aathmaa* is not doing the job of 'experiencing'. Then, what is it, that the *aathmaa* 'does'? It is not doing anything; it just **is**; it **exists**. Using the verb 'exist' also may create an impression that the *aathmaa* does the act of existing, since a verb always denotes action. To avoid this eventuality, use of the verb 'exist' is also avoided, in the context of *aathmaa* ; instead *aathmaa* itself is denoted by the noun '**Existence**' (*sath*)

"To negate all modifications, including the modification involved in the action of 'experiencing', I am going to define *aathmaa* as a *saakshi*", the *Achaaryaa* says.

But, this also causes another problem. Once you say *aathmaa* is a *saakshi*, it is true, that, it is not doing any action and therefore, it is changeless *saakshi*. But, even this status, changeless *saakshi*, is a relative status- i.e. it has relation to *saakshyam*. Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* may argue: "*Saakshi* also cannot be the absolute truth; because, *saakshithvam* is also a relative status and secondly *saakshi* also will be limited, because there is duality – *saakshi* and *saakshyam*." Therefore, later, the word *saakshi* also will have to be removed. This is the approach made in *Advaita Makarandhaa*.

But, here, in this portion, Sureswaraacharyaa limits himself to dropping the *dhrashtaa* status for the *aathmaa*, bestowing it with the *saakshi* status, with the intention, to stress on the 'changeless' nature of the *aathmaa*; but, he does indicate, that the *saakshi* status is also false, as follows:

- अविध्या परिकल्पितं (साक्षित्वं) – the *saakshithvam* status, which is also temporarily superimposed, because of ignorance.

Both, *saakshi* and *dhrashtaa* statuses are false. But, between the two, the *saakshi* false status is better than the *dhrashtaa* false status, since *dhrashtaa* implies 'change' and *saakshi* implies 'changelessness'.

77. Chapter II, Verse 56 to 58 (01-12-2007)

As a part of *aathma-anaathma viveka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa established that *ahamkaaraa*, or the individuality is also a part of *anaathmaa* only. In fact, this is evident, because this individuality exists only during *jaagrath* and *svapna*, while, during *sushupthi*, it gets resolved. It is, thus, subject to arrival and departure; and in *mokshaa*, it is subject to total destruction also. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa* only, *aathmaa* being ever-existent and non-destructible.

When this much was said, a *poorva pakshin* raised a question: "If *ahamkaaraa* is *anaathmaa*, the word *aham*, which refers to *ahamkaaraa*, should refer to *anaathmaa* only; i.e. the word *aham* or 'I', is, ultimately, connected to *anaathmaa*, according to you. If, thus, the word *aham* refers to *anaathmaa*, how can you explain the *mahaa vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi*? How can the *jada mithyaa anaathmaa* and *Brahman* be equated? Prove the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*aham brahma asmi*."

Sureswaraachaarya gave the answer to this question of the *poorva pakshin*, in the three verses 54, 55 and 56. He said: "Even though the word *aham* generally refers to *ahamkaaraa*, it can, in context, refer to *saakshi chaithanyam* also. The unlocalized Consciousness can be referred to, by the word *aham*, through *lakshanaa* or implication". And, pointed out: "This we regularly do, whenever we talk about our own sleep. When we use the word 'I', in the sentence 'I slept well', in that context, the word 'I' is referring to the unlocalized Consciousness only, rid of its individuality. Therefore, by implication '*aham*' can refer to the *chaithanyam*."

He supported his contention (that '*aham*' can refer to *chaithanya aathmaa*) by two other methods also, known as *gounee vrutthi:* and *mukyaa vrutthi:*, *mukyaa vrutthi:* meaning 'direct method'.

For the use of the *mukyaa vrutthi:*, the *Achaaryaa* gave his argument in verse 56: "The word 'I' generally refers to *ahamkaaraa* only; but, since, the pure Consciousness is ever in association along with *ahamkaaraa*, the word *aham* can also refer to the inseparable Consciousness, which is in and through the *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, the *mahaa vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi* is very much valid (when the word '*aham*' is interpreted as *chaithanyam*)".

This (i.e. establishing, that `aham` can mean `aathmaa` also) is only an incidental topic. The main / primary topic is: "ahamkaaraa is anaathmaa". The incidental topic was discussed at length, because the *poorva pakshin* had raised an objection here.

While on the incidental topic, Sureswaraachaarya also wants to give the meaning of the word *Brahman*, which is revealed through the word `aham`. That *Brahma lakshanam*, the Achaaryaa gives in the next *sloka*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 57:

कीदृक्पुनर्वस्तु लक्ष्यम् ।

What is the nature of the principle thus signified indirectly?

The *Achaaryaa* gets into the subject with an assumed question from the *poorva pakshin*: "In the *mahaa vaakyam*, `aham brahma asmi`, if the word *aham* reveals not *ahamkaaraa*, but is revealing the *brahma vasthu* only, then, tell me what is that *brahma vasthu*, revealed indirectly through the word `aham`."

- कीदृक् वस्तु –What is the nature of that entity,
- लक्ष्यम् - which is indirectly revealed (through the word `aham`)?

The *poorva pakshin's* question: 'ekaathmaa prathyaya saaram kim?'

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "That's the subject of all the *Upanishads*. I will give you an example."

Chapter II: Verse 57 –

नामादिभ्यःपरो भूमा निष्कलोऽकारकोऽक्रियः।

स एवात्मवतामात्मा स्वतस्सिद्धःस एव नः॥ ५७ ॥

The principle, that transcends the empirical determinations like name, is infinite, partless, not involved in any action as a factor therein and is actionless, is the Self for those who have mastered themselves. It is self-established for us.

The *Achaaryaa* says: "It (the word `aham`) reveals the Consciousness principle, which is not a part, product or property of the body; which is not limited by the boundaries of the body; (that's why it is called *brahma*, the very word *brahma* meaning not limited by space); and, which is not limited by time also (and therefore Consciousness continues to exist even after the disintegration of the body-mind medium). This pure Consciousness, not limited by time or space is called *brahma*; the very word *brahma* means *anantham*; this *ananthachaithanyam* is revealed by the word `aham`, in the *vaakyam`aham brahma asmi`".*

This *ananthachaithanyam* is the subject matter of all the *Upanishads*. Sureswaraachaara takes *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* to give an example in this context. In *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, there are eight chapters; the last three chapters deal with *Brahman*. In the 6th chapter, *Brahman* is revealed as *sadhroopa brahman* - as "pure existence"; in the 7th chapter, it is revealed as "Pure *Aananda*" (*aananda roopa*); and, in the 8th chapter, it is revealed as "pure Consciousness (*chith roopa*)". The five principles which are applicable to the *aathmaa*, are applicable to *sath* (existence) also, to *aananda* (happiness) also and to *chith* (consciousness) also.

In the context of *aananda*, the five principles apply as follow:

- happiness is not a part, product or property of the mind;
- happiness is an independent entity which pervades and manifests in *modha* and *pramodha vrutthis*;
- happiness is not limited by the boundaries of the mind;
- happiness continues to exist, even after the destruction of the mind, and
- pure happiness, in the absence of mind, is not recognizable .

In short, *aanando brahmethi vyajaanaath*.

Aananda exists even before the Creation was born; happiness is not something generated in your mind; *aananda* is the *jagath kaaranam*; from *aananda*, the *pancha bhoothaas* are born (*aanandaath hi eva kalu imaani bhoothaani jaayanthi*).

In other words, happiness is not an adjective qualifying the mind; but, is a noun which is "pure existence"/ "pure Consciousness". This *aananda* - pure *aananda*/ non-experiential *aananda* - is called *Bhooma* in the 7th chapter of the *Chandhoghya Upanishad*. (That's why, the 7th chapter of *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, is, itself, called "*Bhooma Vidhya*".)

Sureswaraachaarya refers to that *Bhooma Vidhya* here.

भूमा पर :नामादिभ्यः - Brahman is the pure *aananda* or *chaithanyam* which is beyond the entire Creation, starting with *naamaa*;

In the 7th chapter of the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, the Creation is referred to, with the help of 15 entities, beginning with *naamaa*.

First, the teacher says "naamaa is infinite. Naamaa being name, is infinite, because there is name everywhere; because every object is associated with some naamaa or other. Therefore, naamaa is infinite."

Then, the teacher introduces *vaak*, which is bigger; then, he introduces *mana:*, which is still bigger; thereafter, he goes on to *sankalapa:*, *chittham*, *vijnaanam* etc. Thus, the teacher *Sanathkumara* goes through 14 stages of teaching to *Naaradaa*, beginning with *naamaa* (*naamaadhibhya:*), and, finally comes to the 15th stage, called *bhoomaa*, which is "pure Consciousness" or *aanandam*.

Declares the teacher: "Yo vai bhoomaa thath sukham na alpe sukham asth" – "No object in the Creation can be happiness / no object in the Creation can have happiness, because every object is *alpam*; *alpam* cannot have *sukham*; happiness is an entity beyond the universe, beyond time and beyond space, which gets reflected in the mind; the experiential happiness is *prathibhimba aanandaa*; *bhimbha aanandaa*, which is called *bhoomaa* can never be experienced".

Then, when the student eagerly asked: "Where is that unexperientable *bhimbha aananda?*", the teacher replied "thath thvam asi – you **are** that original limitless happiness".

At best, you can only get a reflected version of that original happiness, an example being one's own face, which one can never look at directly; but, has to be satisfied with a reflection through a mirror.

"I am the original *aananda*, which can never be experienced. I have to be satisfied, with a reflected pleasure, which is subject to arrival and departure" is the teaching of *Sanathkumara* in the *Chaandhogya Upanishad*.

Therefore, "*Paro bhoomaa*" in this verse 57, means *aananda svaroop:*, which is 'infinite', which is :

- **निष्कलः** - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) without divisions.

Pure happiness does not have divisions as 'my joy', 'your joy' etc. It is only *eka:* | "Sa ya:schaayam purushe ya:schaavaadhithye sa eka:". Original happiness is one indivisible whole.

- **अकारकः** - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) not one of the entities which is used for transactions.

The very question "how to experience that pure Bliss?" is fallacious, since the moment one 'experiences' any bliss, it will not be pure bliss, because it has become one of the

entities of the creation / an object of experience. *Aananda aathmaa* is beyond all transactions / experiences.

- अक्रियः - (This *aananda aathmaa* is) not a *kriyaa* or action / unassociated with any action.

Whatever is applicable to Consciousness is applicable to *aananda* also.

- सः एव – That pure *aananda aathmaa* / *chaithanya aathmaa*
- आत्मवतां आत्मा – is the essential nature of all living beings.

It follows, therefore, that, whenever somebody says "I am unhappy", the 'unhappiness' referred to, can only mean the "unmanifested happiness". In other words, the statement should only be: "I *am* happiness; but, my mind is not serving as an ideal reflecting medium; therefore, in the disturbed mind, happiness is not manifest. But, even when it is not manifest, I am *aananda aathma svaroopaa*: alone".

What is the proof for that *aananda aathmaa*?

स्वतस्सिद्धः (स एव) - (That pure *aananda*) is always self-evident (in the form of pure *Chaithanyam*).

Because "*sath eva chith, chith eva aananda*:", we do not require a separate proof for *aananda* - existence is ever evident, Consciousness is ever evident, that alone is the proof for *aananda* also, because *aananda* is *chaithanyam*.

In the *Kathopanishad* also, *Nachikethas* asks: "How can that pure *aananda* be known or experienced by me?" – "*Thad ethath ithi manyanthe anirdesyam paramam sukham katham nu thadh vijaaneeyaam kimubhaathi vibhaathi vaa*" (II.2.14) and the teacher *Yamadarmaraja* replies "*Na thathra suryo bhaathi na chandrataarakam na imaa: vidhyutha: bhaanthi kuthoyamagni: | thameva bhaanthamanubhaathi sarvam thasya bhaasaa sarvamidham vibhaath!*" (II.2.15), which verse implies "Pure *aananda* can never be experienced, because it is in the form of the 'experiencer' Consciousness principle".

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says "*svathasiddha: sa: eva*" – "That is always self-evident". For whom (is it self-evident)?

नः - for all of us.

And, this *Brahmaananda* alone is revealed through the *mahaavakyam*, '*aham brahma asmi*'; and, in that *mahaavaakyam*, the word '*aham*' does **not** refer to *ahamkaaraa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 58:

अज्ञानोत्थबुद्ध्यादिकर्तृत्वोपाधिमात्मानं परिगृह्य एव अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां अहं सुखी दुःखी चेत्यहंकारादेः
अनात्मधर्मत्वं उक्तं केवल आत्म अभ्युपगमेऽशक्यत्वात्पलाभावाच्च । अथेदानीमविध्यापरिकल्पितं
साक्षित्वमाश्रित्य कर्तृत्वाध्यसेषपरिणामप्रतिषेधायाह ।

Accepting the Self, as conditioned by the mind, agency etc., which are emanations of ignorance, that the ego and such other phenomena involved in feelings like pleasure and pain, are other than the Self has been demonstrated, through reasoning. Such a procedure would be impossible and purposeless, if only the unconditioned Self were attended to. Similarly, now, taking our stand on the fact that the Self is the witness, which fact itself is a projection of nescience, we are going to deny of the Self, all the transformations of the nature of being an agent in action etc.

In this involved passage, Sureswaraachaarya is trying to convey an important message: "The pure *aathmaa*, which is eternal and all-pervading, is never available for any transaction; therefore, it is not even available for teaching or communication, since, communication is also only a form of transaction".

That's why, it is said: "*Yatho vacho nivarthanthe apraapya manasaa saha*" – "Words, along with the mind, return without reaching that" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Brahma Valli – 4*).

The all-pervading *aathmaa* is *avyavahaaryam*; therefore, beyond communication; therefore, in the course of *Vedhaanthic* teaching, for the sake of communication, "*aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind (*buddhi upahitha aathmaa*)" is first talked about, since "*buddhi upahitha aathmaa*" is *vyavahaaryam* / i.e. "*aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind" is available for some form of communication. In effect, a compromise is made and the "enclosed *aathmaa*" is *initially* talked about, with the hope, that, the student will *ultimately* understand the "un-enclosed *aathmaa*".

This is somewhat similar to the well known fact, that, pure all-pervading space is not useful in any manner and that only enclosed space (enclosed, as a room or as a container) can have utility.

Since pure *aathmaa* is *avyavahaaryam* – therefore, not available even for communication - the teacher first brings in the *sopaadika aathmaa*, which is revealed in the first stage as the 'experiencer' of everything, as in verse 23, Ch. XIII of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*Upadrashtaanumanthaa cha barthaa bokthaa maheswara: paramaathmethi cha api uktha: dehesmin purusha: para:*" – "The supreme *Purushaa* in this body is said to be the close witness, the supporter, the sustainer, the expereincer, the great lord and the supreme Self".

That all-pervading *aathmaa*, enclosed in the mind, is revealed as the experiencer 'I'-*dhrashtaa aathmaa*. Who is *dhrashtaa*? **Not** the all-pervading *aathmaa*, but, the *aathmaa* enclosed in the *buddhi*. Even this is a compromise made by the teacher, who comes down and calls the *aathmaa* a *dhrashtaa*.

To repeat: as a first step, the teacher says "You are the *aathmaa*, which is *dhrashtaa* and everything else is *dhrusyam*- the *anaathmaa*." Thus, in the initial stages, *aathma-anaathma viveka* is in the form of *dhrashtru-dhrusya viveka* / experiencer-experienced distinction.

The teacher further says: "The world / body / mind / thoughts are all *anaathmaa*. But, who are you? You are the experiencer – the *aathmaa*".

This is the first level of teaching called *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* or *dhrashtru-dhrusya-viveka*.

But, in this teaching, there is a problem, even though there are advantages. The advantages are: Through this teaching the world is negated; the mind is negated; the body is negated; the thoughts are negated and the conviction "I am the pure experiencer of even the blank mind" is instilled. But, there is a problem.

What is that problem? The moment you use the word 'experiencer', the very word creates an impression that *aathmaa* is doing the action of experiencing; since, the suffix 'er' added to any verb, refers to an agent doing the action indicated by the verb – examples being talker, speaker, walker etc. etc.

So also, in the word 'experiencer', we have added the suffix 'er' to the verb 'experience' and have thus presented *aathmaa*, as the 'experiencer' principle.

The moment you understand *aathmaa* as a *dhrashtaa* – experiencer – action is implied; and, once action comes, modification is involved, because any action results in *vikaaraa*. Therefore, the word '*dhrashtaa*' conveys *savikaarathvam*; and once you talk about the modification on the part of *aathmaa*, then the question 'if *athmaa* has modification, who is 'watching' the modification?' rises. Such a question cannot have answers, the result being 'confusion' instead of 'clarity'.

Therefore, in the second stage of teaching, the word 'experiencer/ *dhrashtaa*' is abolished. Initially, the word is used as a compromise, which, the teacher knows will create a doubt and therefore, later, replaces the word 'experiencer' by the word *saakshi*. What is taught initially as the 'experiencer', is, later, taught as '*saakshi*', the 'witness' principle. Once you use the word '*saakshi*', the confusion is cleared, since a 'witness' is that which is not

involved in any activity; which is impartial; which is only a bye-stander spectator. 'Witnessing' is **not** a job done by the 'witness'. The incident falls within the range of the witness, who does not 'look' into it."

Therefore, the word '*saakshi*' would indicate '*nirvikaara dhrashtaa*'; it is not an 'experiencer'; it is the pure Consciousness principle, *in whose presence*, things are known; but, *it is not a 'knower*'.

Aathmaa is not a 'knower'; but, in its presence, things get known; therefore, you call it a 'knower', though no 'knowing' action is involved on the part of the *aathmaa*. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadaa* gives the beautiful and apt example of 'fire' to this fact.

When we say 'fire burns paper'; we use the verb 'burn', as though fire is doing the action of 'burning'; while, in fact, fire does not will to/ does not plan to/ does not do, the action of burning; because, if 'burning' is an action done by the fire, the 'action' will have a beginning and an end; but, the reality is "fire **is**; and, in the presence of fire, the paper gets burnt". Because of this, from the standpoint of paper, fire is said to be a 'burner'- though the suffix 'er' does not convey an action. In a similar manner, do we say: "Consciousness is a knower/ an experiencer".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Consciousness does not 'know'; it does not 'experience'; it simply **is**; but, in its presence, mind gets known ; thoughts get known; and, through the thoughts, the world also gets known. And, to this Consciousness, which is actionless experiencer, a different name should be given and that name is *saakshi*".

Previously *aathmaa* was named *dhrashtaa* and *anaathmaa* was referred to as *dhrusyam*; now, in the advanced stage, *aathmaa* is called *saakshi* and *anaathmaa* as *saakshyam*. The term *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* is also dropped; *saakshi-saakshya-viveka* is the term used.

And, who am 'I'? 'I' am not a knower or experiencer; 'I' **am** and in 'my' presence things get experienced / known / awared.

This is the change of topic now: *Dhrashtu-dhrusya-viveka* to *saakshi-saakshya-viveka*.

In this portion, not only is the topic complex; the language used is also complex.

- **अहंकारादेः अनात्मधर्मत्वं उक्तं** - Until now, it had been taught, that, *ahamkaaraa* etc. are the attributes of *anaathmaa* / that, individuality is not the attribute of *aathmaa*.

What type of individuality?

- अहं सुखी (अहं) दुःखी च इति (अहंकारादेः) - (the *ahamkaaraa*) which expresses in the form of 'I am happy' / 'I am unhappy' etc.

By what method was this established?

- अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां - By using the reasoning of *anvaya* and *vyathirekha*.

'*Anvaya*' means 'continuity' and '*vyathirekha*' means 'discontinuity'. 'Continuity' is of the *dhrashtaa*, the experiencer and 'discontinuity' is that of the *dhrusyam*, the experienced. In 'I', the experiencer, there is '*anvaya*' and in whatever is experienced, there is '*vyathirekha*'. As in verse 13 – Ch. II of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: '*Dehino asmin yathaa dehe kaumaaram youvanam jaraa* – *kaumaaram, youvanam, jaraa* are all *vyathirekhaa*; 'I' am *anvayaa*. By using this method, *ahamkaaraa* has been separated.

On what basis, were all these done?

- आत्मानं (द्रष्टारं) परिग्रह्य - By taking the *aathmaa* as the experiencer / *dhrashtaa*.

The word '*Dhrashtaaram*' is understood. *Parigruhya* – by taking / assuming.

"*Aathmaa* is the 'experiencer'" is a compromised definition.

What type of *aathmaa*? Not the pure, un-enclosed, all pervading *aathmaa*, which cannot be the experiencer. The *aathmaa* enclosed within the *buddhi*, is the experiencer-*aathmaa*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- बुद्ध्यादि कर्तृत्वोपाधि - The *aathmaa* which is enclosed within the *buddhi*, which gives the *aathmaa* the qualification of the 'experiencer'

'*Karthruthva upaadhi*' means the medium (the mind) which gives *aathmaa* the 'experiencer' status.

What type of mind?

- अज्ञान उत्थं - which is born of pure ignorance.

'*Ajnaana uttham*' is an adjective to the mind. Ignorance here means the *thaamasica* aspect of *maayaa*.

The *Achaaryaa* uses this adjective for the mind, since, only as long as 'I' am enclosed within the mind 'I' can be called an 'experiencer' and when *jnaanam* comes and the mind is negated 'I' cannot be called 'experiencer'. Finally, *aathmaa* cannot have any of these statuses. Only to indicate this fact, Sureswaraacharya uses this adjective '*ajnaana uttham*'. This *aathmaa* (enclosed by the *buddhi*) has been talked about, so far. Why? The *Achaaryaa* answers:

- **केवल आत्म अभ्युगमे** - If the pure un-enclosed, all-pervading *aathmaa* has been taken,

Kevala aathmaa – pure un-enclosed, all-pervading *aathmaa*.

This pure, all-pervading *aathmaa* is not available even for communication, just as pure space is not utilitarian in any way. Even an open land has to be enclosed at least by a fence, to be claimed as one's property; thereafter, space has to be further enclosed to be utilized as a house / rooms etc. 'House' is the name of 'enclosed space'; so also is 'room', 'hall' etc. Somewhat in a similar manner, *dhrashtaa* is the name of 'enclosed *aathmaa*'; the pure *aathmaa* is, as *Gouda Paadhaacharya* declares in his *Maandookya Karika – Advaita Prakaranam* – Verse 36, "*na upachara: kathanchana*" – "There is no transaction at all, with regard to the Self".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- **अशक्यत्वात्** – since, it is not possible to teach / communicate (about pure *aathmaa*)
- **पल अभावात् च** – and also since the *aathmaa* cannot enjoy the benefit of being known about

Palam – indicates 'knowledge', in this context; "'knowledge' (of *aathmaa*) is not possible" is the essence.

Aathma can be neither taught about; nor can it be known. Neither teachable nor knowable.

Therefore, we have compromised and we are communicating the 'enclosed *aathmaa*' as *dhrashtaa*.

But, in this method, as mentioned earlier, there is the following problem: "Once you say *aathmaa* is a *dhrashtaa*, it seems to be doing the action of experiencing"

"Therefore" the *Achaaryaa* says "I want to go to a different method". What is that?

- **अथ इदानीम्** - Therefore, hereafter,

- साक्षित्वं आश्रित्य - by resorting to the *saakshi* status (to the *aathmaa*, after knocking off the *dhrashtaa* status),
- कर्तृत्वादि अशेष परिणाम प्रतिषेधाय – to negate all modifications, including the modification involved in the action of experiencing,

Asesha parinaama – all modifications without exceptions

- आह - this is being said (in the following verse)

The word 'experiencer' conveys the 'action of experience'; that 'action of experience' (*dhrastruthvam*) is called '*karthruthvam*' in this context. That 'experincerhood' involves 'experiencing' modification. That modification also, the *Achaaryaa* wants to negate, by pointing out that the *aathmaa* is not doing the job of 'experiencing'. Then, what is it, that the *aathmaa* 'does'? It is not doing anything; it just **is**; it **exists**. Using the verb 'exist' also may create an impression that the *aathmaa* does the act of existing, since a verb always denotes action. To avoid this eventuality, use of the verb 'exist' is also avoided, in the context of *aathmaa*; instead *aathmaa* itself is denoted by the noun '**Existence**' (*sath*)

"To negate all modifications, including the modification involved in the action of 'experiencing', I am going to define *aathmaa* as a *saakshi*", the *Achaaryaa* says.

But, this also causes another problem. Once you say *aathmaa* is a *saakshi*, it is true, that, it is not doing any action and therefore, it is changeless *saakshi*. But, even this status, changeless *saakshi*, is a relative status- i.e. it has relation to *saakshyam*. Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* may argue: "*Saakshi* also cannot be the absolute truth; because, *saakshithvam* is also a relative status and secondly *saakshi* also will be limited, because there is duality – *saakshi* and *saakshyam*." Therefore, later, the word *saakshi* also will have to be removed. This is the approach made in *Advaita Makarandhaa*.

But, here, in this portion, Sureswaraacharyaa limits himself to dropping the *dhrashtaa* status for the *aathmaa*, bestowing it with the *saakshi* status, with the intention, to stress on the 'changeless' nature of the *aathmaa*; but, he does indicate, that the *saakshi* status is also false, as follows:

- अविद्या परिकल्पितं (साक्षित्वं) -the *saakshithvam* status, which is also temporarily superimposed, because of ignorance.

Both, *saakshi* and *dhrashtaa* statuses are false. But, between the two, the *saakshi* false status is better than the *dhrashtaa* false status, since *dhrashtaa* implies 'change' and *saakshi* implies 'changelessness'.

78. Chapter II, Verse 58 and 59 (08-12-2007)

Chapter II: Verse 58 –

एष सर्वधियां नृत्तमविलुप्तैकदर्शनः।

वीक्षतेऽवीक्षमाणोऽपि निमिषत्तद्ध्रुवोऽध्रुवम् ॥ ५८ ॥

This seer of the inextinguishable and undivided awareness witnesses the insentient dance of the operations of all minds, though in reality there is no such thing as the act of witnessing on his part. He is the abiding spectator of phenomena that are transient.

In this portion, Sureswaraachaarya points out, that, the *Vedhantic* teaching, especially the *thvam pada vichaaraa* will start with *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* – the experiencer-experienced-discrimination. And, after some time, the discussion will be elevated to the level of *saakshi-saakshya-viveka*, the witness-witnessed-discrimination.

In the beginning stages, I look upon myself as an 'experiencer' and later, I learn to look upon myself as the 'witness'; and, why this change is made, should be made very, very clear : as an 'experiencer', I am a changing entity and as a 'witness', I am a changeless entity.

And, the principle of this difference should also be clearly understood: 'I' am the pure Original Consciousness principle, which is not subject to any change or action; in 'my' presence, the inert mind gets revealed / illumined; this revelation / illumination of the mind is not a job 'I' do; 'I' am innocently present and in 'my' presence, the mind gets the capacity to reveal itself. Because, 'my' reflection is formed in the mind, the mind gets *chiddabhaasaa*, just as the moon gets the reflection of the sun, without the will of the sun. And, therefore, I say "The mind is 'experienced' in 'my' presence/ the mind is 'experienced' because of me". ('Because of me' only means 'because of my sheer presence'). Since the mind gets experienced because of 'my' presence, I am figuratively called the 'experiencer' of the mind.

To repeat : In reality, 'I' am not doing the job of experiencing the mind and therefore, the use of the word 'experiencer', as an adjective to 'me', is, strictly speaking, not correct. Still the word is used, because, in 'my' presence, the mind reveals itself; in 'my' presence, the mind is experienced; because of 'my' presence the mind is experienced.

This changeless 'experiencer' is called *saakshi*. Primarily, I am the *saakshi thathvam*.

There are a few other facts also, to be considered and discussed.

While in 'my' (the *saakshi's*) presence, the mind 'reveals' itself (as explained so far), the mind also simultaneously gets the capacity to experience the world ; i.e. the mind becomes the 'experiencer' of the world ; this is also, again, only because of 'my' blessing, by 'my' mere presence; thus, the mind is verily the 'changing secondary experiencer' called *pramaathaa*, while 'I' am the 'changeless primary experiencer', called *saakshi*. 'I' am the 'experiencer' of the mind and the mind is the 'experiencer' of the world.

The next (third) fact: When we use the word 'I', before our exposure to *Vedhaanthalaa*, we are not aware that there are two 'experiencers', one the primary, changeless experiencer 'I', called *saakshi* and the other, the 'secondary, changing experiencer 'I' called *pramaathaa*. We are not aware of the existence of this 'mixture'; and the consequence is that, I mix up the two and therefore use the general term that 'I' am the *dhruk / dhrashtaa*, the observer.

Vedhaanthalaa does not want to sort out this 'mess' initially ; therefore, in the initial stages, the *Vedhanthic* teacher very loosely uses the words '*dhruk / dhrashtaa*' and '*dhrusyam*' and teaches " I am the 'observer' and everything else is the 'observed' – I am the *aathmaa* and everything else is *anaathmaa*" etc. Only after the student has had considerable exposure to *Vedhaanthalaa*, the teacher will point out: "the word *dhrashtaa* is a generic and confusing term. In reality, you are not *dhrashtaa* in the conventional sense; normally, *dhrashtaa* means 'the changing observer'. In *Vedhaanthalaa*, '*dhrashtaa*' means the 'changeless awareness' / *saakshi*, from which the mind is excluded. So, in *Vedhanthalaa*, the word 'I', the 'experiencer', refers to the *saakshi* 'I', who is changelessly present and who excludes the mind also – even the mind comes under '*dhrusyam*' or to be precise, '*saakshyam*'".

Therefore, in a nutshell: (1) Who am 'I'? I am the '*saakshi*? and (2) what do 'I' do ? 'I' do not do anything.

But, 'I' am called the 'witness', even though 'I' do not do anything and also there is no change involved in 'me', for 'me' to get the status of 'witness'.

This fact can be better appreciated with a simple analogy: Imagine a person, with a number of brothers and sisters, and living far away from his brothers and sisters; if this person gets married, his/her brothers and sisters acquire the statuses of brothers-in-law or sisters-in-law, as the case may be, without themselves planning or doing any action and in spite of the distance separating them from the individual getting married. The statuses are superimposed, incidental statuses attributed to the brothers and sisters, without any contribution *on their parts* to gain the statuses.

In a similar manner, 'I' am the Consciousness, not involved in action; but, in 'my' presence, the mind gets the capacity to reveal itself and also becomes the 'experiencer' of the world. And, in the mind, 'I' get the status of *saakshi* - the 'changeless witness'.

But, even this superimposed title / status of *saakshi*, which does not belong to me, is retained only until the *Vedhaanthic* teaching is complete. Once the *Vedhaanthic* teaching / communication is complete and the conviction '*aham brahma asmi*' takes root, the *saakshi* title is also dropped / removed.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya said (in the introduction to verse 58):

avidhyaa parikalpitham saakshithvam aasrithya – Resorting to this (temporary, incidental and superficial) status called *saakshithvam*, which itself is *a projection of ignorance*

karthruthvaadhi asesha parinaama prathishedhaaya - to negate all the *parinaamaas* / changes associated with *karthruthvam* (the agency of observation) etc.

To enjoy the status of *saakshi* / to gain the status of an 'observer', no change is required on my part. I am an 'observer', without doing the action of observation, similar to one getting the status of an 'in-law' consequent on one's sibling getting married, even if thousands of miles away.

Prathishedham – negation; *parinaamam* – change; *karthruthvam* - agency of observation; *asesha* - all.

'I' am not an observing agent; but I have the title 'observer' now, because, the mind happens to be in front, gets the *chidhaabhaasa*, becomes 'live' and undergoes changes. The changes in the mind are called emotions and the world is called 'object'. All these events happen in the mind and the world; and, based on these events happening in the mind and the world, 'I' am given the title *saakshi*; but, importantly 'I' am free from *vikhaara*: | "*Nirvikhaara chaithanyam saakshi aham asmi*".

To establish this,

- *Aaha* – the author gives the following (*sloka*).
- **एषः अविलुप्त एक दर्शनः** - This *saakshi chaithanyam* which is of the nature of eternal, non-dual / divisionless / unbroken awareness,

Esha: - This (referring to *saakshi chaithanyam*); *darsana:* - of the nature of awareness; *eka-* non-dual /divisionless/unbroken/all-pervading; *aviluptham* – eternal.

Aviluptham ekam darsanam yasya sa: - aviluptha eka darsana: |

The essence of this above statement: 'Awaring' is not a job that 'I' do; 'awareness' is my '*svaroopam*'.

What do 'I' do or what do 'I' seem to do?

- **वृत्तं वीक्षते** - observes the 'dance'

The treatise *Panchadasee* has a chapter entitled *Naataka Deepa Prakaranam*. The mind is a stage and in the mind stage, thoughts 'dance' around; the mind is like a stage and every thought is like a 'dancer'. *Raagha vrutthi, dvesha vrutthi, kaama vrutthi, krodha vrutthi, ghata vrutthi, pata vrutthi* etc. are different types of thoughts.

'I' am aware (*veekshathe*) of the emotions in the mind ; in 'my' absence, the thoughts will be only electrical impulses; they cannot be called 'emotions'; because, mind itself is only inert matter , thoughts are nothing but material disturbances; they cannot be called emotions; thoughts are called emotions, only when there is life in them. Who is lending life to them? *Vedhaantha* gives the answer: "By 'my' mere presence, 'I' give life to the body, the mind and the thoughts and through the material body, I 'experience' the material world". Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says: '*nruttham veekshathe*'. This '*nruttham*' takes place, all the time, except during 'deep sleep' *avasthaa*.

- **सर्वधियां** - taking place in all the minds,

The use of the term '*sarva*' is significant. It implies: "'I' am the Consciousness principle, witnessing not only the *nruttham* (emotions) in *my* mind; but 'I' am the '*chaithanyam*' behind *all* the minds – '*Kshethragnam cha api maam viddhi sarva kshekthreshu bhaaratha*' - 'Oh ! Arjuna! May you understand *Kshekthragnyaa* as Myself obtaining in *all* the bodies' (Verse 3 –Ch. XIII – *Srimadh Bhagavadh Githa*)".

- **अवीक्षमाणः अपि** - without doing the job of observation.

Similar to one becoming a brother-in-law, consequent on one's sibling getting married, though one does not do anything to become a brother-in-law (the analogy already cited), it is only the mind which does the job of 'observation' and 'I' am called the 'observer'.

This is the *aathmaa* – the *thvam padha lakshyaartha*:. Then, what is *ahamkaaraa*? The secondary observer – the mind – is called *ahamkaaraa*. 'I' am **not** *ahamkaaraa*; but, 'I' am the *saakshi*.

But, it has to be very carefully noted, that, even though 'I' am the *saakshi*, who excludes *ahamkaaraa*, when I want to claim that 'I' am the *saakshi*, I have to make use of *ahamkaaraa*. *Saakshi* cannot claim 'I' am the *saakshi*; it uses *ahamkaaraa* but excludes the *ahamkaaraa*. This is somewhat similar to writing – I have to use a pen to write; but, I claim that I am writing; I do not include the pen in myself. In a similar manner, 'I', the *saakshi*, use *ahamkaaraa*; but, *baagha thyaagha lakshanayaa*, I exclude *ahamkaaraa* and say "'I' am the *saakshi*."

This gives rise to an eternal question "Who claims '*aham brahma asmi*'? Is it the *saakshi* or is it the *ahamkaaraa*?" If you logically analyze, *ahamkaaraa* cannot do anything, if *saakshi* is absent – in fact, *ahamkaaraa* cannot even exist without *saakshi*. Therefore, pure *ahamkaaraa* cannot claim '*aham brahma asmi*'; similarly pure *saakshi* also cannot do anything without the medium of *ahamkaaraa* and, therefore, pure *saakshi* also cannot make this claim. It is the mixture (of *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*) alone which can make this claim – though *ahamkaaraa* has to be excluded from the claim. 'I' use the *ahamkaaraa* to make the claim, but, mentally exclude the *ahamkaaraa* and say "'I' am the *saakshi*."

- ध्रुवः - The changeless (*saakshi*)
- (वीक्षते) - (observes)
- तद् अध्रुवं (द्रुत्तं) – that constantly changing 'dance' of thoughts,
- निमिषत् - (which is) *jadam* / blind.

In this context, '*nimishath*' means '*jadam*'. *Nimesham* means winking or closing of the eyelids; when the eyelids are closed, one becomes temporarily 'blind'. Thoughts are 'blind' i.e they are *jadam*, by themselves.

Adhruvam and *nimishath* are adjectives and *thad* is the pronoun to *nruttham*.

The 'dance' of the inert thoughts are observed by the sentient *saakshi*, on the stage of the mind; and, in observing the inert thoughts, 'I' convert the inert thoughts to sentient thoughts, by lending *chidhaabhaasaa* to the thoughts. And, every thought becomes 'knowledge' or 'emotion' and I become 'aware' (of objects, emotions etc.)

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 59 :

- ननु सर्वसिद्धान्तानामपि स्वस्वद्रष्टापेक्षयोपपन्नत्वात् इतरेतर द्रष्टापेक्षया दुस्स्थितसिद्धिकत्वात् न एकत्रापि विश्वासं पश्यामः।

Here it may be objected: But all theories are reasonable from their own respective points of view. (But) they exhibit themselves as untenable when viewed from other points of view. Therefore, we have no confidence in any school of thought.

An interesting observation is made by a listener, who addressing Sureswaraachaaryaa, says: "Oh! *Advaitin!* According to you, *aathmaa* is the changeless 'observer', the *saakshi*, and that *aathmaa* is the absolute Reality. This is your *siddhaantha* – your teaching i.e., **"I am the *aathmaa*; I am of the nature of changeless Consciousness ; I get a temporary status of *saakshi*; everything else is *saakshyam* ; *saakshyam* is *mithyaa*; *saakshi* 'I' is *sathyam* ; and, 'I' the *sathyam* is not affected by the 'dance' that goes on; 'I' am not affected by any event that happens in the material world or in the material body ; 'I' am the changeless Reality etc.'** But, every system of philosophy claims that its conclusion is the ultimate truth – whether it is *saankhyaa*, *yogaa*, *nyaayaa* or *vaiseshikaa*. Every group of philosophers claims that their teaching alone is the truth. Every group has *poorva paksha siddhaantha* also – i.e., while establishing their school of thought as the 'truth', they dismiss all other systems as 'untruth', presenting valid arguments. In this situation, I have the problem of deciding as to which philosophy is the real truth, since, every school has arguments in their favour and also arguments against all the other schools. What is established by one system of philosophy is negated by all the other systems. So, whatever truth we know is only relative truth. How can we know the absolute truth, which is non-controversial and which will be non-debatable? Does such an absolute truth exist or not? Can you help me out?"

- ननु - But, there is a problem.
- सर्वसिद्धान्तानामपि स्वस्वद्रष्टापेक्ष उपपन्नत्वात् - Since all schools of thought are perfectly logical, from their own standpoints,
- इतरेतर द्रष्टापेक्षया दुस्स्थित सिद्धिकत्वात् - (but, while) from the stand points of the other schools of thought, they cannot stand scrutiny / enquiry,

Dhu:sthitha siddhika: – one which cannot survive the test of enquiry (*dhu:s sthithaa siddhi: yasya sa: siddhaantha: - dhu:sthitha siddhika:*)

Saankhyaa is 'Truth', from its standpoint ; but, *naiyaayikaa* will vehemently reject it ; in a similar manner, *nyaayaa* is 'Truth', from its standpoint; but, *saankhyaa* will vehemently reject it.

Maandookya Kaarika (verse 4 – *Alatasaanthi prakaranam*) refers to a particular viewpoint of the two philosophies *nyaayaa* and *saankhya*, each contradicting the other: “*Bhootham na jaayathe kinchith abhootham naiva jaayathe vivadhantha: dvayaa: hi evam ajaathim khyapayanthi they*” - “The existent is not born; the non-existent is not at all born; disputing thus, these dualists reveal birthlessness indeed”. (Of the two statements, ‘the existent is not born’ and ‘the non-existent is not at all born’, the former is a viewpoint of *nyaayaa* philosophy, while the latter is a viewpoint of *saankhya* philosophy).

एकत्र अपि विश्वासं न पश्यामः - we are not able to trust / rely upon even one school of thought.

If an individual limits himself only to an academic study of the differing systems of philosophy, he does not have a problem. But, the problem arises for a serious *mumukshu*, who has to follow one particular philosophy, for the attainment of his goal, and, therefore, has to make a definite choice with regard to his path, and should be able to rely totally, on the philosophy he chooses. But, the different philosophies, with their varied but convincing arguments, may create confusions for such a serious *mumukshu*.

(Further) *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 59:

न च सर्वतार्किकैः अदूषितं समर्थितं सर्वतार्किक उपद्रव अपसर्पणाय वर्त्म संभावयामः ।

We see no path-way that has not been refuted by any logician and is defended by all logicians and is competent to repulse the onslaught of all logicians.

“So, my problem is, which path to take? Which school of thought to follow? Whom should I consider as my guru?” (asks the listener).

- **वर्त्म न संभावयामः** - We are not able to visualize /arrive at any particular path to follow, Varthman - path (philosophy / school of thought, in this context).

What sort of path?

- **अदूषितं सर्वतार्किकैः** - (which path is) not criticized by **any** philosopher,

Sankaraachaarya may be glorified by many *aachaaryaas*; but, there are equally numerous *aachaaryaas* and their works, severely critical of *Sankaraachaarya* and his approach. No system of philosophy has totally escaped criticism.

- **समर्थितं (सर्वतार्किकैः)** - (or) validated / accepted (by **all** philosophers).

Essence: “There is no system of philosophy which has not been criticized by **any** philosopher/ universally uncriticized; nor is there a system, which is universally accepted/

validated by **all** philosophers". In short: "A non-controversial system of philosophy / school of thought is not to be found (*na sambhaavayaama:*)".

Why does the seeker look for such a system (i.e. an universally validated system)? Because, if he follows a non-controversial system, he will never be criticized by any one. Sureswaraachaarya points this out:

- **सर्व तार्किक उपद्रव अपसर्पणाय** - for the purpose of avoidance of harassment by all schools of thought / philosophies.

Upadravam - harassment; *apasarpanam* - avoidance.

In *Vairaaghya Sadakam*, the author *Bharthru Hari* writes: "*Saasthre vaadhi bhayam*", along with "*boghe roga bhayam, kule chuthi bhayam*" – "everything causes *bhayam* in this world".

Up to this is the *poorva pakshin*. Sureswaraachaaryaa replies:

(Further) *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 59:

उच्यते विस्रब्धः सम्भाव्यतामनुभवमात्रशरणत्वात्सर्वतार्किकप्रस्थानानाम् । तदभिधीयते ।

This charge is refuted now: Let experience be admitted with confidence, for the theories of all the logicians, ultimately take refuge in experience. This is explained now:

Sureswaraachaarya gives a subtle and profound answer.

Whenever there is a controversy and a debate is on, the tendency of the participants is to try to establish their viewpoints by one methodology or another. This is true of any field – law, science etc. In every field, a particular method is used to settle the controversy and arrive at the finality.

In scientific debates, scientific experimentations are resorted to – scientific proof or *pramaanam* is furnished. Observations are made, data is collected, theories are projected, predictions are made and then, the predictions based on the theories are again proved by observations, before the final truth is arrived at. In fact, theories formulated by some scientists were established much later, even after their lifetimes, by other scientists. This is in relation to scientific matters.

In *Saasthric* matters, six types of *pramaanam* – *shad pramaanaani*- are talked about. (*Pramaanam* is the means to prove one particular theory or another, whenever there is a controversy or debate). But, even though there are supposed to be six *pramaanams*,

ultimately, most of them boil down to one *pramaanam* – *prathyaksha pramaanam*, since *anumaanam*, *upamaanam* etc. are themselves based on *prathyaksham* only. Thus, if 'observation' is the *pramaanam* in Science, '*prathyaksham*' is the ultimate *pramaanam* in philosophical matters; both terms, 'observation' and '*prathyaksham*' denoting 'direct experience'. It follows, therefore, that ultimately, 'direct experience' is the *pramaanam* that is used to settle controversies in all matters.

'Direct experience' is thus comparable to an umpire or referee in the field of sports. Sureswaraachaarya uses the word '*praasnika:*', which means a 'referee' , one who is referred to, in all controversies and who is the final authority.

In all debates, universally – in all the fields – law, medicine, science, astrology, astronomy and so on – 'direct experience' is the referee, the ultimate authority.

Sureswaraachaarya argues: "A referee, who is referred to, for settling controversies, should himself be non-controversial and acceptable to everyone concerned. There is only one thing in the Creation, which is non-debated / non-controversial - that is 'direct experience' and 'direct experience' means nothing but Consciousness principle. 'Experience' means 'awareness'; 'awareness' means 'Consciousness'; therefore, *chaitanyam* alone is never questionable / undebatable; therefore, that alone can be the absolute Reality." This is to be the essence of the *Achaaryaa's* arguments in this portion.

79. Chapter II, Verse 59 to 61 (15-12-2007)

When Sureswaraachaaryaa established that the *svaroopam* of the individual is the *saakshi chaithanyam*, which is free from all changes, which is *asangha svaroopam*, which does not have *samsaaraa* in any of the three periods of time, which is identical with the all-pervading *Brahman* - when such a *saakshi chaithanyam* was revealed, a student or a *poorva pakshin* raises a doubt: "Every philosopher claims that his philosophy / teaching alone is absolutely correct. If all the philosophers have got the same view point, there will be no problem. But, they do not. They have discordant views regarding all the fundamentals. Whether we look at the six *naasthika darsanams* or the six *assthika darsanams* or even the three schools of thought within *Vedhaantha – dvaitha, visishtaadvaita* or *advaita* schools – all of them hold different views, with regard to the nature of *jeeva*, with regard to the nature of *Isvara*, with regard to the nature of *jagath*, with regard to *bandhaa, mokshaa, saadhanaa* etc. With regard to all these six fundamentals – *jiva, Isvara, jagath, bandhaa, mokshaa* and *saadhanaas* - there are differences. Further, if the various systems confine themselves to only establishing their own view points there may not be much of a problem; unfortunately, every system carries out a two-fold task – the first task being 'establishing its views' and the second more vehement task being 'refutation of other *darsanams*', in the name of *mananam*. In *Brahma soothraas – Ch. II – paadhaa 2*, the whole *paadhaa* deals with *aasthika-naasthika- darsana - bedhaani*. Consequently, the lay student faces problems ; he does not have sufficient resources to thoroughly analyze all the twelve *darsanams* and arrive at one of them as **the** Truth for him to follow; at the same time, he is unable to accept any of them as '**the** Truth', without analysis also, since his intellect questions him 'if this is **the** Truth, how is it that other philosophies refute it?'. For instance, if the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*Thathvam asi*' is interpreted based on *Advaita*, a sincere seeker after Truth would wonder how the *Achaaryaas* of *Visishtaadvaita* or *Dvaita* - viz. Raamaanujaachaarya or Madhvaachaarya would have dealt with this *mahaa vaakyam*. Such intellectual curiosity is natural and inevitable. Under such circumstances how am I to accept your teaching as **the** absolute, non-controversial Truth?"

This question of the *poorva pakshin* is covered in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 59:

- *Varthma na sambhaavayaama*: - We are unable to visualize /arrive at a path (for us to follow)
- *sarva thaarkikai: adhooshitham* – which is not criticized by other systems;
- (*sarva thaarkikai:*) *samarthitham* - (or) which is universally accepted (by all philosophers),
- *sarva thaarkika upadrava apasarpanaaya* – in order to avoid harassment from any philosopher.

It is common knowledge, that, when a serious seeker holds on to a particular system, quite often he is criticized or attacked by followers of other systems, even if the seeker sincerely wants to avoid any confrontation. Obviously, this fact is in the *poorva pakshin's* mind, when he says "*sarva thaarkika upadrava apasarpanaaya*".

(In this context, it is worth noting that Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his *Saadhanaa Panchakam*, gives a warning to all the *Vedhaanthic* students: "*Budha janai: vaadha: parithyajyathaam*" – "Do not enter into arguments with other systems". Similarly, *Naarada Bakthi Soothraas* also says "*vaadha: sarvathaa thyaajya:*" – "never get into arguments". Swami Chinmayaanaanda (jocularly) remarks: "*Vaadhaa* produces 'heat' rather than 'light'".)

When this much was said by the *poorva pakshin*, Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "I will present you with a fact, which you will have to accept, since, what I am going to say is non-controversial / cannot be found fault with".

- उच्यते - I shall teach you (and)
- विस्रब्धः संभाव्यतां - may you accept my teaching without any doubt / diffidence / suspicion.

But, why (is the statement to be presented by the *Achaaryaa* acceptable without doubt)? Because of a particular reason.

What that reason is, is being explained below:

"Whatever is controversial can, at best, be, only a relative truth, **not** the absolute truth, because, the controversial view is considered **the** truth, from the standpoint of one particular *vaadhi*, but not considered as **the** truth, from the standpoint of the *prathi vaadhi*.

Then, what constitutes the absolute truth? Naturally that which is non-controversial.

"Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that, to arrive at **the absolute** truth, any system must use some *pramaanam* or other, since, obviously, without a *pramaanam*, and there will be no means to establish or accept a truth. It follows, that, if the view of any system is to be accepted as the absolute non-controversial truth, the *pramaanam* given by the system, should itself be non-controversial or universally acceptable, similar to a referee in the field of sports, who has to be absolutely non-controversial or dependable if the game should go on.

"Thereafter, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks 'what are the various *pramaanams* used?'. And, points out that the first and foremost *pramaanam* is *prathyaksha pramaanam* or 'direct experience', which Sureswaraachaaryaa calls *anubhava pramaanam*.

"*Prathyakshaa* or *anubhavaa* is the primary referee acceptable to all *aasthika* and *naasthika darsanaani*. There are other *pramaanams* like *anumaana*, *upamaanaa* etc. But, they are also based on data derived from *prathyakshaa* only. Every one, without exception, agrees with *anubhava pramaanam*. In other words, 'direct experience' can serve as a non-controversial referee for all *darsanams*. Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the word *praasnika:*, which means 'a non-controversial referee, who is referred to, in controversies/ doubts / suspicions/ problems/ differences of opinion etc.', similar to an honest witness in courts of law, which term 'witness' also implies 'direct experience'.

"Therefore, the first point that Sureswaraachaarya asserts, is, that, 'direct experience' is a non-controversial factor and therefore, it has to be acceptable *pramaanam* from the standpoints of all the *darsanams*. There may be controversies with regard to what 'direct experience' reveals; but, that 'direct experience' itself is a non-controversial *pramaanam*, is accepted by every one. 'Direct experience' is the *praasnikam* – a referee that reveals **the** truth.

"Thereafter, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks the question "What do you mean by 'direct experience'? i.e. what is the content of every 'direct experience'?"

"The answer to this question: When one observes or experiences an object – for instance, a 'clip' - and talks about the 'direct experience' of the clip, the definition of the 'clip-experience' is nothing but the association of one's 'Consciousness' with the 'clip'. To quote one more example, 'music experience', is nothing but 'Consciousness associated with / conditioned by music'. Thus, every experience is the name of 'Consciousness conditioned by the relevant object of experience' - *thadh thadh vishaya avachchinna chaithanyam eva anubhava:* Therefore, the content of any 'direct experience' – any *anubhava* – is *chaithanyam* alone.

"Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya argues *chaithanyam* alone is the non-controversial truth to be accepted by all the *darsanams* – eastern or western – *naasthika* or *aasthika* – everyone will have to accept the referee named Consciousness.

" In fact, in the absence of Consciousness, no controversy is possible; the only place where there are no controversies or differences of opinion is the graveyard – '*chaithanya abhivyakthi abhaavaath'* – 'because of the seeming absence of *chaithanyam'* (obviously, you cannot say *chaithanya abhaavaath*, since *chaithanyam* is omni-present). All controversies / systems are possible only in the presence of *chaithanyam*; and, attempts to resolve all controversies are also possible only with the help of *chaithanyam* alone".

“The conclusion of the above course of arguments is: *Chaithanyam* is non-controversial that alone has to be the Reality - **sathyam**, *jnaanam*, *anantham brahma*. What is *sathyam*? *Sathyam* is nothing but *jnaanam*, which means ‘*anubhava: chaithanyam*’. What is its nature? ‘*anantham brahma*’.”

Based on this line of argument, Sureswaraachaarya asserts “Nobody can question Consciousness and that is what, we, *Advaitins*, are trying to establish. You cannot question Consciousness. In fact, even to question Consciousness, there has to be Consciousness. Therefore, *chaithanyam* alone is the truth of *jagath*, *Isvara* and *jeeva*. You have to necessarily accept this / arrive at this non-controversial fact - *sambhaavyathaam*”.

- अनुभव मात्र शरणत्वात् – Because the ‘direct experience’/ Consciousness is the only referee / refuge to resolve the issues,

For whom?

- सर्व तार्किक प्रस्थानानाम् - for all schools of thought / all systems of philosophy.

Different *darsanams* accept different number of *pramaanams*. *Advaita* accepts six *pramaanams*, *Visishtaadvaita* accepts eight, certain others accept two, certain others three etc.- but, all *darsanams* accept ‘direct experience’ as a *pramaanam*. In fact, the *Chaarvaaka matham* does not accept any *pramaanam* other than ‘direct experience’; to express it differently, even *chaarvaka matham* accepts ‘direct experience’ as the *pramaanam*.

While systems of philosophy other than *Advaitam* are engaged in vehement arguments, the *Advaitin* has no quarrel with any philosophy – (*Goudapaadhaa* in his *Maandookya Kaarikaa* – verse 17, *Advaitaprakaranam* – remarks “*parasparam virudhyanthe, thai: ayam na virudhyathe*” – “the other philosophers contradict one another. This – my teaching – is not in conflict with any of them”), because he accepts the ‘Witness Consciousness’ of the quarrels, as **the** truth. And, as far as the quarreling contentions are concerned, *advaitin* points out “that is called *maayaa – anirvachaneeyam*. From a particular angle one philosophy is right; from another angle, another philosophy is right. *Maayaa* is relative truth; *chaithanyam* is absolute truth. Arguments are unnecessary or they are useless. In matter, arguments cannot be avoided; but, in Consciousness, arguments cannot exist”.

तदभिधीयते - That is being said (in the verse that follows).

Chapter II: Verse 59 –

इमं प्राश्निकं उद्दिश्य तर्कज्वरभुशातुरा :।

त्वाच्छिरस्कवचोजालैः मोहयन्तीतरेतरम् ॥ ५९ ॥

By an appeal to this impartial witness i.e. experience, all theorists, in the grip of the fever of dialectics, weave webs of arguments and confound each other in consequence.

- **तर्कज्वर भ्रुशानुराः** - (All the eleven *darsanams*, apart from *Vedhaanthaa*) extremely afflicted / disturbed by the 'fever' called argument,
Aathuraa: - afflicted; *bhrusa* - extremely / strongly.
- **इमं प्राश्निकं उद्दिश्य** - appealing to this referee/ impartial witness (called Consciousness)
Uddesam - (in this context, means) appeal.
- **त्वाच्छिरस्क वचो जालैः** - by the use of networks of arguments which contain the suffix '*thvaath*' as the prominent component,
Vacho jaalam – network of arguments.

In *tharka saasthram*, every argument has got five components – of which the main component is 'reason'/ 'cause'. (Details of the other components are not relevant here and are, therefore, not discussed). For instance, in the statement "there is fire in the mountain, which is understood because of the smoke that is seen, as in the kitchen fire", all the five components mentioned by the *tharka saasthram* are there; but, the main component is the reason or cause '*dhoomavathvaath*'- the 'cause' expressed with the suffix '*thvaath*'. Any reason or cause is expressed, in the same fashion, with the suffix '*thvaath*', further examples being, '*nithyathvaath*', '*janyathvaath*' etc. The 'reason' / 'cause' will end with the expression /suffix '*thvaath*', (*thvaath* is not a word) the use of which suffix, reveals that evidence is being furnished, for proving a view.

The *Achaaryaa* refers to this common usage – "*thvaath chiraska vacho jaalaai*:"- "all the *vacho jaalani* of the different theorists have the suffix *thvaath* as their prominent component, as evidence for proving their views"

मोहयन्ति इतरे इतरम् - confuse each other.

On the other hand, the *Advaithin* says: "We have no arguments. The Consciousness, which is the Witness of all the arguments is **the** Truth; the arguments themselves are *mithyaa*, since they deal with the relative, empirical world."

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 60 and 61:

अत्रापि चोदयन्ति । अनुभवात्मनोऽपि विक्रियाभ्युपगमेऽनभ्युपगमेऽपि दोष एव । यस्मादाह ।

Concerning even this experience a further objection is raised: There are fallacies, whether the Self, of the nature of experience, is admitted to be changing or unchanging. Therefore, this point is brought forward:

Even though the *Advaitin* tries to put an end to all the controversies, by pointing out that (1) the referee to all the controversies, viz. 'direct experience', is non-controversial (2) 'direct experience' is nothing else other than the Consciousness principle (3) therefore, the referee Consciousness, *praasnika chaithanyam*, is the non-controversial Truth and (4) the essential nature of every one of us is this referee Consciousness, the *poorva pakshin* is not convinced ; he says "even there, there is a controversy".

- अत्र अपि - Even with regard to the non-controversial Consciousness
- चोदयन्ति - several objections are raised by some people.

What is that (objection)? "Consciousness is the Truth; this is accepted. But, what is the nature of that Consciousness? Is it a substance or a property or a relationship? Is it one or is it many? There can be controversies on all these aspects".

- अनुभव आत्मनः अपि - Even with regard to the *aathmaa* which is of the nature of Consciousness,

Anubhavaa – chaithanyam ; aathmaa – svaroopam.

- दोषः एव - there will be further problems and fallacies,

"Is Consciousness subject to change or not? If you say that Consciousness is subject to change, there will be a set of problems; if you say that Consciousness is changeless, then also, there will be another set of problems" says the *poorva pakshin*.

- विक्रिय अभ्युपगमे - if you accept that the Consciousness is subject to change
- (विक्रिय) अनभ्युपगमे अपि - or even if you accept that it is changeless.

"Therefore, who am 'I'? Am 'I' changing Consciousness or changeless Consciousness" is the doubt implied.

Some philosophers, like *Naiyaayikaas*, say that Consciousness is subject to change. Some other philosophers hold that Consciousness is changeless. *Visishtaadvaitam* talks about two types of Consciousness – *dharma bhootha jnaanam* and *dharmi bhootha jnaanam*. Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* says: "*dosha: eva*" - "there are still controversies".

यस्मात् आह - Because of the reasons, which the author presents in the following verses.

Chapter II: Verse 60 –

"वर्षातपाभ्यां किं व्योम्नश्चर्मण्येव तयोः पलम् ।

चर्मोपमश्चेत्सोऽनित्यः खतुल्यश्चेदसत्समः" ॥ ६० ॥

"What is it to the sky, whether there is rain or sunshine? Their effects are seen on the skin, the organ of touch. If the Self is analogous to the skin, it must be non-eternal and if analogous to the sky, it is as good as non-existent".

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa is quoting a verse from one of the textbooks of the *Buddhistic* philosophy, called *Vainaasika Kaarika*. *Vainaasika*: means a *Buddhist*; *kaarika* means 'a collection of verses'. In this verse of the *kaarika*, the *Buddhist* author gives two examples – *aakaasa*: (space) and *charman* (skin) - for comparison with *aathmaa* and asks "Is *aathmaa* like the first example, *aakaasa*.; or is it like the second example, *charman*?"

- वर्ष आतपाभ्यां – Because of the rainy and summer seasons,

Varsha: – rain; *aathapa*: - sunshine. The words stand for the rainy and summer seasons respectively.

What happens to the human skin, when repeatedly exposed to the rainy and summer seasons? It is common knowledge, that, the skin undergoes textural changes due to the exposure. (Of course, it ultimately perishes.) *Charmaa* undergoes *vikhaaraa*, caused by *varshaa* and *aathapaa* and is, therefore, *savikhaara*: |

On the other hand, what about *vyomaa* (space)? Any number of alternating seasons cannot affect space, although it is in constant touch with seasons. It is *nirvikhaaram*.

The *Vainaasika Kaarika* query is: "Is *aathmaa savikaara*: *charmavath*? Or, is it *nirvikhaara*: *aakaasavath*?" This query from the *Buddhist granthaa* is quoted by the *Achaaryaa*.

- व्योम्नः किं (भवति) - what will happen to *aakaasaa* (space)?

Vyoman – *aakaasa*: /space.

This is not a question proper; but, only an assertion, that, nothing happens to space, because of exposure to rains and sun. *Aakaasa*: *nirvikaara*: *nithya*: *cha bhavathi* |

- चर्मणि एव तयोः पलं (भवति) - The consequences of the seasons will be felt only on the skin.

Thayo: - Theirs (referring to the rainy and summer seasons).

This means that, *Charma* is *savikhaaram* and *anithyam* |

“Is *aathmaa* similar to the skin or to the space?” is the question, with a further statement, that, in either case, there is a problem.

- **चर्म उपमः चेत्** - If *aathmaa* is like the skin,
Upama: - like / similar to.
- **सः अनित्यः (भवति)** - it will be *savikhaara:* and therefore *anithya:* |

On the other hand,

- **खतुल्यः चेत्** - If *aathmaa* is similar to space,
Kham - space.
- **असत्समः** - it will be as good as non-existent (because it cannot do any *vyavahaaraa*)
Sath – existent; *asath* – non-existent; *sama:* - equal to/ as good as.

The very existence of space is very often overlooked / not noticed, because space is not involved in / not available for any transaction (*avyavahaaryathvaath*). In a like manner, if *aathmaa* is considered similar to space, *aathmaa* will also be *asathsama:*, i.e. as though non-existent; it cannot become *pramaathaa*, *karthaa*, *bokthaa* etc. It cannot even perform *mokshaa saadhanaani*.

This topic is further explained in the next verse.

Chapter II: Verse 61 –

बुद्धिजन्मनि पुंसश्च विकृतिर्यध्यनित्यता ।

अथाविकृतिरेवायं प्रमातेति न युज्यते ॥ ६१ ॥

When an intellectual operation arises in man, if he changes, he is non-eternal and if he does not change, he is not the knower of the knowledge in question.

Let us consider the two options – (1) 'I', the *aathmaa*, as similar to *nirvikhaara aakaasaa* and (2) 'I', the *aathmaa*, as similar to *savikhaara charmaa*. “Which one should I take myself as? Either way, I will have problems” says the *poorva pakshin*, based on the *Vainaasika Kaarika*.

- **बुद्धिजन्मनि** - When cognitions / experiences (like *ghataa jnaanam*, *pata jnaanam* etc. arise, during our transactions),

Buddhi: - experience / cognition / knowledge

- **पुम्सः यदि विक्रुतिः (भवति)** – if changes result to 'me', the *aathmaa*, because of the experiences (i.e. if, 'I', the *aathmaa*, associated with the experiences – *sukham*, *dhu:kham*, *raagham*, *dvesham* etc. - as the 'experiencer' of those experiences, undergo changes, as *sukhee*, *dhu:khee*, *raaghee*, *dveshee* etc.)

Pumsa: - for 'me', the *aathmaa*; *yadhi* – in case / if; *vikruthi*: - changes / modification from one state to another state.

A hypothetical case is considered: At a given moment 'I' was unhappy and at a subsequent moment, 'I' become happy; and 'I' admit 'changes' in 'me', what is the consequential problem?

- **अनित्यता (स्यात्)** - (like the skin/ *charmaa*) 'I' will be an *anithya* subject.
- **अथ** - On the other hand,
- **अयं अविक्रुतिः एव (चेत्)** – (if) 'I' am the space-like Consciousness Principle, not subject to any modifications / not connected to any experience,
- **(अयं) प्रमाता इति न युज्यते** - - (then) I cannot be called an 'Experiencer' of the events of life.

If *aathmaa* is the 'experiencer' it becomes *anithyam*; if *aathmaa* is *nithyam* it cannot be the 'experiencer'.

Nithyathvam and 'experiencerhood' do not seem to co-exist.

What is our observation? "I am the 'experiencer'" is the general observation. Once this is accepted, then, "I am *charmavath vikhaara*.; *aathmaa* will become *anithya*:", but, *aathmaa* is *nithya*: /

And, if 'I' have *nithyathvam* and 'I' do not have the 'experiencer' status, how can 'I' be called Consciousness? Being 'conscious' means, 'undergoing varieties of experiences', the consequence of which is 'modifications'. But, *aathmaa* is *nirvikhaara*: |

Then what exactly is the nature of *aathmaa*?

Sureswaraachaarya has to establish that 'I', the *aathmaa*, am the **eternal** Consciousness also and **I can enjoy 'experiencer' status also without undergoing any change**, because of my mere 'presence' – *saannidhya maathrena*. This is *Vedhaanthaa*.

80. Chapter II, Verse 61 to 63 (22-12-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya pointed out that the only non-controversial entity in the entire Creation is Consciousness. With regard to everything else we experience, there are controversies and differences of opinion; the only thing which is non-controversial is Consciousness.

What is the reason for that? The reason is explained as follows: for resolving all controversies, we use one *pramaanam* or another; the basic unquestionable *pramaanam* is direct experience (*anubhava:*); and, direct experience (*anubhava:*) is nothing but Consciousness (*chaithanyam*) associated with a particular object. Therefore, it follows, that, *chaithanyam* alone is unquestionable. In fact, in the absence of Consciousness, there will be no controversies at all and there will be no requirement for the resolution of controversies also. *Chaithanyam* is the Absolute Reality and everything else is controversial. And, what is controversial, can be, only relative reality.

If Consciousness is the absolute truth of everything, it has to be the truth of *Isvara*, it has to be the truth of the *Jagath* and it has to be the truth of the *Jeeva*.

The truth of the *Jeeva*, thus, being Consciousness alone, "*aathmaa anubhava roopa: / chaithanya roopa:*" This was established by Sureswaraachaarya in verse 59.

Based on that, a *poorva pakshaa* was raised: "Let us accept and assume that I am of the nature of Consciousness; that, I am *anubhava aathmaa / anubhava svaroopta:* | Still, the controversies cannot be said to have been totally resolved; because, the next question is 'what is the nature of Consciousness? Is it *anithyam* or *nithyam*? Is it *anithyam* like *charma* (skin), which is affected by *varsha* (the rains) and *aathapaa* (the hot sun)? Or, is it *nithyam* like *aakaasaa* (space), which is not affected by seasons?'"

"Am I changing Consciousness or changeless Consciousness?" the *poorva pakshin* asks "When the cognitions / *vrutthaya:* are born in the mind, am I (the Consciousness), associated with them, and affected / influenced by them or not affected by them, at all?"

Buddhi janmani - Buddhi, in this context, is to be taken as 'cognitions in the mind' i.e. '*buddhi vrutthaya:*'

he *poorva pakshin* further proceeds: "Either way, I will have problems". He explains:

"Suppose I say, I am the changeless Consciousness, who does not have any connection to whatever happens in the *buddhi*, it would mean that 'I' cannot be the 'experiencer'; this is obvious, since, if I do not have any connection with 'experiences', I cannot be called an

'experiencer'; i.e. if I am pure, changeless *chaithanyam*, I cannot be an 'experiencer'; but, if I am not an 'experiencer', it is contradictory to what I experience, which experience is that 'I am an experiencer'. In my day-to-day experience, I find that I **am** an 'experiencer'.

"So, if we go by our daily *anubhava* and say that I am an 'experiencer' and that I have connection/ association with every experience, it would mean that I am subject to modification / change – *sukhaa* experience at times, *dhu:kha* experience at other times etc. i.e., 'I' am subject to *vikaaraa*. And, if 'I' am subject to *vikaaraa*, 'I' will become *anithyam*. In short, if I am 'experiencer' I will become *anithya*: and if I am *nithya*:, I cannot be an experiencer. *Nithyam cheth na dhrashtaa* (experiencer); *dhrashtaa cheth na nithya*:. But, you are saying *aathmaa* is *nithya*: and also that *aathmaa* is experiencer – *dhruk* of everything. Is this not a contradiction? Therefore, tell me clearly, is *aathmaa* an 'experiencer' and (therefore) *anithyam* or is it *nithyam* and (therefore) not an experiencer."

These objections / questions from the *poorva pakshin*, were dealt with, in verses 60 and 61. In verse 61:

- **यदि पुम्सः विकृतिः (भवति)** - If *aathmaa* undergoes change (by getting connected to every experience),
- *Pumsa*: - *aathmana*: (in this context)
- **बुद्धिजन्मनि** - when the experiences are rising in the intellect,
- **अनित्यता (भवति)** - mortality will result to the *aathmaa* ('I' will become a changing 'experiencer' and whoever is changing, is also mortal, because one of the six changes - *asthi, jaayathe, vardhathe, viparinamathe, apaksheeyathe, vinasayathi*- is '*vinasyathi*'. A changing 'experiencer' will have to perish in course of time)
- **अथ** - To avoid this problem (i.e. to claim that *aathmaa* is *nithya*:)
- **अयं अविक्लृतिः (चेत्)** - (if) *aathmaa* is considered as 'changeless' Consciousness
- **प्रमाता इति न युज्यते** – *aathmaa* cannot be an experiencer of anything (because, to be an 'experiencer', is to undergo change)

How do you resolve this issue? Sureswaraachaaryaa gives the answer, in this very, very important portion.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 62 & Verse 62:

अस्य परिहारः

ऊर्ध्वं गच्छति धूमे खं भिध्यते स्विन्नं भिध्यते ।

न भिद्यते चेत्स्थानसुत्वं भिध्यते चेद्भिदास्य का ॥ ६२ ॥

This charge is answered in what follows:

When a column of smoke ascends upwards in the sky, is the sky cut up thereby or does it remain one and unbroken? If it remains unbroken, it means that the smoke is not rising up at all; and, if it is broken up, what is the nature of the division, that has taken place?

It is desirable, at this stage, to consider, in totality, the gist of the answer given by the *Achaaryaa*, in the following few verses, since, he gradually builds up his arguments.

The *Achaaryaa* wants to say "I am the changeless Consciousness and I changelessly experience everything and therefore, I am a **changeless 'experiencer'**. This seems to be a contradiction in terms; but, it is **not** a contradiction. It is possible in a peculiar manner, though not in a normal manner".

The truth is: 'I' am the changeless Consciousness is **the** fact. Really speaking, I am not an 'experiencer', because, I am not doing the job of 'experiencing'. What is happening is, that, in my presence, the inert mind gets experienced and revealed. The inert, insentient mind cannot reveal itself; it cannot know anything by itself. But, in 'my' presence, the inert mind gets sentient and inert thoughts get experienced. Since the mind gets experienced, from that standpoint, I am figuratively called an 'experiencer'".

The correct expression should, in fact, be: "In my presence, the mind becomes known; the mind becomes 'awared'; the mind becomes sentient; the mind becomes 'experienced'."

Since the mind becomes experienced in my presence, from that standpoint, I call myself an 'experiencer', without doing anything, similar to the example earlier cited – an individual acquiring a new status as a brother-in-law or sister-in-law, sometimes even without the individual's knowledge, consequent on a sibling marrying.

"Status-change can happen without an actual change of the object".

In a similar manner, 'I' am the non-experiencer Consciousness and when the mind is in front of 'me', from the standpoint of the mind, which gets experienced in 'my' mere presence, 'I' get a new status without undergoing any change – the new status being 'experiencer' status. During *sushupthi*, when the mind is resolved, 'I' have non-experiencer status. During the waking and dream states, the mind comes alive and active and 'I' get 'experiencer' status. There is no change in 'me'; the change is only in the 'arrival' of the mind and 'departure' (resolution) of the mind; mind comes and 'I' get the status of 'experiencer'; mind goes and I get the status of 'non-experiencer'; thus, 'I' **can be said** to be the primary, changeless, but, 'experiencer' *aathmaa*. Since, thus, the *aathmaa* is changeless, it is eternal and therefore, it is ever free also. *Vedhaantha* is talking about that *aham* as *Brahman*. "Where is the problem, in this?" wonders the *Achaaryaa*.

This mystery – the change of status, without an actual change - or the mystery of *aathmaa* being a changeless experiencer, can be understood with the example of another mystery.

The *Achaaryaa* gives a brilliant example, never cited earlier anywhere, in verse 62. These uncommon examples give an unique strength to this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

- **अस्य परिहारः** - I am giving the solution to your question.

What is the example? When there is fire, say a forest fire, smoke is formed. The smoke goes upwards in the sky. Up there, is *aakaasa*; which is an all-pervading principle. *Aakaasaa* is not nothingness; it is a subtle substance, a positive entity and **is** existent. *Tharka saasthraa* accepts *bhaava roopa akaasaa* as one of the five elements; *Vedhaantha saasthraa* talks about *aakaasaa* as a *bhava roopa padhaartha*; therefore, *aakasaa* **is** a **substance**, all-pervading.

"When the smoke is going up, does the smoke pierce the *aakaasaa* and go up or does it not pierce the *aakaasaa* to go up?" is the question.

Sureswaraacharya asks the question: "Does the smoke pierce the *aakaasaa* to go up?" and proceeds: "Any way you answer, you are in trouble. If you say, the smoke does not pierce the *aakaasaa*, it will mean, that the smoke will not go up; it will stand arrested in position. But, since it is going upwards, you have to say that it 'pierces' *aakaasaa*. And, if you say so i.e. 'since smoke is going upwards, it is dividing/ separating *aakaasaa* to go upwards', then tell me where is the 'partition'. You have to show me the separation / the division. And, if you reply that there was a temporary division in *aakaasaa* and later the 'divisions' joined, do you mean to say, that there is an activity in *aakaasaa* – of 'giving way' to the smoke and 'joining' later? Therefore, you cannot say *aakaasa* is pierced also. The smoke goes up; it does not pierce *aakaasaa* also. Without piercing *aakaasaa*, the smoke goes up. Can you explain how the smoke goes up, without piercing *aakaasaa*? If, thus, *aakaasaa* can give way to the smoke, without getting pierced/ without any change, in an exactly similar manner, *chaitanyam* can 'experience' and can allow the experiences also to take place, without getting affected / undergoing any change".

- **धूमे ऊर्ध्वं गच्छति (सति)** - (When) the smoke is going upwards,

The word '*gacchathi*' is not used as a verb here. It is 'present active participle -*sapthami vibhakthi*' – the noun being '*gacchari*'. Locus of time is indicated – 'when the smoke is going upwards'.

- **खं भिध्यते** - Is the *aakaasaa* (which is a positive entity, a subtle material substance) pierced / partitioned/ divided
- **स्वित्** - *athavaa* / or
- **न भिध्यते** - is it (*aakaasaa*) not split/ pierced / penetrated ?

Suppose the space is divided into two, we have to accept that there are now two pieces of space and then the question arises "When, thus, space is divided or portioned, what is there in between the two portions?" When any material, say a loaf of bread, is split, what is in between the split pieces, can only be 'space'. Therefore, if it is assumed that 'space' is divided, what is in between the 'divided' portions of 'space' can also be nothing other than space; then it follows that space has not been divided/ partitioned at all. The conclusion: Space is, therefore, indivisible.

This is the question Sureswaraachaarya asks of the *poorva pakshin*, and proceeds:

- न भिध्यते चेत् - If the space is not pierced / portioned / separated,
- स्थासुत्वं (भवति) – the smoke will become stationery (similar to its upward movement being obstructed by the ceiling in a covered hall).
- भिध्यते चेत् - If it is presumed that the smoke is piercing the space,
- भिदा अस्य का - what is the nature of the division that has taken place?

Bhidaa – partition; *asya* – *aakasasya*; *kaa* – what (is the nature)?

No convincing explanation can be given, because, if 'space' is partitioned to allow the smoke to go up, it would mean that 'space' provided some space, in between its two portions, to accommodate the smoke, in which case, it would not have been partitioned at all, since there is only space in between the two split portions of the space.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 63:

इत्येतत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थमाह ।

This is rendered intelligible by the following:

- इति एतत् - If we arrive at this mysterious, inexplicable situation,

At the level of space, how smoke or any other object goes upwards in space is a mystery. Similarly, how Consciousness is a 'changeless experiencer' is also a mystery. Both mysteries appear inexplicable. But, the *Achaaryaa* says "I will explain the mystery".

- प्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् – for understanding this conundrum,
- आह – I will give you the answer.

Prathipatthi: - Right understanding.

Chapter II: Verse 63 –

अविक्रियस्य भोक्त्रुत्वं स्यादहंबुदिविभ्रमात् ।

नौयानविभ्रमाध्यद्वन्नेषु गतिकल्पनम् ॥ ६३ ॥

The unchanging Self becomes the experiencer of pleasures and pains through the illusion of egohood, even as one going in a boat become subject to the illusion that the trees on the banks are moving.

This topic is elaborated by the *Achaaryaa*, in several verses that follow and has to be studied step by step.

Here (in this verse), Sureswaraachaarya explains the *Vedhaantha siddhanthaa*, the salient features of which are broadly as follow:

"That I am the space-like Consciousness is the fact; just as space is everywhere, 'I' am also everywhere. And, Consciousness is 'my' nature. The Creation is existing in 'me', because, I am all-pervading like space; the Creation which is existing in the space, is existing in the all-pervading Consciousness, 'me'. And, one of the things in the Creation is the mind, which is also made up of subtle forms of matter only. (In modern science, they talk about energy – how energy is a non-tangible, subtle form of matter only. The mind is also a non-tangible, subtle form of matter, like energy.) And, the mind gets the capacity to generate thoughts when blessed by the all-pervading Consciousness. (This is similar to an electrical gadget getting the capacity to function, when blessed by the presence of electricity.) When 'I' am available, because of 'my' *saannidhyam*, the mind gets activated / sentient and becomes capable of generating *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *kaamaa*, *krodhaa* etc.; in short, the mind gets 'experienced' – i.e. it reveals its existence. When the mind is, thus, experienced, 'I' am temporarily called (in the presence of the mind) an 'experiencer' (to remember the example of an individual becoming a 'brother-in-law'). 'I' get the 'experiencer' status, not by doing any job, but, because the mind reveals its existence/ experiences / thoughts etc., in 'my' presence.

"Once the mind gets experienced and sentient, the mind gets the status of the 'experiencer' of the world (this fact had, of course, been covered earlier), not by itself, but because of the presence of 'I', the primary experiencer. Because of the presence of 'me', the primary experiencer, who is a changeless experiencer, the mind has become experienced, sentient, alive, capable of generating thoughts and capable of experiencing the external world through the five sense organs. Thus, in 'my' presence, the mind becomes a secondary observer – called *ahamkaara*:

"*Ahamkaaraa* is, thus, the secondary experiencer. And, how does the mind carry out the job of the (secondary) experiencer? By undergoing thought **modifications** – i.e. for the mind to experience sound, *sabda vrutthi* has to take place, for the mind to experience 'form', *roopa vrutthi* has to take place and so on. So, the mind is the changing, secondary

experiencer, while, Consciousness is the changeless, primary experiencer. But, just as there is no 'distance' separating space and any object in space, there is no 'distance' between the mind, the secondary experiencer and Consciousness, the primary experiencer. Because of this (i.e. the close proximity between the two), the word 'I' includes both the secondary and primary experiencers; i.e. 'I' is a mixture of *saakshi* (changeless primary experiencer) and *ahamkaaraa*, (the changing secondary experiencer) – this mixture, *amsa dvaya yuktha: aham asmi* |

"But, even though both of them, the *saakshi aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*, are there in the word 'I', - the primary changeless experiencer *saakshi*, is invariably lost sight of / taken for granted . A typical example is that, when an object is within one's sight, one observes the object, and, when questioned "what is in front of you?" will mention the object – but, invariably will not mention the 'space' in which the object is located. There are actually two things where the object exists – the object and the *aakaasaa* accommodating the object; since, without the *aakaasaa* to accommodate, the object cannot exist. But, though it is *aakaasaa* which accommodates the object, the observer has a tendency to ignore its existence. The changeless, formless *aakaasaa* and the changing, formed object are in existence together; but, the observer loses sight of the changeless accommodator *aakaasaa*. In a similar fashion, when the word 'I' is used, invariably, the word is taken as referring to the changing mind / *ahamkaaraa* experiencer, losing sight of the changeless Consciousness *saakshi aham*.

"And, *Vedhaantha* is struggling to turn our attention towards that 'I', the changeless experiencer, in whose presence the mind is awared – *roopam dhruyam lochanam dhruk thadh dhruyam dhruk thu maanasam dhruyaa: dheevrutthaya: saakshee dhruk eva na thu dhruyathe.*"

The *Achaaryaa* wonders: "How could you miss this *saakshi* 'I'? Is it not similar to experiencing the various objects around you, accommodated in space, but, always missing the space, in which the objects are accommodated?" And, says "because of this preoccupation with the secondary 'I', losing sight of the primary 'I' and also taking the changes of the secondary 'I', as changes of the primary 'I', we suffer *samsaaraa* - losing the binary format, in which I am the primary 'I', and descending down to the triangular format , in which I am the secondary 'I'". Taking the attributes of the secondary 'I', as those of the primary 'I' is the source of all problems.

- **अहंबुद्धिविभ्रमात्** - Because of the confusion caused by the secondary 'I', which is the mind,

Aham buddhi: - indicates the secondary 'I'; *vibhrama:* - confusion.

- **भोक्त्रुत्वं** - the *bokthaa* status,

Bokthaa - experiencer of pains and pleasures

- **अविक्रियस्य स्यात्** - results to 'me', who is 'changeless' (and, who, in reality, does not have *bokthaa* status at all).

Mind undergoes changes; but, 'I' am called a sufferer.

The *Achaaryaa* gives an example:

When a boat moves along a river, the movement of the boat is wrongly transferred to the trees on the banks, by the passenger in the boat, who mistakenly thinks, that, the trees are moving in the opposite direction.

Another example is the arrival of a train at its destination, when the traveler remarks that the destination has arrived, while, in fact, it is the train that has arrived at the destination.

Na me dvesha raaghau na me lobha mohau - 'I' do not have any sorrow or anger or jealousy. So, 'I' do not require any *saadhanaa* to get over them; nor am 'I' capable of any *saadhanaa*. The emotions, attributes and even the *saadhanaas* are of only the mind, which, I mistake as 'mine'. In reality, 'I' do not require *saadhanaas*; nor, do 'I' require *mokshaa*, because, "*saadhana saadhya rahitha nithya siddha moksha svaroopaa aathmaa asmi aham*".

81. Chapter II, Verse 61 to 67(29-12-2007)

Sureswaraachaarya is talking about the nature of the *aathmaa*, as the *saakshi chaithanyam*, the changeless Consciousness principle, which alone has to be the Ultimate Reality, because Consciousness alone is not subject to any form of controversy. Whatever I am conscious of / whatever is objectified by the Consciousness, has to be only relative reality, because everything else, other than Consciousness, is subject to some controversy or other.

Chaithanya aathmaa is **the** Reality, the *svaroopam* of everything, the *svaroopam* of myself also. And, what is the nature of that *chaithanyam*? Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that it is *nirvikaaraa saakshi*, the changeless 'experiencer' of everything. And, the first thing that is 'experienced' by the *Saakshi*, is the mind.

"But", Sureswaraachaarya points out "when we say, that, 'I' the *saakshi* is the 'experiencer' of the mind, it is not that the *saakshi* 'I', is actually *doing* the job of experiencing; the Consciousness 'I' need not and does not *do* any job to experience – but, in 'my' very presence, mind is able to form the *chidhaabhaasaa*; and reveals itself. This self-revealing of the mind, is, what we call 'saakshi experiencing the mind'; in fact, it would be more appropriate to say "in 'my' presence, the mind gets experienced"; and, from that standpoint, 'I' am figuratively called the 'experiencer'".

While the mind gets experienced, simultaneously, it gets another faculty also; it becomes capable of experiencing the world. Thus, in 'my' presence, mind becomes the 'experienced'-cum-'experiencer'; i.e. the mind gets both statuses of the 'experienced' and the 'experiencer'. Conversely, in 'my' absence, neither status will be possible for the mind – neither can it be 'experienced', nor can it become 'experiencer'. This mind, which, thus has these two attributes of 'experienced' and 'experiencer', is called *ahamkaara*: |

Sureswaraachaarya further says "*ahamkaaraa* is the secondary and changing experiencer of the world and 'I' am the primary and changeless 'experiencer' of the mind". And, whenever I use the word I, the word denotes the composite entity, consisting of the primary 'experiencer' *saakshi* and the secondary experiencer *ahamkaaraa*. *Saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture is what is obtaining in the one word I, though the *saakshi* content is, very often, lost sight of.

Of these two entities or *amsaas*, one *amsaa*, the mind, is subject to changes, while, the other *amsaa*, the *saakshi-aathmaa*, the real primary 'I', is changeless. But, because of the proximity between the changing *ahamkaaraa* and the changeless *saakshi*, we commit the

blunder of transferring the changes of the *ahamkaaraa* 'I', to the primary *saakshi* 'I'. And, this blunder is the cause of *samsaaraa*.

Ahambuddhi vibhramaath – Due to the 'mixing up' of *aham* and *ahamkaaraa*,
Bokthurthvam syaath - the status of the changing *bokthaa* is given
Avikriyasya - to this changeless primary 'I'.

"I am sorrowful; I am disturbed; I am calm" etc. are not 'my' attributes; 'I' am neither disturbed; nor do 'I' have the need to become calm; nor do 'I' have the need to sit in meditation to become calm. *Saantham*, *sivam*, *advaitam* are 'my' eternal natures. Disturbance and calmness are attributes, coming and going, only for the *ahamkaaraa*, the secondary I. Therefore, the *secondary I* (and not the primary 'I') may have the necessity for meditation and may attain calmness because of the meditation – but, that, too, only during meditation.

Vedhaanthaa warns: "Do not get lost in the *vyaavahaarika* calmness of the *ahamkaaraa*; be interested in the *paaramaarthika* calmness of the *saakshi*".

Aapekshika saanthi of *ahamkaaraa* is not the *Vedhaanthin's* goal; but, 'claiming' the *aadhyanthika saanthi* of the *saakshi* – *saanthim nirvaana paramaam madhsamsthaam adhigacchathi* – (*madhsamsthaam* means *saakshisamsthaam*, denoting *aadhyanthika saanthi*). The effort should be for 'claiming' this *aadhyanthika saanthi* of the *saakshi* and declaring "'I' am *nithya saantha*:", irrespective of the 'arrival' and 'departure' of the *aapekshika saanthi* in the *ahamkaaraa*". This is because 'I' am not the *ahamkaaraa*; *ahamkaaraa* is an incidental attribute, which is controlled not by 'me' but, by ever so many factors, including *praarabhdhaa*.

An example is given by the *Achaaryaa*, to *aham buddhi vibhrama*: /

"When a boat moves along a river, the movement of the boat is wrongly transferred to the trees on the shore, which, of course, are incapable of moving". The choice of the word *naghaa*:, in verse 63, to denote the trees, instead of *vrukshaa*: or other words, is significant; the *Achaaryaa's* intention is to emphasize the incapacity of the trees, for any movement, since, '*Na gacchathi*' is '*nagha*:'

Another apt example, drawn from a more common experience of the present days, is the illusory impression, which a passenger waiting in a stationery train gets, of *his* train moving, when he watches *another* train on a parallel railway track, moving in the opposite direction.

- नौयानविभ्रमात् – Because of illusion, (for a passenger in) a moving boat

Nau – boat; yaana – movement

- नगेषु गतिकल्पनम् - movement of the trees (on the banks) is imagined.

The movement of the boat is superimposed on the trees. In a similar manner, *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *kaamaa*, *krodhaa* etc. are all attributes of *ahamkaaraa* alone - the attributes are subject to arrival and departure also - but are wrongly superimposed on 'me' ; whereas, the fact is, "Na me dveshragau, na me loba mohau" – this (absence of attributes) is 'my' nature.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 64 :

यथोक्तार्थाविष्करणाय द्रष्टान्तान्तरोपादानम् ।

To make the point stated clearer, another analogy is given:

- यथोक्तार्थाविष्करणाय -- For the purpose of further clarification of the idea already given (in the previous verse),

Aavishkaranam – further clarification; *yathoktha arthaa* – the idea which had been given earlier.

What was the idea given? "I' am the changeless, primary 'experiencer'/ 'observer'" The *Geetha sloka* "Upadrishtaa anumantaa cha bharthaa bokthaa maheswara: paramaathmaa ithi cha api uktha: dehe asmin purusha: para:" - "The Supreme *Purushaa* in this body is said to be the close witness, the supporter, the sustainer, the experiencer, the great Lord and the supreme Self" (verse 23 – Ch. XIII) is relevant, in this context.

- द्रष्टान्त अन्तर उपादानम् - another example is given.

Dhrushtaantha: - example; *dhrushtaantha anthara:* - another example.

The previous example is "nau yaana" – "the moving boat". Now another example is given, in the following verse.

Chapter II: Verse 64 –

यथा जात्यमणे :शुभ्रा ज्वलन्ती निश्चला शिखा ।

संनिध्यसंनिधानेषु घटादीनामविक्रिया ॥ ६४ ॥

The brilliance of a natural diamond is pure and steady, whether objects like a jar be near it or not. Similarly the light of Consciousness in the Self remains changeless, whether objects are in its proximity or not.

The example is a *jaathyamani* - a high quality gem, which is very radiant and bright – so bright that it can illumine the objects around. Normally a flame is taken as an example; Sureswaraachaaryaa chooses to change the example to a “high quality gem”, obviously, with a purpose. In the case of the flame, motion is there - there is a *vikaaraa*, whereas *Saakshi* is changeless. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* considers the gem as a better example, because, once the gem is placed in a particular place, it has no movement at all.

- शुभ्रा शिखा – The brilliant / pure radiance

Sikhaa - ray of light / radiance; *subraa* – brilliant / pure

- जात्यमणे: - of a high quality gem,

Jaathya – high quality (adjective); *jaathau bhava: jaathya: / Jaathi: - high quality ; mani: - a radiant gem or a precious stone or a diamond .*

- ज्वलन्ती - (which gem is)shining all the time, without fluctuations in its brightness,

In the case of a flame, the brightness may fluctuate; but, a gem shines uniformly, all the time.

- निश्चला - (and which gem is) motionless,

‘Motionless’ implies, that, the gem cannot do any job, since any action requires motion.

The gem or the light of the gem just “is”; it does not do any action. But, even though the gem does not do any job, generally, it is referred to, as ‘shining’ gem; of course, the status of ‘illuminator’ is not given to it, when there are no objects around, to be illumined by the gem; in other words, the gem is a non-illuminator, shining gem, when there is no illuminable object in its proximity.

In such a situation, if and when an object, earlier stored in a dark area, is brought in front of the gem, though the gem itself does not do any job, but is just ‘shining’, the object becomes ‘illumined’ in the presence of the gem. The object, which was in darkness earlier, has ‘moved’ from darkness to the presence of the gem and the earlier non-illumined object, has also become ‘illumined’ because of the presence of the gem. Even so, i.e. while it is the object that has moved and has got illumined, while the gem itself did not do anything, the moment the object comes into the presence of the gem, the gem gains a new/ different status – it is called an ‘illuminator’ gem. There is a change in the status of the gem – from ‘non-illuminator’ to ‘illuminator’. Peculiarly, the change in the status is not caused by any change in the gem; ‘changelessly’ the gem acquired a new status; conversely, when the

object is removed from the vicinity of the gem, 'changelessly', the gem loses its status of 'illuminator'. 'Acquiring' a new status and 'losing' that status, have been both achieved by the gem, without itself doing any job.

In the same manner, 'I' am the 'changeless' Consciousness, without any inherent status. But, 'I' am still called the 'experiencer', when the mind becomes active, in the *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* states. I become the 'experiencer' of the mind and through the mind, 'I' become the 'experiencer' of the world also, though 'I' do not undergo any change. First, 'I' become the 'experiencer' of the mind, without doing any job; later, I assume the attributes of the experienced mind on myself and consider 'myself' an 'experiencer'. In reality, 'I' do not have any attributes, though, assuming the attributes of the *ahamkaaraa*, 'I' claim "I do not have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*; I do not have liberation" etc. The fact is: "'I' do not require *saadhanaas*; 'I' do not require *mokshaa*; 'I' am the *nithya-muktha aathmaa*, requiring neither *saadhanaas* nor *saadhyam (mokshaa)*. My *mokshaa* does not depend on the conditions of my mind. 'Asangha chaithanya svaroopaa: thath thvam asi, Svethaketho' as in the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*."

- अविक्रिया - is without any vikaaraa,
- सनिध्यसनिधानेषु – either in the presence or in the absence
- घटादीनाम् - of objects like a pot etc.

In the presence (*sannidhi*) of an object, the gem gets the status of an 'illuminator'. In the absence (*asannidhi*) of an object, it loses its status of 'illuminator'. But, either during the arrival and or during the departure of the status, the gem itself does not have any change (*vikaaraa*).

If this is understood with regard to the example of a gem, the same principle can be extended to the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

- यथा - - In a similar fashion (the light of Consciousness in the Self remains changeless, whether objects are in its proximity or not).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 65:

अयमत्रांशो विवक्षित इति जापनायाह ।

The point intended by the analogy is brought out in the following:

Sureswaraachaarya is anxious, that, from the example, the right conclusion is arrived at, by the listener; since, quite often, the essential message intended to be conveyed through the citing of an example is missed by the listener, who "catches at the shadow and loses the substance" (as the proverb goes). All criticisms of *Advaitam*, by the *Visishtaadvaitins* and

the *dvaithins* are based on such wrong extensions of the examples given by the *Advaitin*. The rope-snake example, *svapnaa dhrishtaanthaa*, the mirage-water example etc. are all wrongly extended by the *poorva pakshins* and based on the wrong extensions, they criticize *advaitam*. The *Achaaryaa* is aware of this aspect and is therefore more explicit in his explanations.

- अत्र - In the context of this example,
- अयं अंशः - the following aspect
- विवक्षितः - is intended to be clarified.
- इति जापनाय - With this purpose ,
- आह – the author gives the following verse.

Chapter II: Verse 65–

यदवस्था व्यनक्तीति तदवस्थैव सा पुनः।

भण्यते न व्यनक्तीति घटादीनामसंनिधौ ॥ ६५ ॥

Exactly in the same state in which we say the diamond illumines objects, we say it does not illumine, if the objects to be illumined are not in the required proximity.

What the *Achaaryaa* wants to say, is this: "In the *mani-sikhaa dhrishtaanthaa* – the example of the light of the gem - the *mani sikhaa*, changelessly acquires the 'illuminator' status and changelessly loses that status. Therefore, that status is not 'intrinsic' to the *sikhaa* – it is only an 'incidental', superimposed status. In the same manner, the *saakshi* status (for *aathmaa*) is also a superimposed status which *aathmaa* enjoys, only in the presence of the mind. If the mind is not there, *aathmaa* cannot even be called *saakshi*, because , to term it as a 'witness', it has to be the 'witness' of something.

"(Chethyoparaagha roopaa me sakshithaa api na sathvikee upalakshana meveyam nistharangha chidambhutha)"

In the presence of *ahamkaaraa*, I understand 'I' am the *saakshi* and in the absence of *ahamkaaraa*, 'I' am not even a *saakshi* – I cannot and I need not claim that 'I' am a *saakshi*. Therefore, the proof for "'I' am the *saakshi*' is the presence of *ahamkaaraa*.

- यदवस्था - Whatever be the condition (of the mani sikhaa),
- व्यनक्ति इति (उच्यते) - when it is said to be the 'illuminator',
- तदवस्था एव पुनः - again, the same condition continues (when it is said to be the non-illuminator),
- सा – (for the) mani sikhaa.

The import of this statement: The beam of light from the gem, is the same, when the 'illuminator' status is attributed to it or and when the 'illuminator' status is taken away from it - the attributing and the removal of the status to the beam of light, being based on the arrival and departure of the objects of illumination. The change is in the 'object' of illumination and not on the 'subject' – the beam of light.

- भण्यते - Only the statements are made,
- (व्यनक्ति इति घटादीनां संनिधौ) - that the gem illumines, in the presence of the objects of illumination; and
- न व्यनक्ति इति – that the gem does not illumine,
- घटादीनां असंनिधौ - in the absence of the objects of illumination.

When you say "the gem 'illumines'" it appears that the gem "gets ready and starts the job of illumination" and when you say the gem "does not 'illumine'", it appears that the gem "stops its action of illumination", whereas, in either situation, the gem does not do any action. The verbs used (*vyanakthi / na vyanakthi*) cause a confusion, that the gem is engaged in the action of 'illumining' and 'not illumining'.

In the same manner, when I say, 'I' am the illuminator of the mind, it appears as if 'I' do the job of 'illumining' / 'experiencing' the mind. But, the fact is: 'I' just am; the mind is 'awared'.

There is one more similarity between the *mani sikhā* and *aathmaa*:

When either of the two statements about the *mani sikhā* (1) "vyanakthi" (illumines) and (2) "na vyanakthi" (does not illumine) is made (*bhanyathe*), the gem remains in the same condition. There is no change in the condition of the gem, though different perceptions (that it "illumines" and that it "does not illumine") are made by the observer.

In the same manner, when one says "I am sorrowful / I am happy" etc. , i.e. when one talks of varieties of situations in life, it should be clearly understood that these changes are happening only at the objective world level, while 'I' remain free of all the changes, 'I' remain only as an 'illuminator'. I need not even work for liberation; I am *nithya-muktha*: |

The structure of this verse throws a challenge to the student of *Sanskrit* language. It may be restructured as follows, for clarity:

"Yadh avasthaa (sathi) saa (sikhā gataadheenaam sannidhau) vyanakthi (ithi bhanyathe) thadh avasthaa eva(saa) puna: gataadheenaam asannidhau na vyanakthi ithi bhanyathe ."

Though the two verbs (*vyanakthi* and *na vyanakthi*) are associated with the subject of the sentence (*mani sikhaa*), really speaking, the two verbs indicate a change only in the condition of the objects of illumination (*ghataadheenaam*), though it appears that they indicate changes in the condition of the subject.

Up to this is the example. The *Achaaryaa* now proceeds to extend this example to *aathmaa*, in wonderful verses, ideal for *nidhidhyaasanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 66 & 67 and Verse 66:

तत्र च ।

सर्वधीव्यञ्जकस्तद्वत्परमात्मा प्रदीपकः ।

संनिध्यसंनिधानेषु धीवृत्तीनामविक्रियः ॥ ६६ ॥

This being so: The supreme Self is the light that reveals all minds. Whether the functions of minds take place in its vicinity or not, it remains immutable.

- तत्र च - This being so (i.e. a change in 'object' attributed / transferred to the subject, which is *adhyaasaam*),
- तद्वत् - as in the case of the gem,

Three examples were cited in the preceding verses: (1) *aakaasaa* seemingly 'pierced' by smoke rising upwards from a fire (2) trees incapable of movement, seemingly appearing to move, to a passenger on a boat and (3) a gem seemingly 'illuminating' the objects in its vicinity, because of its shine.

- तत्र च - This being so (i.e. a change in 'object' attributed / transferred to the subject, which is *adhyaasaam*),
- तद्वत् - as in the case of the gem,

An important principle of *Vedhaanthaa* (referred to, as the 3rd capsule of *Vedhaanthaa*, by Swamiji): "By 'my' mere presence, 'I' give life to the body, mind and thoughts and through the body I 'experience' the external world 'changelessly'". Another important principle (the 4th capsule, as referred to, by Swamiji): "'I' am not affected by any event that happens in the material world or in the material body".

'I' am the changeless witness of the thought, when the thought is there; and when the thought is not there, I either say that I am a non-witness or I say that I am the witness of the absence of thoughts. But, of course, even to say this, I require a thought – I have to use a thought to say this.

Pradeepaka: implies *svayam prakaasa pradeepaka*: To 'illumine' objects, the gem needs the presence of the objects to be illumined. But, to 'shine', it does not need any external factor. 'Shine' is its inherent quality. In the same manner, 'I' do not 'illumine', all the time, because, to 'illumine', 'I' require objects / thoughts (i.e. 'illuminating' is dependent on other factors); but 'I' am 'shining' all the time, without any dependence on any external factor. *Svayam prakaasa pradeepaka*: *ayam (chaithanyam)*.

And, what is 'my' 'job' (!)?

- **सर्व धी व्यञ्जकः (भवति)** - *am the 'changeless' revealer/ illuminator of all thoughts / emotions that arise in the mind.*

Vyanjaka: - revealer; *dhee - vrutthi*: / thought / emotion etc. (in this context).

The thoughts or emotions do not belong to 'me'; they belong to the mind. 'I' am only the 'illuminator' of the disturbed or calm mind, as the case may be. But, 'I' am never disturbed.

- **संनिधि असंनिधानेषु** - Either in the presence or in the absence,

Sannidhi - presence; *asannidhi* - absence.

- **धीवृत्तीनां** - of thoughts / emotions of the mind,
- **(परमात्मा) अविक्रियः** - 'I' am absolutely unaffected / untainted. ('I' am *Nirvikaara*:)

"*Thadhvath pradeepaka: Paramaathmaa sarvadhee vyanjaka: (bhavathi)*" is the content of the first line of the verse, while, "*Dheevruttheenaam sannidhi asannidhaaneshu (Paramaathmaa) avikriya: (bhavathi)*" will be the structure of the second line.

When thought arises, 'I' become the 'illuminator' of the thought ; but, 'I' do not do (nor do I have to) do anything, to become the 'illuminator'; it is the thought that gets 'illumined', in 'my' presence.

This is said in the next verse.

Chapter II: Verse 67 –

न प्रकाशक्रिया काचिदस्य स्वात्मनि विध्यते ।

उपचारात्क्रिया सास्य यः प्रकाशस्य संनिधिः ॥ ६७ ॥

In the Self, there is no such thing as the act of illumining. The approach of the object to be illumined within its range of illumination is figuratively spoken of as the act of illumination on the part of the Self.

Earlier, in the case of the example of the *jaathya mani*, the *Achaaryaa* made a statement:

“‘Illumination’ is not a ‘job’ done by the *jaathya mani*”. Now, he makes a similar statement with regard to *aathmaa*: “‘Experience’ is not a ‘job’ done by the *aathmaa*. Things get ‘experienced’; ‘I’ do not do the job of ‘experiencing’”.

- अस्य - For this Paramaathmaa,
- काचित् प्रकाशक्रिया न विध्यते - there is no job / action / function in the form of ‘experiencing’ / ‘knowing’ / ‘awaring’ etc.
- स्वात्मनि - in itself.

Then why does one use the word *saakshi* for *aathmaa* – implying it witnesses/ illumines/ experiences etc.? Sureswaraachaaryaa explains that, it is a figurative usage, which is not to be understood in a literal sense.

- उपचारात् - Figuratively,
- सा (अस्य) क्रिया भवति - that (illumination) is said to be the ‘function’ (of the *saakshi*),

When is this status given, even figuratively?

- यः प्रकाशयस्य संनिधिः - when an object comes in front of ‘me’.

Therefore, I am ‘actionless’ – not even a *saakshi*.

82. Chapter II, Verse 67 to 69 (05-01-2008)

Sureswaraacharya continues with the topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara vivekaa*, *saakshi* being the changeless 'experiencer' of the mind and *ahamkaaraa* being the changing 'experiencer' of the world.

It should be remembered that the words *ahamkaaraa* and mind, are interchangeably used in these discussions. When the mind becomes alive in the presence of the *saakshi*, the live mind is called *ahamkaaraa*. And, to make the mind alive, the *saakshi* is providing the mind with its own reflection called *chidaabhaasa*: . Once *chidaabhaasa* is received by the mind, that live mind is called *pramaathaa-ahamkaaraa* /

It should also be remembered, that, the mind gets the *chidaabhaasa* , not because of the will or desire of the *saakshi*'I'; but, it does so, by the mere presence of the *saakshi*.

Similarly, the very presence of the mind makes the *saakshi*, the 'observer' of the mind. The *saakshi* does not 'do' anything to become the 'observer'. The mind becomes alive, the mind becomes known, the mind becomes experienced, the mind becomes 'awared' – all in the presence of 'I', the changeless *saakshi*. And, since the mind becomes 'observed', Consciousness 'I', is figuratively called the 'observer', akin to the example already cited - one getting a brother-in-law status, without any action on one's part, but consequent on one's sibling getting married.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "the presence of the mind makes 'me' an 'observer'", (in this important verse 67).

- *Prakaasyasya sannidhi*: - The (mere) presence of the mind
- *Prakaasyam* - the 'witnessed' mind; *sannidhi*: - presence.

Since the mere presence of the 'witnessed mind' makes 'me' the 'observer' and to be the 'observer', no action is involved on 'my' (the *saaksh/s*) part, the 'observation' by the *saakshi* is only a figurative action. The *Acharya* uses the expression '*upacharaath*', to mean 'figuratively'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 68:

मैवं शङ्किष्ठा :सांख्यराद्धान्तोऽयमिति । यत :।

Let it not be thought that this is the system of *Saankhya*; For:

The *Achaaryaa* established that 'I' am the changeless 'observer', the *saakshi* and the mind is the *saakshyam*, the 'observed' and also that the *saakshyam* mind itself, later, becomes the 'observer' of the world and is, therefore, called *pramaathaa*.

'I' observe the mind; the mind 'observes' the world. This can be presented in a different manner also, as follows: 'I' observe the mind *directly* and 'I' myself observe the world *indirectly*, through the mind.

An example to this: During full moon nights, the sun illumines the moon and the moon illumines the earth. This can also be expressed as "the sun illumines the moon directly and the sun itself is illumining the earth also, indirectly, through the moon, (because the moon does not have light of its own)".

Thus it can be said: 'I' observe the mind directly and 'I' am the observer of the world indirectly; therefore, mind is also 'observed'; world is also 'observed'; therefore, the entire inert universe is *saakshyam*. In effect, there are only two factors in the world (1) 'I', the *saakshi* and (2) *everything else*, the *saakshyam* – directly or indirectly.

When this much is said, it gives rise to a major doubt: Would not all these arguments, accepting the existence of two things (namely, (1) *saakshi*, the *purusha*.; the *chethana thathvam* and (2) *saakshyam*, the *prakruthi*.; the *achena thathvem*) amount to accepting the *dvaita siddhaanthaa* of the *Saamkhyaa* philosophy, which also talks about *Purushaa* and *Prakrithi* / *Chethanam* and *Achethanam* / 'observer' and 'observed' etc.? And, after all, the description of *chaithanyam* is the same in *Vedhaanthaa* and *Saamkhyaa* philosophies - *asangha chidh vibhu*: *sakshi*. *Saakshi* is *asangham* in both systems; *saakshi* is *chaithanya svaroopam* in both systems; and *saakshi* is of all-pervading nature, in both systems. Then, what is the difference between *Vedhaanthaa* and *Saamkhyaa*? How can a *Vedhaanthin*, then claim, that, he is an *advaitin*, different from the *saamkhyaa*?

Sureswaraachaarya foresees this objection and gives his answer: "In *saamkhyaa* philosophy, *Purushaa* and *Prakrithi* - the 'observer' and the 'observed universe' - have got the same order of Reality; and, therefore, they have to be counted as 'two', whereas, in *Vedhaanthaa*, *Purushaa* belongs to the highest order of Reality – the *paaramaarthika sathyam* and *Prakrithi* belongs to a lower order of reality – the *Vyaavahaarika* or *Praathibhasika sathyam*.

"Also, in *saamkhyaa* philosophy, the world is a product of *Prakruthi*, whereas, in *Vedhaanthaa*, the entire universe is said to be a product of *Brahman* / *chaithanyam* / *aathmaa*."

In his *Baashyam* to the 2nd *Soothra* of the *Brahma Soothraas* – "*Janmaadhyasya yatha:*"; Sri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa firmly asserts that Consciousness alone is the cause of the universe. *Saamkhyaa* philosophy holds that 'matter' is the cause of the universe, while, *Vedhaanthaa* declares that 'matter' is **not** the cause, but, Consciousness **alone** is the cause of the universe.

Manthraa 1 of *Brahmavalli* of the *Thaithreya Upanishad* runs: "*Thasmaadh vai ethasmaadh aathmana: aakaasa: sambhootha: | aakaasaath vaayu: | Vayo: agni:*" etc.–From that *Brahman*, which is this *Aathman*, space is born; from space, air is born, from air, fire is born" etc. And, again, in *Manthraa* 1 of *Bhruguvalli* of *Thaithreya Upanishad*, *Varuna* exhorts his son and disciple, Sage *Bhrughu*: "*Yatho vai imaani bhoothaani jaayanthe | Yena jaathaani jeevanthi | Yath prayanthi abhisamvisanthi | Thadhvijignyaasasva| Thadh brahmethi*" - " Seek to know that *Brahman*, from which indeed, all these beings are born, by which all the born-beings exist and unto which they go back, while resolving".

Thus, that "*aathmaa* is *kaaranam* and *jagath* is *kaaryam*" is an established fact for *Vedhaanthaa*. It follows, therefore, that, the world or the mind does not have a separate existence from 'me', the 'observer', and therefore, the world and the mind are of a lower order of reality, as against *aathmaa*.

Thus, the basic difference between *Saamkhyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa* is: "The world is as real as 'me', the 'observer', is *Saamkhyaa*; the world is less real than 'me', the 'observer', is *Vedhaanthaa*".

(An aside: It should be noted, that, when *Vedhaanthaa* says "the world is less real", the claim is not "the world is not there at all". When the *Vedhaanthin* says the world is *mithyaa*, *Visishtaadvaitam* misunderstands the word *mithyaa* as 'non-existence'. But, the use of the word *mithyaa*, with reference to the *jagath*, only means "*jagath* is very much available for experience; but has got a lesser order of reality and therefore, cannot be accounted as true. It is comparable to one's reflection in the mirror, which is experiencable, but not countable").

"Therefore, *Vedhaanthaa* is not *Saamkhyaa*" asserts Sureswaraachaaryaa.

- **मा एवं शङ्किष्ठा :-** - May you not entertain the following doubt,

Maa – do not; *evam* – the following; *sankaa* – doubt; *sankishta:* (*aasankishta:*) - people who doubt.

What is the doubt?

- अयं सांख्य रद्धान्तः इति - that my teaching is *saamkhya siddhaantham*,

Raaddhaantha: - siddhaantha: / teaching; ayam - This (teaching given by me).

"Do not mistake my teaching as *saamkhyaa* philosophy" says the *Achaaryaa*.

- यतः - because of the following (basic difference between *saamkhyaa* and *Vedhaanthetaa* given in the *sloka* that follows).

Chapter II: Verse 68 –

यथा विशुद्ध आकाशे सहसैवाभ्रमण्डलम् ।

भूत्वा विलीयते तद्ब्रह्मात्मनीहाकिलं जगत् ॥ ६८ ॥

Just as, in the uncontaminated sky, clouds suddenly appear and dissolve, even so the whole phenomenal world appears and disappears in the Self.

The *Achaarya* presents the basic difference.

The *saamkhyaa* philosopher is called *achethana kaarana vaadi* - the philosopher who subscribes to the view 'matter is the cause of the universe'. The term '*achethana kaarana vaadha:*' means a 'philosophy which assumes matter as the cause of the universe'.

Saamkhyaa, Yoga, Nyaayaa, Vaiseshikaa, Bouddhaa are all *achethana kaaranaa vaadhaas*, whereas, *Vedhaanthetaa* is unique; it is *chethana kaarana vaadha:*. '*Chethanam/ Consciousness is the cause of the universe*' is the principle of *Vedhaanthetaa*.

But, what is that Consciousness? It is '**I**'; '**I**', the Consciousness principle, is the cause of the universe. "*Mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sakalam prathistitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh brahmaadhvayam asmi aham*" – "Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual Brahman" declares *Kaivalya Upanishad* (verse 19).

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- अकिलं जगत् - This entire universe,
- इह आत्मनि भूत्वा - arising out of / in 'me', the *saakshi chaithanyam*,

Aathmani – sakshi chaithanye /

The universe arises **from** 'me' and arises **in** me. Why is it said "in 'me'" (apart from saying "from 'me'")?. It is because, the world which arises out of 'me', cannot remain outside 'me',

there being no 'outside' for 'me', 'I' being the all-pervading Consciousness. The world comes from 'me' and it rises in 'me'; both the words 'from' and 'in' are important. '*Aathmani jaayathe, aathmana: jaayathe*' |

After arising from 'me', what does this whole cosmos do, "in 'me'"? It dances about for some time, giving me entertainment or struggles, depending on my attitude, an essential principle of *Vedhaanthalaa* being: "By forgetting 'my' nature, I convert life into a struggle and by remembering 'my' nature; I convert life into a sport / entertainment"

(An interesting aside: When things go well for an individual, the individual does not ask the question 'why did *Bhagavaan* create this world?' Only when problems abound, the individual, in despair, raises this question. But, if only the individual cares to remember 'his' nature, even when problems are met with, the question would not be raised at all.

Vedhaanthalaa does not answer/ solve the question 'why the world was created?' Instead, *Vedhaanthalaa* 'dissolves' the question by convincing the seeker, that there is no need for such a question at all, through its efforts in making the seeker realize 'his' true nature, because of which realization, he does not see life as a struggle.)

Thereafter, i.e., after 'dancing about for sometime, giving entertainment or pain',

- विलीयते - resolves (in 'me').

When all these things happen, what happens to 'me'? Sureswaraachaarya says 'I' am not affected by all these changes, the word 'I' meaning neither the body (which undergoes comforts or sufferings) nor the mind (which also enjoys pleasure or suffers pain), but, 'I', the *asangha chaithnyam*, free from any contamination. The *Achaaryaa* gives a beautiful example, in the first line of the verse.

- यथा अभ्रमण्डलम् इव - Just as patterns of clouds
- सहसा (भूत्वा विलीयते) - suddenly (appear and dissolve)
- विशुद्धाकाशे - in the uncontaminated / pure sky,
- तद्वत् - in the same manner (this entire universe, arising in 'me' resolves in 'me').

The sky is not affected by the nature of the clouds. If the clouds are rain-bearing, *akaasaa* does not become wet; and, if there are impurities in the clouds, *akaasaa* does not become impure.

Also, how do the clouds behave? They seem to appear from nowhere and also to disappear to nowhere. The perceiver of the clouds does not perceive the origin of the clouds, nor its destination.

This example (of the clouds) is given in the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, and Sureswaraachaarya uses the example.

In the same fashion as the clouds appear and disappear in the sky, without, in any way, affecting the sky, the clouds of 'galaxies' appear in 'me' (for my entertainment) and disappear, (without affecting 'me', in any way)

What is the conclusion based on these statements? "According to us (*Vedhaanthaa*), *aathmaa* is *jagath kaaranam*. According to *saamkyaa*, *aathmaa* is not *jagath kaaranam*; therefore, we (*Saamkyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa*) are not identical" establishes the *Aachaaryaa*.

The *anvayam* of the verse: "*Yathaa visudde aakaase abhramandalam sahasaa eva (boothvaa praleeyathe) thadvath akhilam jagath iha aathmani boothvaa praleeyathe*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 69 :

तस्मादेष कूटस्थः न द्वैतं मनागपि स्मृशति । यतः ।

Thus the unchanging Self does not so much as touch the realm of duality:

The topics covered in this portion are all highly technical. In *Gouda Paadha Kaarika* also this topic is beautifully discussed.

The world is the *kaaryam*; and, even though it appears, that, 'I', the 'observer', am contacting the world, the 'observed', i.e. though there appears to be a *kaarana-kaariya sambhandha*: / observer-observed contact / Consciousness-matter contact, *Vedhaanthaa* asserts that one can never talk about 'contact' between *chaithanyam* and the *achethana prapancham*.

What is the reason? Two important reasons are given, though there are even more reasons.

(1) Like *aakaasaa*, which is *asangha*;, *chaithanyam* is also *asangha svaroopam*. *Asangha*: means 'relationless' / 'contactless'. Just as space cannot contact or touch any object, similarly *chaithanyam* cannot have *sambhandha*.

Suppose an object, say, a clip, gets connected with clip-space, when the clip is moved, the particular space in which the clip was located should also 'move' along with the clip. But, it does not happen. The clip is 'in' space; but, is not 'connected' to space. Similarly, the world is 'in' *chaithanyam*; but, the world does not get 'connected' to *chaithanyam*. *Gouda Paadha* calls this *asparsa yoga*: - 'untouchability' philosophy. Every *Vedhaanthin* should strive to become 'untouchable', in this sense i.e. should not be affected by any object / event.

(2) The second reason: *Aathmaa* is *kaaranam* and *jagath* is *kaaryam*. *Kaaryam* cannot have contact with *kaaranam*, because there is no *kaaryam* separate from *kaaranam*. For instance, clay cannot contact pot, for the simple reason, that, the pot does not exist as a substance separate from clay. If clay and pot were two **distinct** substances, the possibility of 'contact' between the two may be there. *Vedhaantha* says, that, in the same manner, the world cannot have contact with *chaithanyam* – because there is no world, *kaarya prapancha*, separate from the only substance called *aathmaa*, the *chaithanyam*. "*Chaithanya vyathirikthasya prapanchasya abhaavaath eva chaithanya-prapancha sambhandha: naive sambhavath*". Therefore, *chaithanyam* will not have problems caused by contact with the world (since, it does not have contact at all).

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- एष कूटस्थः - this 'changeless' Consciousness ('I', the *saaksh*),
- द्वैतं न स्पृशति - does not contact the world,

That is the reason: "*na me dvesha raaghau, ne me lobha mohau, madho naive me naiva*". But, the seeker may question: "I do not contact; but, my mind contacts (the world)". The counter-question will be: "Is there a mind separate from *chaithanyam*?; when it is said that, there is no world separate from *chaithanyam*, the 'world' includes the mind also".

- मनाग् अपि - even a little bit.
- यतः - Therefore (the following sloka)

Verse 69 – Chapter II:

शब्दाध्याकारनिर्भासा :क्षणप्रध्वंसिनीर्द्रुशा ।

नित्योऽक्रमद्रुगाल्मैको व्याप्नोतीव धियोऽनिशम् ॥ ६९ ॥

The one, eternal and non-successive seer, through his consciousness, pervades, as it were, all the perishing functions of the mind always, which take up forms of objects like sound and colour.

What is the phenomenon that is taking place? Sureswaraacharya says "the world, which is *kaarya prapancha*, is entering the mind through the sense organs".

The mind also comes under *kaarya prapancha*: (which word means the 'projected world'). The external world, through the sense organs, enters the mind and as even as it enters the mind, the mind is able to have thoughts, which thoughts are in keeping with the external objects – for instance, when a *ghata*: (pot) is seen, *ghataakaaraa vrutthi*: (thought of the pot) is generated; in the same manner, *pataakaara vrutthi*:, *mataakaara vrutthi*: etc. are generated.

How is the mind able to do all these things? The mind does not have the capacity to do all these by itself, but the mind becomes capable because of 'my' *saannidhyam*, just as, in the presence of one magnet, another piece of iron will get 'induced magnetism', with the capacity to serve temporarily as a magnet. If the original magnet is removed from the vicinity of the iron piece, the 'induced magnetism' in the iron piece will also be removed. In a similar manner, in the presence of 'I', (the Original Consciousness), the mind gets 'induced consciousness' and is able to entertain *sabda vrutthi*, *sparsa vrutthi*, *roopa vrutthi* etc. As even as a speaker talks continuously without a break, the words are absorbed by the listeners' minds.

(An interesting aside: In an experiment, written sentences with a number of words consciously mis-spelt, with the first and last letters of the words in proper position, but all the other letters intentionally jumbled, were presented to a number of readers. It was observed, that, majority of the readers sub-consciously re-arranged the words properly and received the message conveyed by the sentences, without even noticing the 'jumble' of the letters, thus proving the versatility of the 'mind'. This is a unique power of the mind.)

But, all the *vrutthis* (thoughts) are only *jadam* i.e. inert – they are not 'knowledge' by themselves; they are not 'cognitions', by themselves. But, in 'my' presence, these inert thoughts become particular cognitions / varieties of knowledge. "Not only that" Sureswaraacharya points out "the thoughts are capable of producing reactions." One particular cognition / information / piece of knowledge, generates *raaghaa vrutthi*. Another generates *dvesha vrutthi* – still another *kaama vrutthi* and so on. These are also thoughts and in 'my' presence, they become 'experiences' in life.

Sureswaraacharya asks "When these experiences, what do 'I', the *Chaithanyam* do?" and replies "'I', the *Chaithanyam*, do not do anything".

Do the emotions affect 'me'? The answer is: "No; emotions are thought disturbances **only** in the mind and are not disturbances in 'me' - the *Chaithanyam*". Who am 'I'? 'I' am the 'illuminator' of the disturbances. In the 10th chapter of *Panchadasa*, Vidhyaaranyaa compares this (*chaithanyam*) to '*naataka deepa*'; the mind, with the thoughts, is the dancer, 'sweating' because of the strain, while, the *chaithanyam* just 'watches' and also 'lights' the dance, without 'sweating' or 'getting tired'. The mind sweats / frets / fumes – but, 'I' am not the mind; 'I' am the untiring, unaffected *chaithanyam*.

- शब्दाधि आकार निर्भासा: - Thoughts in the form of objects in the world

Aakaara - form; *Sabhdhaadhi* - sound etc. (implying objects in the world); *Nirbhaasaa*: - thoughts / experiences / *vrutthi jnaani* / *vrutthaya*:

Only when the relevant thoughts occur, the relevant experiences take place. That's why it is said "You are not actually seeing the external world; but, you are seeing the mind, in which imprints of the external world are given". The imprints are called thoughts; 'I' am watching the world thought and not the world. To repeat: What I perceive is nothing but the thoughts that are generated by the world.

Constantly thoughts are formed in the mind; metaphorically speaking, the 'imprints' keep changing. Therefore, what type of thoughts?

- **क्षण प्रध्वंसिनी:** - (which thoughts are) fleeting (adjective to '*nirbhaasaa*.')

'*Kshana pradhvamsinee*:' literally means 'those which die every moment'.

- **धियः** - belonging to the mind

"*Dhiya: sabhdhaadhi aakaara nirbhaasaa: kshana pradhvamsinee*:" is the *anvayam*. The meaning, in simple English: "Fleeting thoughts that are generated in the mind, in keeping with the objects outside".

And, what am 'I' doing? 'I' am not entertaining any thought; thoughts are entertained only by the mind. 'I' do not have any emotions also, which, again, belong only to the mind. 'I' am, all the time, by 'my' mere presence, making these experiences known / aware.

- **एक :आत्मा** - One non-dual Consciousness,
- **नित्यः** - which is eternal,
- **अक्रम् द्रुक्** - and is the 'changeless' observer,
- **व्याप्नोति इव** - pervades (the thought and illumines the thought without will or desire).

The non-dual, eternal, changeless *saakshi chaithanyam* 'I' pervade the thought and illumine the thought.

- **अनिशम्** - constantly / continually / always

Even in the deep sleep state, when the mind does not experience any external world and is silent, this silent mind also is illumined by 'me', the *saakshi*.

The word *akrama dhruk* is a significant word. Mind is called *krama dhruk* and *aathmaa* is called *akrama dhruk*.

The term *Krama dhruk* for the mind implies that the mind has to perceive the world sequentially only – one by one. It may do it quickly ; but, has to do it only sequentially - because, the first observation requires one thought, the second observation requires a second thought and so on. Each observation requires a thought, which should arrive and depart. Thus, mind's observation of the world is a successive, gradual and sequential process. Whereas, *chaithanyam* does not 'observe' through any action; *chaithanyam's* observation is not a process, not a sequential observation. Therefore, it is called *akrama dhruk*. Sequence belongs to the thought and not to the Consciousness.

- दृशा - *svaroopā chaithanyena* / with its own original Consciousness

"*Saakshi* illumines the thoughts, with its own original Consciousness" is the meaning.

What is the significance of the usage of this expression - *dhrusā*? In contrast to the *aathmaa*, which illumines the world with its original Consciousness, the mind illumines the world, **not** with its original Consciousness; but, with borrowed Consciousness.

(*Anvayam* of the verse: *Eka: nithya: akramadhruk aathmaa anisam kshanapradhvamsinee sabhdhaadhi aakaara nirbhaasaa: dhrusaa vyaapnothi iva* |)

83. Chapter II, Verse 69 to 72(12-01-2008)

Sureswaraachaarya is continuing with the topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara-viveka:*, the word *ahamkaaraa* referring to the mind, which has become alive in the presence of *saakshi*. *Saakshi* is a *dhrashtaa* / observer, therefore also called *dhruk*; the mind / the *ahamkaaraa* is also a *dhrashtaa* / an observer / a *dhruk*. *Saakshi* is the observer of the mind and the mind is the observer of the external world, through the five sense organs.

Sureswaraachaarya is talking about the differences between the *saakshi-dhruk* and the *ahamkaaraa-dhruk*. This differentiation is important, because, both *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* are physically together – they are inseparable physically; and, therefore, we have to do the separation cognitively, in the form of 'understanding'. Several differences are being pointed out, by the *Achaaryaa*.

One important difference: *Ahamkaaraa* becomes the 'observer', by undergoing change, which is called thought modification / *vrutthi parinaama*. Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is *savikaara-dhruk*. On the other hand, *saakshi* illumines the mind, not through a particular action. Really speaking, *saakshi* is not even an 'illuminator'; but, is called an 'illuminator', because in its mere presence and also only in its presence, the mind becomes 'illuminated'. *Saakshi*, by its mere presence, illumines the mind as well as the thoughts (which are changing all the time); but, while illumining the mind, *saakshi* does not do any action, nor does it undergo any 'change', and is therefore called *nirvikaara-dhruk*.

Based on this, another observation is also made by the *Achaaryaa*. Since the mind / the *ahamkaaraa* has to illumine the world by entertaining the relevant *vrutthis*, the mind can illumine the world only sequentially, since, every specific perception requires a specific thought mode. *Gataa* (pot) perception requires *ghataakaara vrutthi:*, *pataa* (cloth) perception requires *pataakaara vrutthi:* and so on. The mind can deliberately entertain only one thought at a time; therefore, mental perception is sequential / gradual / time-governed. Perception 1 will be mental Act 1; perception 2 will be mental act 2 and so on. Each act is *thadh thadh aakaara vrutthi parinaama roopaakriyaa vikriyaa* | Wherever perception involves an action, there is sequence or succession. On the other hand, *saakshi* 'illumines' not through a particular act; therefore, *saakshi's* perception is non-sequential and therefore, *saakshi* is called *akrama-dhruk*, as against the mind / *ahamkaaraa*, the sequential observer or *krama dhruk*.

To understand this, an example is cited: The sunlight pervades the whole class room and all the students, who are falling within the range of the light, are 'illuminated' by the sunlight simultaneously. The sunlight does not illumine each single person, one by one, through specific acts done in a sequential manner. Because, thus, all students fall within the range of

sunlight, the sunlight is *akrama-dhruk* i.e., non-sequential, simultaneous 'illuminator' of all the objects falling within its range (i.e., of the sunlight). But, even though the sunlight is illumining all the students simultaneously, if an individual wants to take cognizance of the students, the individual's mind cannot register all the students simultaneously ; but, can perceive and record the findings, only one by one i.e. the mind can perceive only 'sequentially'.

Not only the sunlight, but, the perceiver's Consciousness also has the same faculty as the sunlight. Once the perceiver opens his eyes in front of the students, the students fall within the range of his perception or Consciousness. The eyes of the perceiver have a range of perception; all the students fall within that perceptual Consciousness, the moment the perceiver's eyes are opened. But, even though, thus, all the students fall within the range of the perceiver's eyes or Consciousness simultaneously, if the perceiver's *mind* has to perceive the students, the mind has to entertain only one thought after another. In short, in this example, the sunlight is *akrama dhruk*, the Consciousness is *akrama dhruk* and the mind is *krama dhruk*. The perceiver might have his entire audience within his perception for a length of time; but, if he has to remember particular members of the audience, his mind should have registered the presence of the members separately, one by one, or sequentially i.e. the mind requires *thadh thadh aakaara vrutthi*.

To cite another example: Imagine an individual attending a *bharatha naatyam* concert. Even when the individual's hearing faculty is fully activated and is simultaneously exposed to all the musical instruments accompanying the artist - i.e. all of them fall within the range of the individual's *chaithanyam*, which 'illumines' all of them simultaneously - if the individual desires to judge the individual performances of the various artists, his 'perception' of the individual performances has to be necessarily one by one i.e. sequential. This example also shows that *chaithanyam* is *akrama dhruk* i.e. everything / every one falls within its range simultaneously, whereas, the mind is *krama dhruk* – which can perceive and register only one by one.

One more example is the simultaneous 'illumining' of an entire page of a book, by sunlight. Though the entire page is simultaneously 'illumined', the mind cannot register the entire page simultaneously. It has to register the contents only word by word / line by line / sentence by sentence – i.e. only sequentially. Sunlight is the simultaneous illuminator of the entire page; but, the mind cannot read the entire page simultaneously. The mind is *krama dhruk*.

But, when, thus, the mind reads the first line first and then moves on to the second line, it cannot be said that sunlight also initially 'illumined' the first line, when the first line was being read and 'illumines' the second line later, when the second line is being read; in other

words, the sunlight does not illumine the lines in the page in sequence ; it illumines all the lines – the entire page – simultaneously. 'Illumination' by the sunlight is not bound by time. When the reader is reading the second line, reading of the first line is 'past'; reading of the second line is 'present'; reading of the third line is 'future'. There are 'past', 'present' and 'future' with regard to the *reading* process; but, as far as 'illumination' is concerned, the sunlight is not conditioned by 'past', 'present' and 'future'. In a similar manner, *saakshi* (comparable to the sunlight) is 'timeless illuminator' and the mind is 'timed', sequential, process-involving 'illuminator'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is struggling to communicate this message, through this wonderful *sloka* 69, in which verse, the crucial word is '*akrama dhruk*'. *Aathmaa* is *akrama dhruk* and the mind is *krama dhruk*. This is further clarified in the following verses.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 70:

एवं च सति बुद्धेः परिणामित्वं युक्तम् ।

Such being the case, it is logical to suppose that the mind is subject to modification:

Sureswaraachaaryaa is interlinking three important concepts: the **first** is *krama*: - sequential illumination / perception; the **second** is *parinaamaa* – change; wherever there is *kramaa*, there is *parinaamaa* / *vikriyaa* / modification / change. Since the observation is sequential, there must be a difference between the first observation and the second observation and therefore, there must be a modification - *sabda sravanam*, *roopa darsanam* etc. - each one must be a different act on the part of the mind. Therefore, *krama dhruk* is *parinaami dhruk*. *Krama* and *parinaama* go together. The **third** concept is 'time'; wherever there is *krama* and *parinaama*, there is 'time', in the form of past, present and future. Our experiences through the mind involve time – I *was* unhappy / now I *am* happy and so on. Since the *boghaa* is mental, it has got *varthamaana*, *bhootha*, *bhaavi kaala thrayam*. Thus - *krama*:, *parinaama*: and *kaala*: - all these three, are associated with *ahamkaaraa*, the mind.

But, as far as the Consciousness is concerned, it is free from *krama*: (sequence), *parinaama*: (change) and therefore, most importantly, free from *kaala*: (time) also. *Saakshi* is timeless. The brilliant *manthraa* of *Kathopanishad* " *Anyathra dharmath anyathra adharmaath anyathra asmaath kruthaakruthaath anyathra bhoothaascha bhavyaascha yath thaath pasyasi thadh vadha*" - " Tell me that which you see as different from *dharmath*, different from *adharmaath*, different from this cause and effect and **different from past and future**" (Ch.I . Sec.2. Verse 14), declares this fact, viz., "*aathmaa* is timeless". *Aathmaa* does not have *varthamaana*, *bhoothaath*, *bhaavi* – it non-sequentially illumines the sequential past, present and future.

Anaathmaa has got *kaalam*; *aathmaa* is *kaala atheetha*: / *Yascha anyathrikaala atheetham thadapi Omkaaraa eva* |

- एवं च सति - This being so,
- बुद्धेः परिणामित्वं - the change / modification of *buddhi*, otherwise called *Ahamkaaraa*,
- युक्तम् – (is) logical .

This is because *buddhi* is a gradual perceiver. This is said in the verse that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 70 –

अतीतानागतेहृत्यानुगपत्सर्वगोचरान् ।

वेत्यात्मवन्न धीर्यस्मात्तेनेयं परिणामिनी ॥ ७० ॥

The mind is subject to modification, because it does not cognize all objects, past, present and future in a simultaneous apprehension, as the Self does.

The idea, that, *ahamkaaraa* (the mind) alone is associated with time, because *ahamkaaraa* experiences the events gradually, as a *krama dhruk*, is clarified.

- धीः न वेत्ति - The *ahamkaaraa* (the mind) does not experience / perceive / know / cognize
- सर्व गोचरान् - all the events /objects of the world (which themselves have got *krama* or time),

"Avyakthaath vyakthaya: sarvaa: prabhavanthyaharaagame raathriyaagame praleeyanthe thathraive avyaktha samyake".

The events unfold gradually; *buddhi* perceives gradually. Therefore, events have *kaala thrayam*; *buddhi's* experiences also have *kaala thrayam*. "But, do not extend that *kaala thrayam* to the *chaithanya aathmaa*, (which *chaithanya aathmaa* you are)".

What do the events / objects belong to?

- अतीत अनागत इहृत्यान् - belonging to the past, future and the present,

Atheetha - past; *anaagatha* – future (literally means 'that which has not yet arrived'); *ihathyaa*: - *iha bhavaa*: / the present. '*Atheetha anaagatha ihaathyaan'* is adjective to '*sarva gocharaan'*'.

- युगपत् - simultaneously.

Essence: The mind does not cognize all events or objects simultaneously.

In what manner, then, does the *buddhi* know/ experience / perceive / cognize? "*Kramatha: / kramena vetth'*" – "knows gradually" is to be supplied.

- यस्मात् तेन - because of which reason,
- इयं – this *buddhi: / ahamkaara:*
- परिणामिनी – (is) subject to change.

Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* has past, present and future; *ahamkaaraa* of the past birth is different from the *ahamkaaraa* of the present birth and similarly of the future birth, because it undergoes change. On the other hand, *aathmaa* is not a gradual observer.

This is what the *Achaaryaa* says:

आत्मवत् (धीः युगपत् न वेत्ति) - (the *buddhi* does not illumine things simultaneously) as the *aathmaa* does.

But, even though there is no *kaala thrayam* in the *saakshi* and there is *kaala thrayam* in the *saakshyam* (the world), we commit the mistake of transferring / extending the *kaala thrayam* of the world to the *saakshi* also (wrongly presuming, that the past *saakshi* witnessed the past *saakshyam*, the present *saakshi* is witnessing the present *saakshyam* and the future *saakshi* will witness the future *saakshyam*. The adjectives 'past', 'present' and 'future', which belong to the *saakshyam* are transferred mistakenly to the *saakshi*).

"*Athmaa vaa idham eka eva agre aasseeth; sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth'*" are *Upanishadic* statements, in which *aaseeth* (meaning 'was') is the verb. But, strictly speaking, you can never say "*Brahman was*" or "*Brahman is*" or "*Brahman will be*", since *Brahman* is *kaala atheetha:*

Though *Brahman* is *kaala atheetha:*, since in the past, the world was in potential form and at present, is in a manifest condition, and, therefore, has 'association' with time, we (wrongly) think that *Brahman* also has *kaala sambhandha:* .

Vidhyaaranya Swami says in a beautiful *sloka* in his *Panchadasee:* "*Kaalaatheethe puraa ithi mukthi: | kaala vaasanayaayutham sishyam prathyeva bandhee|*"

Strictly speaking, "*Brahman was*" is a wrong usage ; still, *saasthraas* and the *guru* use the verb 'was', for *Brahman*, since the *sishyaa* has got *kaala vaasanaa*. In any sentence, the subject is associated with a verb and any verb has one of the three tenses – past or present or future. Therefore, when *Brahman* is associated with a verb, *Brahman* seems to have

'time'. But, really speaking, for *Brahman*, *kaala: naasthi*. "That *kaala atheetha brahma aham asmi*" is the *Vedhaanthic* teaching.

And, "When will I become that *Brahman*? If I do my *saadhanaas* regularly, will I become *Brahman*?" are (wrong) questions, resulting from the time-oriented intellect, which connects even *Brahman* and *Mokshaa*, as a 'timed' event.

"*Dhee: aathmavath yugapath na vetthi ; paranthu kramatha: vetthi ; thasmaath parinaami bhavathi*" is the message of this verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 71 to 75 :

ततश्चैतसिद्धम् ।

Therefore this is established:

The corollary is extremely important. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* addresses the student: "Oh! Student! Note the corollary of this teaching".

- ततश्च - Therefore (if the two previous verses have been thoroughly understood),
- एतत् सिद्धम् - the following is the conclusion/ the following is established.

What is this conclusion? "All the changes belong to *ahamkaaraa*; emotions are nothing but thoughts (which is obvious, since, when one goes to sleep, one's mind and thoughts are resolved and, therefore, one has no emotions); thoughts are 'changing'; and therefore, emotions are 'changing'; *saakshi* is 'changeless'; and, therefore, emotions do not belong to the *saakshi chaithanyam*; *saakshi* is the 'changeless illuminator' of the changing emotions belonging to the mind or *ahamkaaraa*. The real 'I', *saakshi* is free from emotions".

"*Na me dvesha ragau na me loba mohau madho naiva me naive maathscharya bhaava: |*"
And, therefore only, "*na dharmo na chaartha na kamo na moksha: chidhaanandha roopo siva: kevalo aham|*"

This has to be assimilated by a seeker: (that), "I am only the 'observer' of the troubled mind; 'I' am not troubled". The *Achaaryaa* stresses this idea, in the next five verses, so that a seeker will remember this, when he meets with problems in *vyaavahaarika* life. These five beautiful *slokaas*, if meditated upon, during difficult and stressful situations in life, will help the meditator maintain his composure and poise.

Chapter II: Verse 71 –

अपश्यन्पश्यतीं बुद्धिमश्रुण्वन् श्रुण्वतीं तथा ।

निर्यत्नोऽविक्रियोऽनिच्चनिच्चन्तीं चाप्यलुप्तद्रुक् ॥ ७१ ॥

(The Self) which does not see, does not hear, does not will, does not change, does not desire and does not lose awareness at any time, (perceives in all the bodies) the mind, which sees, hears and desires.

All these five verses (71 to 75) are extensions of one known idea only. The *Achaaryaa* presents the idea in different languages, so that, the seeker can prepare himself for the 'binary format'.

The binary format is a mindset, wherein the seeker learns to look at himself as the *saakshi* all the time, and learns to consider everything else, including his mind also, as *anaathmaa*.

Vedhaanthaa is not against any action towards 'improvement' of the seeker's mind ; but, only warns against connecting the mind to *mokshaa*, since the seeker is always the *nithya muktha saakshi*. 'Improvement of the mind' is for the benefit of others around the seeker – a '*loka kshema kaaryam*' ; but, the mental conditions of the seeker should not be connected with the original nature of the seeker, since, as pointed out already, the seeker is always a *nithya muktha saakshi* and his *mukthi* is not dependent on the conditions of his mind.

To repeat : It is true, that, the mind can never be in perfect condition all the time, since it is subject to influences of the world and influences of one's own body (the physical conditions of the body, the harmones in the body, the chemicals in the body, the three *gunaas* etc.). And, of course, one should try to keep one's mind as healthy as possible, which is a *loka kshema kaaryam*; but, the condition of the mind should not be connected with one's *nithya muktha saakshi svaroopam*.

This is called 'living in binary format' – "i.e. the conviction that only (1) 'I', the *saakshi* and (2) the *saakshyam* (everything else other than *saakshi*) are there; that *Saakshyam* is never free from problems and *saakshi* is ever free from problems. And, therefore, both of them do not require freedom. *Saakshyam* cannot be free; *saakshi* need not become free". In fact, this understanding itself is 'freedom'. The seeker is relaxed, once this attitude is attained, with a proper understanding of the *saakshi* and the *saakshyam*.

"*Prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha paandava | Na dveshti sampravrutthani na nivrutthaani kaankshath'*" (Verse 22 – Ch. XIV - *Bhagavadh Githa*) – "The three *gunaas* will continue to change; when the mind is 'fine', one should not get attached to the 'fine' mind and when the mind 'throws tantrums' one should not hate the mind also. One should learn to be objective". *Dayananda Swamiji* advises, in his inimitable manner: "Be kind to your own mind".

- आत्मा - (taken from the next verse i.e., verse 72) – The Self,

- अलुप्तद्रुक् - (which is) the unbroken / continuous Witness,

Aluptha - unbroken / continuous; *dhruk* - Witness.

- निर्यत्नः - (which is) the effortless (Observer) / / *prayathna rahitha:*,

Niryathna: (*dhruk*) - Effortless (Observer). The *saakshi-aathmaa* does not put forward any effort to become a Witness / Observer.

- अविक्रियः - (and, therefore, which is) free from any form of *vikriyaa* / *parinaamaa*/ change,

Niryathna:, *avikriya:* and *alupthadhruk* are all adjectives to *aathmaa*.

Such a *saakshi – aathmaa:*

- पश्यति - (from verse 75) - illumines
- सर्वदेहेषु - (also, from verse 75) – in all the bodies.

Not only is the *saakshi* witnessing one particular mind, but, is the 'Witness' of all the minds. By this statement, the *Aachaaryaa* implies that the *saakshi* is one and the same, in all the minds, even though it has got a seeming division caused by the intellect - "in every body, one and the same *saakshi* 'illumines' everything" – "*sarva deheshu pasyath*" (verse 75).

This leads to the doubt "If I am the *saakshi* and *saakshi* is illumining all the minds, it must be illumining the minds of all the scientists also, would it not mean, that I should have all their knowledge also?" The clarification to this doubt : "When you say, "I should have all the knowledge" what is meant by the word 'I'? If the word 'I' is taken to mean the mind, such a claim, viz. 'I have all the knowledge', is absurd, since the mind will certainly continue to have limitations. If, on the other hand, the word is interpreted as referring to *Saakshi (aathmaa)*, the claim is right, since *saakshi* illumines all the minds ; *saakshi is sarvagnya:* ; the individual mind is certainly *alpagnya:*."

What all does the *athmaa* perceive? Coming back to Verse 71 (first line):

- पश्यतीं बुद्धिं (पश्यति) - (Perceives) the seeing buddhi / mind,
- अपश्यन् - without doing the action of seeing.

The mind is seeing (registering) forms through the sense organs, eyes. That *buddhi* / mind, with the *roopa vrutthi*, is referred to as '*pasyathee buddhi* – 'seeing mind' (in this verse). The *saakshi* is perceiving the 'seeing mind', without doing the action of 'seeing'.

All these five *slokaas* are trying to convey only one message: "The **changeless Saakshi** observes the mind, *which is a changing observer*".

- तथा - In the same manner,
- (आत्मा - the Self)
- अश्रुण्वन् - without doing the action of hearing
- (पश्यति - perceives / srnothi)
- श्रुण्वती (बुद्धि) - the 'hearing' mind.

Again, *saakshi* 'hears' / perceives the 'hearing' mind, without doing the job of hearing – *srunvatheem buddhim pasyathi (srnothi)*.

The following *manthraa* (no. 21) from *Kaivalya Upanishad* is relevant in this context: "*Apaanipaadoham achinthyaa sakthi: pasyaamachakshu: sa srnothyakarmana:*" – "I am without hands and legs; yet, I am endowed with incomprehensible power. I see without eyes; I hear without ears".

- (तथा - in the same manner)
- (आत्मा – the Self)
- अनिच्छन् इच्छन्ती (पश्यति) - (perceives) the desiring mind without doing the job of desiring.

Anicchan - without desire.

The *aathmaa* does not have any desire to 'observe' a particular type of world. *icchaa* also is a problem of the mind only. Verse 7, Ch XIII of the *Bhagavadh Githa* points out: "*icchaa dvesha: sukham dhu:kham samgaatha: chethanaa dhruthi: ethath kshethram*" – "Desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, the body-mind complex, sentiency, fortitude - all this is *Kshethram*". *Saakshi* does not desire to observe either a 'nice' mind or a 'disturbed' mind – it does not have any type of desire, similar to the sunlight not having any desire to 'illumine' any particular object / event.

Various other activities of the mind are covered in the next few verses.

Chapter II: Verse 72

द्विषन्तीमद्विषन्नात्मा कुप्यन्तीं चाप्यकोपनः ।

निर्दुःखो दुःखिनीं चैव निस्सुखः सुखिनीमपि ॥ ७२ ॥

(The Self) which does not hate, does not get angry, does not suffer and does not enjoy (perceives in all the bodies the mind) which hates, gets angry, suffers and enjoys.

The *Achaaryaa* holds forth in the same strain.

The *Saakshi* perceives the 'hating' mind, without getting associated with 'hatred'; the non-hating *saakshi* perceives the hating mind.

Aathmaa (pasyathi) - The Self (perceives)
Dvishantheem (buddhim) - the hating mind,
Adhvishan - without hating.

Similarly,

-)आत्मा पश्यति - The Self perceives)
- कुप्यन्तीं बुद्धिं (- the mind which gets angry,
- अकोपनः - without itself getting associated with anger.

Again, in the same manner,

- निर्दुःखः (आत्मा सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति) -The sorrowless (Self perceives in all the bodies),
- दुःखिनिं (बुद्धिं) – the sorrowful mind.

Even when the mind is full of sorrow, the individual in the binary format, should be able to declare "I am sorrow-free".

- निस्सुखः (आत्मा) - (The Self) which is free from the emotion of happiness also,

Interpreting '*nissukha:*' as 'unhappy', (as an adjective to *aathmaa*) is not appropriate. *Aathmaa* cannot be unhappy; but, is 'free from the emotion of happiness also', just as it is free from all types of emotions.

- (सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति - perceives in all the bodies)
- सुखिनीं बुद्धिं) - the joyful / joyous mind.

This may result in a doubt. How is it that *aathmaa* can be said to be joyless, while the mind is joyful? Does not *Vedhaantha* declare *aanandha aathmaa* and *anandho brahmethi vyajaanaath* etc.? The explanation: When the word 'happiness' is used in common parlance, it only refers to experiential temporary *aanandaa*, which is only *prathi bhimbha aanandhaa*, which *prathi bimmbha aanandha* is the arriving and departing / the fleeting joy, belonging to the mind alone, more precisely, to the *aananda maya kosaa* alone, whereas, 'I' the *Saakshi*,

do not want to claim that 'fleeting' joy but the original, non-experiential *aanandhaa* – *aathmaanandhaa*.

Nobody can 'experience' *aathmaananda*; only *aathma prathibhimbha aanandhaa* can be 'experienced'. If a person claims "I experienced the *aathman* bliss in *nirvikalpa samaadhi*", such a statement is only erroneous. The 'bliss' experienced, which arrived and departed, was not *aathmaanandaa*, but only *prathi bhimbha aanandhaa*, which belongs to the *kosaa*, whereas *aathmaanandha* is 'yourself'. This *sloka* refers only to the *prathi bhimbha aanandaa*, belonging to the *kosaa*.

84. Chapter II, Verse 72 to 75 (26-01-2008)

Sureswaraachaarya is differentiating *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*, in these important verses. He wants to point out that *ahamkaaraa* is nothing but the mind and *saakshi* is the Consciousness, in whose presence, the mind is able to reveal itself. The *saakshi* does not 'do' anything to reveal the mind; but, in the mere presence of *saakshi*, the mind gets revealed. And, because the mind gets revealed in the presence of *saakshi*, the *saakshi* is given the name of 'revealer', though, the name 'revealer' does not refer to any specific 'action' or 'status' of *saakshi*; the name 'revealer' only indicates, that, in the presence of *saakshi*, the mind gets revealed.

This mind alone is called *ahamkaaraa* and this mind- *ahamkaaraa* alone undergoes varieties of experiences, each experience being only a thought modification. What is called a 'flow of experiences' is nothing but 'arrival and departure of thoughts'. The *vrutthi* is called a thought, when it is by itself; when the *vrutthi* 'reveals' itself, in the presence of the *saakshi*, the 'revealing *vrutthi*' is called an experience. In other word, a 'thought' itself is called an 'experience', when the thought is capable of revealing itself, in the presence of *saakshi*.

Since by the word *saakshi*, what is referred to is 'I', the real *aathmaa*, it can be also be said "in the presence of 'I', the real *aathmaa* – the *chaithanyam*, the mind has got 'arriving' - 'departing' thoughts."

In 'my' presence, the mind entertains arriving – departing thoughts and every thought is called an experience, because, the thought is able to reveal itself, not because of *its* glory, but, because of 'my' *saannidhyam*.

Since, thus, 'experiences' are 'revealing thoughts' and since thoughts belong to the mind, all the experiences belong to the mind alone. Therefore, all the experiential adjectives - such as 'happy', 'unhappy', 'hateful', 'jealous', 'calm' – are attributes belonging to the mind alone. They do not belong to 'I', the revealer *aathmaa* and therefore 'I' am 'attributeless'; 'I' am the 'sorrowless revealer' of the 'sorrow thought' of the 'sorrowful mind'. (So also of every emotion). 'I' am without sorrow, without hatred and so on; I am '*nirguna chaithanyam*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa takes up some of the common and familiar thoughts and experiences that happen in the mind. In these five verses, 71 to 75, the *Achaaryaa* talks about the 'flowing' experiences / thoughts of the mind, which the *saakshi* reveals, without itself getting 'contaminated', in any manner, by the experiences / thoughts / emotions.

"*Na me dvesha raagau na me lobha mohau, mado naive me naiva maathsaryabhaava: na dharmo na chaartho na kaamo na moksha: chidhaananda roopa: sivoham sivoham*" (verse 3

of *Nirvaana Panchakam* of *Adi Sankara Bhangavadh Paadha*) is the essence of these five beautiful verses 71 to 75.

Chapter II: Verse 73 –

अमुह्यमानो मुह्यन्तीं कल्पयन्तीमकल्पयन् ।

स्मरन्तीमस्मरंश्चैव शयानामस्वपन्मुहुः ॥ ७३ ॥

(The Self) which does not get deluded, does not indulge in imagination, does not remember and does not slumber (perceives in all the bodies, the mind) which gets deluded, indulges in imagination, remembers and slumbers.

The idea is the same in this verse, as in the verses 71 and 72; the *Achaaryaa* is talking of varieties of experiences, and, asserts, that, 'I', the *Aathmaa* , is free from all the experiences.

The next experience he talks of, is *moha vrutthi*; '*moha*:' meaning 'delusion' or 'mental conflict', which is common to all human beings, all the time. Every 'conflict' is a 'thought' and that is the reason in the 'deep sleep' state, when 'thoughts' are not there, there are no 'conflicts' also. 'Conflict' or 'confusion' is also an 'experience' belonging to the mind alone; 'I' am the 'confusionless revealer' of the 'confusion- thought' of the 'confused mind'. The adjective 'confused' is applicable only to the mind; not to 'I', the *chaithanyam* / *saakshi* / *aathmaa*.

-)आत्मा(– The Self
- (सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति(- perceives in all the bodies,
- मुह्यन्तीं बुद्धिं(- the intellect that gets deluded (confused),
- अमुह्यमानः - without itself getting deluded (confused).

Aathmaa reveals the deluded / confused intellect, without itself being affected / tainted by the attribute called 'confusion'. An example is the sunlight which illumines a dirty object, without being contaminated by the dirt of the dirty object. In the same manner, 'I' illumine the confused mind, without getting contaminated by the 'confusion' of the confused mind.

Other 'experiences' are similar.

- (आत्मा) - The Self
- (सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति) - perceives in all the bodies,
- कल्पयन्तीं (बुद्धिं) - the fanciful / imagining mind,
- अकल्पयन् - without indulging in imagination / fancying.

Sureswaraachaarya says "every fancy is also a thought belonging to the mind alone". The 'fancy-less' *aathmaa*, 'I', reveal the 'fancy' thought of the 'fancying' mind, uncontaminated by the 'fancy'. Therefore, the anxiety resulting from the fancy, is, also only for the mind; not for 'me', the *aathmaa*.

- अस्मरन् (आत्मा) - The Self, which does not 'remember'
- (सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति) - perceives in all the bodies,
- स्मरन्ती (बुद्धि) - the remembering mind.

The 'non-remembering' Self reveals the 'memory-thoughts' of the 'remembering' mind.

In the same manner:

- अस्वपन् (आत्मा) - The Self, which does not sleep/ rest / relax,
- (सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति) - perceives in all the bodies,
- शयानं (बुद्धि) - the mind that sleeps / rests / relaxes / is passive,
- मुहुः - again and again.

Sleep belongs to the mind alone. That mind, which does not entertain any thought, to illumine either the *sthoola prapancha* or the *sookshma prapanchaa* – i.e. that mind, with 'subsided' thoughts – is called the 'sleeping' mind. And, that 'sleep' does not belong to the *saakshi*, which, however, 'reveals' the 'sleeping' mind.

Verse 8 - Sec. II - Ch. II of *Katopanishadh* also points out: "Ya esha: suptheshu jaagarthi kaamam kaamam purusho nirmimaana:" – "The Self is this Consciousness, which keeps awake projecting various (dream) objects, when all senses are asleep".

When all the organs, including the mind are sleeping, the non-sleeping Consciousness reveals the 'sleeping' mind, uncontaminated by the sleep-*avasthaa*.

Chapter II: Verse 74 –

सर्वाकारां निराकारः स्वार्थोऽस्वार्था निरिङ्गनः ।

निस्त्रिकालस्त्रिकालस्थां कूटस्थः क्षणभङ्गुराम् ॥ ७४ ॥

(The Self) which does not have any form, is for itself, is unmoving, is time-less and is immutable (perceives in all the bodies, the mind) which assumes all forms, subserves the ends of another, is subject to time, past, present and future and perishes every moment.

Two important laws or principles, on which the entire *Vedaantha* is resting, are:

(1) 'I' am different from everything that 'I' experience, because 'I' am the 'experiencer'-subject and everything else is the 'experienced'-object, and

(2) all experienced attributes belong only to 'experienced'-objects and never to the 'experiencer'-subject.

Sureswarachaaryaa, in these verses 71 to 75, is applying the above-mentioned second important law by pointing out : "All emotional states - like anger, worry, anxiety, stress etc. - are 'experienced' attributes belonging to the experienced object – the 'mind' (which, it should be remembered, is only an 'object' of experience) and never to the 'experiencer' *saakshi chaithanyam*."

Most of the thoughts correspond to external objects and since each object in the external world has got '*aakaara*:' - a finite form – the thought also has got a form; and in fact, the form of the thought alone decides the 'experience'. *Sabda aakaara vrutthi* corresponds to *sabda anubhavaa*; *sparsa aakaara vrutthi* refers to *sparsa anubhavaa* and so on. Every experience gets specified only because of the specific form of thought. If (this is purely hypothetical) all the thoughts are the same, all the experiences will also be the same. Experiences are differentiated by different types of thought; every thought has got an individuality of its own and is therefore 'finite' in nature.

This is what the *Acchaaryaa* also points out: "Every *vrutthi* is *saakaara vrutthi* and every *saakaara vrutthi* has got an individuality of its own and that *saakaara vrutthi* is 'revealed' by the *saakshi chaithanyam*, without the *saakshi* itself getting contaminated / tainted by that *aakaaraa* / individuality".

'Experience' has got a specific nature; but, the Consciousness does not have any specific nature and is therefore called *nirvishesha chaithanyam*.

- निराकारः (आत्मा) - The formless / 'individuality'less Consciousness
- (पश्यति) - perceives / illumines
- सर्वाकारां (बुद्धिं) - the mind that assumes different forms.

Further:

- स्वार्थः निरिङ्गनः (आत्मा) - The Self which is self-valid and is without any motion,

Niringana: - adjective to *aathmaa*, meaning the 'one without any motion'; *ingathi* is the verbal form, meaning *chalathi* – 'moves'.

Aathmaa is the only thing which is valid by itself; i.e. whose existence is justifiable by itself. Nothing else is self-valid. Everything else has to validate itself, by proving its usefulness/ utility for others. The moment an object is found useless, it is rejected and is therefore called *paraarthathaa*.

This principle, is, in fact, applicable even to people. "*Yaavath vitthopaarjana saktha: thaavath nijaparivaaro raktha:*"- "As long as you are able to earn, so long will your kinsfolk be attached to you" warns *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa* in his famous *Bhaja Govindam*. "*Athmanasthu kaamaaya sarvam priyam bhavathi*" asserts Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* also, in the *Brihadhaaranyaka Upanishad*.

Therefore, *anaathmaa* is called *paraartha vishayaa*, while *aathmaa* is considered *svaartha vishayaa*.

Like everything else apart from *aathmaa*, the mind is also non-self-valid. This is the reason that, as long as the mind is enjoying happiness, is calm, is efficient and is not a burden, an individual loves his mind, considering the mind as a wonderful instrument serving him; but, the moment the mind becomes heavy, because of worry, fear or grief, the individual thinks in terms of 'removing'/ 'eliminating' the mind, by sleep or recourse to liquor or drugs or even to suicide. This establishes the fact, that the mind is *paraartha*

- पश्यति – perceives / illumines
- अस्वार्था (बुद्धि) - the mind that subserves the ends of another.

The next experience taken up by the *Achaaryaa* is the 'experience of *kaala thathvam*', which is an attribute of every object in Creation. The past / present / future tenses are associated with every object in the Creation.

"*Avyakthaath vyakthaya: sarvaa: prabhavanti aharaagame*" - "On the arrival of the day (of *Brahma*) all the manifest beings come forth from the unmanifest" declares the Lord in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (verse 18 – Ch. VIII). Every object had a dormant past state, has an active present state and will again have a dormant future state. The entire Creation – micro and macro – is associated with *kaalathathvam*. Therefore, *kaalaa* can be taken as an 'attribute' and this attribute of *kaalaa* is associated with the mind also. This fact can be proved by *anvaya vyathirekha* logic – when the mind comes alive, *kaala thathvam* also comes alive – either in *jaagrath avasthaa*, with *jaagrath kaalaa* and in *svapna avasthaa* with *svapna kaalaa*. But, when the mind resolves in *sushupthi*, *kaalaa* experience also disappears.

Manas sathve kaala sathvam; mano abhave kaala abhaava: ; thasmaath mana: eva kaalena sambhadhyathe. But, *aathmaa* is not associated with Time; it is ever existent.

And, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- निस्त्रिकालः (आत्मा) - The time-less Self
- (पश्यति) - perceives
- त्रिकालस्थां (बुद्धिं) - the mind which is associated with the three - varthamaana, bhootha, bhaavi - kaalams.

Applying the second 'law' enunciated earlier, 'time' is an 'experienced' attribute, belonging to the 'experienced' mind and therefore, it does not belong to the 'experiencer' *aathmaa*. 'I' do not have association with past tense, present tense or future tense. "Deadlines" are associated with *kaalaa*; "deadlines" cause stress. In other words, stress is associated with *kaala thathvam*. Therefore, *Goudapaadhaachaaryaa* declares in his *Mandookya Karikaa*, "as long as you are associated with time, you have *samsaaraa*". The relevant verse runs: "Yaavath hethupalaavesa: samsaaras thaavath aayatha: / ksheene hethupalaavesa: samsaaram na prapadhyathe //" – "As long as there is obsession with cause and effect, so long *samsaaraa* is extended. When the obsession with cause and effect is subsided, one does not attain *samsaaraa*" (verse 56 – *Alathasaaanthiprakaranam*).

The moral: Stand aloof and watch the flow of time and the flow of events / thoughts in time, with the conviction "I have no connection with either time or the flow of events / thoughts in time. In a river, the riverbed is stationery, while the water keeps flowing ; 'I' am like the flowless, stationery river bed and on 'me', time flows, events flow and thoughts flow". This 'claiming' of 'timelessness' is verily *moksha* :

Ironically, people get tensed up, by the thought of *mokshaa* itself, fearing the consequences (*punarapi jananam, punarapi maranam*) of not achieving *moksha* in this very life. Sureswaraachaaryaa points out "you' are the 'nithya muktha aathmaa'. It is your mind that is bound and suffers from *kaalaa* also. 'You' are yourself ever free".

The *saadhakaa* should be free from the 'tension' of attaining *mokshaa* also, since this 'tension' also is a form of *samsaaraa*, even though the desire for *mokshaa* is the noblest desire possible, compared to all other desires.

That's why, in the *Kathopanishad*, Yamadharmarajaa warns "anyath sreyah: anyath uthaiva preya: the ubhe naanaarthe purushagum sineetha:"- "Sreyas is one path; Preyas is quite another; but, both, though with different destinations, **bind** a person" (Verse 1 – Ch. I- Valli 2).

Does this mean that one should choose to remain a *samsaaree*? No; the message is "Claim that 'I' do not require *mokshaa*, because 'I' am *nithya asamsaaree*; *samsaaraa* is also only

an adjective and is applicable to the mind only; "*Aham samsaara-mukthi-atheetha-saakshi asmi.*"

'*Nisthrikaala.*' is a very meaningful adjective to the Self; 'Self' is free from all the three periods of time.

Dayananda Swamiji points out that the word *nithyam*, as applied to *aathmaa*, should not be interpreted as 'eternal'. The word 'eternal' means 'that which exists in all the three periods of time' and therefore, when the adjective 'eternal' is used to refer to an object, it implies that the object is 'associated' with all the three periods of time/ *kaalaas*. Of course, the word / adjective 'non-eternal' implies association with one or two *kaalaas* only. *Aathmaa* is neither eternal nor non-eternal; *Aathmaa* is neither associated with one *kaalaa*; nor, associated with three *kaalaas*, since it is **asangha:** - 'un-associated with anything including *kaalaa*'. Therefore (Dayananda Swami points out), the right and more appropriate interpretation of the word '*nithya.*', in the context of *aathmaa*, should be 'timeless' and not 'eternal'. Sureswaraacharya's adjective '*nisthrikaala*' to *aathmaa*, in this verse is, therefore, very appropriate, meaning '**timeless** Consciousness'.

Gowdapaadaacharya also expresses in his *Maandookya Kaarika* – "*Aathmaa na saasvatha asaasvatha abhidhaa*" – "You cannot refer to *aathmaa* as *saasvatham* or *assaasvatham*", because while *asaasvatham* is *eka kaala sambhandhi* and *saasvatham* is *thrikaala sambhandhi*, *aathmaa* is *kaala asambhandhi*.

This *kaala atheetha chaithanyam* illumines the mind, which is *thri kaalsthaam* – associated with the three times.

The next thought / experience referred to by the *Achaaryaa:*

कूटस्थः (आत्म क्षणभङ्गुराम् बुद्धिं पश्यति)

- कूटस्थः (आत्मा) -The 'changeless' *aathmaa* (the 'changelessness' nature of the *aathmaa* has already been referred to earlier, by the use of the adjective '*niringhana.*')
- (पश्यति) - reveals
- क्षणभङ्गुरां बुद्धिं(- constantly changing mind / fleeting thoughts.

The thoughts, like *kaama vrutthi*, *krodha vrutthi*, *lobha vrutthi* etc. move constantly in the mind, while the *saakshi* remains changeless / unaffected by the thoughts.

Chapter II: Verse 75 –

निरपेक्षश्च सापेक्षां परार्चीं प्रत्यगद्वयः ।

सावधिं निर्गत्यतः सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति ॥ ७५ ॥

(The Self) which is not relative, which is the inner undivided Reality and which is infinite, perceives in all bodies (the mind) which is relative, which is external and which is finite.

- निरपक्षः (अत्मा)- -'I', the *chaitanyam*, the independent Self,
- सर्वदेहेषु पश्यति - illumines in every body,
- सापेक्षां (बद्धिं) - the mind, which is dependent.

The mind is considered 'dependent' because of two aspects; it (the mind) is insentient and becomes sentient only because of the consciousness (*chidaabhaasa*) borrowed from the Self; this is *chith apekshaa* – 'dependence' for sentiency. The other aspect, which is more often missed, is the fact, that, even the very existence of the mind is dependent on 'I', the observer only. The mind 'borrows' its very existence also from the *saakshi*.

85. Chapter II, Verse 75 to 77 (09-02-2008)

In these verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is doing *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*, which is an extremely subtle process, because *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* are intimately together and both of them are experienced together, in the very word and thought 'I'. The separation will have to be done cognitively, by the process of careful analysis, and therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa is writing several verses with regard to this topic.

The *Achaaryaa* points out: "In the very word 'I', there is the experience of the Consciousness principle, which is changeless, which is formless and which is *paaramaarthika sathyam*. And, in this very word 'I', not only is the *saakshi chaithanyam* experienced, simultaneously, the mind is also experienced"; which mind alone, the *Achaaryaa* is calling here, *ahamkaara*: | The words 'mind' and '*ahamkaaraa*' are used interchangeably here, because the mind is included in the word 'I' (*aham*). To repeat: In the word '*aham*', *saakshi* is also 'shining experience' and mind also is 'shining experience'; both are simultaneously experienced.

"But" Sureswaraachaaryaa also points out "even though they are simultaneously experienced, one is self-evident and the other has got borrowed experience".

Which one is self-evident? It is the *saakshi thathvam*, which, for its experience, does not depend upon anything else, because *chaithanyam* is the intrinsic nature of *saakshi*; on the other hand, the mind is experienced, not because of its natural sentiency, but, because of borrowed sentiency.

Since the mind is shining with Consciousness 'borrowed' from the *saakshi*, we make the statement "the *saakshi* is illumining the mind". The verb 'is illumining' creates an impression that the illumination was not there earlier, that the process of 'illumination' started at a particular time and that the process will continue for some time etc.; but, such an impression / understanding is erroneous. The verb 'illumines' does not have this connotation, in this context; it should be understood to only mean that "in the presence of *saakshi*, the mind is evident".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "the *saakshi* is experienced continuously; the mind is also experienced continuously. But, between the two, one is 'non-changing' and the other is 'changing'; one is 'spirit' and the other is 'matter'; one is '*sathyam*' and the other is '*mithyaad*'; the *sathya-anrutha-viveka* between the *saakshi* and the mind is crucial."

Therefore, in these 5 verses (71 to 75) Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Constantly, when I am using the word 'I', a process is happening. What is that? 'I' the *saakshi* am shining and simultaneously in that self-shining Consciousness, the mind is also experienced constantly. But, even though both are intimate and both are simultaneously shining, their natures are totally different. One is *aathmaa*; the other is *anaathmaa*. One is *chaithanyam*; the other is *jadam*. One is *sathyam*; the other is *mithyaa*. One is *nirvikaaraa*; the other is *savikaaraa*. The *nirvikaaraa sakshi*, the higher 'I', is illumining the *savikaara ahamkaaraa*, which is the lower 'I'. To use Krishna's expression "my own *paraaprkrithi* is illumining my own *aparaaprkrithi*". This mixture is referred to by the word '*aham*'.

Aham padha lakshyaartha: is *nirvikaara saakshi*; *aham padha vaachyaartha:* is *savikaara ahamkaara*; / *antha:karanam*.

To differentiate between the two, *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving many adjectives to both the mind and the *aathmaa* (in verses 71 to 75).

In verse 75 (under study now), the use of the adjective '*nirapeksha:*' to *aathmaa* indicates that *aathmaa* has got independent *sath* and *chith* – *aathmaa* enjoys 'Existence' of its own and 'Consciousness' of its own. Whereas, the mind, when it illumines, it only has 'Consciousness' borrowed from *aathmaa*, popularly known as *chidhaabhaasaa*. Not only does the mind have only *chidhaabhaasaa* (i.e., only borrowed Consciousness), it also has only *sath aabhaasaa* (only borrowed Existence); the 'isness' of the mind also, does not belong to the mind; its '*isness*' also is given only by 'I'. And, whatever has got borrowed '*isness*', is called *mithyaa*.

An example is a 'dream tiger': "When I see a sentient tiger in dream, the sentiency of the tiger is given by me alone, with the Consciousness 'taken' from the mind ; the tiger is nothing but a thought; and that inert thought - tiger *vrutthi* – is given *chaithanyam* by 'me'. The 'thought tiger' becomes a 'live tiger', because of the *chith* borrowed from 'me' through the mind; more importantly, not only does the tiger borrow 'Consciousness' from 'me'; the tiger borrows 'existence' also from 'me' alone". As *Kaivalya Upanishad* declares "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham; mayi sarvam prathishtitham; mayi sarvam layam yaathi*" - "Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything is resolved into me alone". No doubt, the tiger appears tangible; but, its 'isness' is borrowed from me; this is called *mithyaa*. "In the same manner" *Advaitam* says "when I look at the world and sentient people, 'I', the *aathmaa* – the *saakshi chaithanyam* - lends not only 'Consciousness' to everybody and everybody; the very 'Existence' is lent by the *aathmaa*. Therefore, the world is *mithyaa*. This fact – *saapekshathvam / mithyaathvam* of the mind - (in contrast to the *nirapekshethvam* of the *aathmaa*) is brought out by the *Achaaryaa*, in this verse, by the use of the adjective *saapekshaa* to *buddhi* – meaning *mithya ahamkaaraa / mithya antha:*

karanam. The *sathya saakshi* perceives (illuminates) the *mithya ahamkaaraa / mithya antha:karanam*.

(But, to what purpose? The answer can only be: "for entertainment"; similar to watching an unreal 'movie' for entertainment. But, the 'entertainment' should not become a serious 'nightmare'. Therefore the exhortation in the *Kathopanishad*: "*Utthishtatha jaagratha praapya varaan nibhodhata*" – "Arise ! Awake ! Having approached the great ones, know the *aathmaa*" (*manthraa* 14 – Sec. 3 – Ch. I).)

Nirapeksha: aathmaa saapekshaam buddhim pasyathi |

Sureswaraachaaryaa proceeds:

प्रत्यक् अद्वयः(आत्मा) - the inner non-dual Self

Prathyak – Inner.

By the word 'inner Self', what is meant, is the ultimate Subject – *aathmaa*.

Even though the mind is 'inner' from the standpoint of the body, compared to 'I', the *saakshi*, the mind is 'outer'.

- पश्यति - perceives / illumines
- पराचीम् (बुद्धिं)- the 'outer' mind.

The *Achaaryaa* refers to the mind as 'outer' (*paraachee*), even though, to all perception, from the standpoint of the body, it is 'inner' (inside). It is because, as explained already, from the standpoint of the *saakshi*, the mind is outer (outside).

'Outside' and 'inside' are, after all, relative.

The 'absolute' inside is only *saakshi*; all the others are relatively inside or outside; but, from the 'absolute' standpoint, everything is 'outside' only.

Following is another explanation, from the *Vedhaanthic* angle, as to the 'inner' nature of *saakshi* and the 'outer' nature of the mind:

What is the definition of 'outer' in *Vedhaantha*? What is objectifiable is 'outer'. Therefore, world is 'outer'; body is 'outer'; mind is 'outer'; ignorance is 'outer'; even the silence in deep

sleep state is 'outer'. And, therefore, from the *Vedhaanthic* angle, the mind is 'outer' (because mind is an objectifiable entity).

Roopam dhruyam lochanam dhruk thath dhruyam dhrukthumaanasam dhruyaadhee vrutthaya: saakshi dhrugeva na thu dhruyathe |

Similarly, in *Vedhaanatha*, what is unobjectifiable is referred to as 'inner'. What is unobjectifiable? There is only one unobjectifiable entity, the subject *saakshi*.

Therefore, on both the above counts, viz., the 'relative' angle and the *Vedhaanthic* viewpoint, the *Achaaryaa* refers to *aathma* as *prathyak* and *buddhi* as *paraachee*.

As for the adjective '*adhnaya:*', the ultimate 'Subject', *aathmaa*, is the only Subject, according to *Vedhaanatha*. There cannot be a second Subject. Therefore, *aathmaa* – *saakshi* is uncountable as one among many; in other words, 'non-dual'. And therefore, the *Achaaryaa* uses the adjective '*adhvaya:*', to the Self.

"Saakshi chethaa kevalo nirgunascha" ithi Svethaaswatharas sruthe: |

Then, the *Achaaryaa* moves on to the next pair: *Saavadhim nirgatha: yattha: |*

- निर्गत :यत्त) :आत्मा(- The dimensionless / immeasurable/ limitless/ infinite Self

Yatthaa - means dimension or measurement, such as height, width, weight etc.

- पश्यति - perceives / illumines
- सावधिं (बुद्धिं) - the 'limited' mind.

Avadhi: - also means measurement / dimension etc.; in fact, *yatthaa* and *avadhi:* are synonyms. *Sa avadhi:* - means 'with measurement' and therefore 'limited'.

The 'limitless' *saakshi* experiences the 'limited' mind.

When an individual claims that he is in a particular place or location, then his reference is only to his body and mind. The *Achaaryaa* points out "the mind's limited location does not belong to the *saakshi*". From the *saakshi* angle, one can and should claim "I am *sarvagatha:*".

This statement is proved by the axiom "all experienced attributes belong to the experienced objects and never to the Experiencer-Subject". All experienced measurements (height /

weight / location etc.) can belong only to a known body or to a known mind and never to the *saakshi*.

The *saakshi* perceives the mind in every body – “*sarva deheshu*”. But, even though bodies are divisible and are divided, the *saakshi* is indivisible like space – *aakaasavath*. *Saakshi* is *sarvagatha*:

“*Kshethragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarvakshethreshu bhaaratha*” – “Oh! Arjuna! May you know *Kshethragnyaa* to be Myself alone obtaining in all bodies” Lord Krishna declares in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (verse 3 – Ch. XIII).

And, what is the aim of *Vedhaantha*?: “Training the seeker to claim the *saakshi* as himself and as a consequence, enjoy the emotional drama around”.

Verses 71 to 75 form a single sentence – *aathmaa buddhim pasyathi* -, with *aathmaa* as the subject, *buddhi* as the object and *pasyathi* as the verb. The other words are adjectives to *aathmaa* and *buddhi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 76:

एतस्माच्च कारणादयमर्थो व्यवसीयताम् ।

For this reason also, the following principle is to be admitted:

“So, from these discussions, we have to derive a corollary. That is the aim of my writing this book (treatise)” (implies the *Aachaaryaa*).

What is that corollary? The adjective “*dhu:kee*” or “*samsaari*” can apply only to the mind and never, never to the real ‘I’, the *Saakshi*. Therefore, ‘I’, the *Saakshi* need not remove sorrow – need not remove *samsaaraa* - to *become* ‘liberated’. I have only to claim that ‘I’ am the *nithya-asamsaari-muktha*: /

But, a person may argue “All right! I grant that the *saakshi* is free from *dhu:kham* or *samsaaram* and also that it is *nithya muktha*: / But, what I am now more interested in, is the well-being of my body-mind complex”.

Sureswaraachaarya replies: “The body-mind complex will always be un-predictable, uncontrollable and un-sustainable. You can never have total control over *anaathmaa*. Therefore, the more you try to develop ownership and controllership over them, the more miserable your life will become. Even if you manage to control the conditions of the *anaathmaa* at a given point of time, you cannot maintain the controlled conditions for ever,

because *anaathmaa* is subject to the influence of infinite factors – many unknown and many known but uncontrollable ; therefore, instead of trying to 'control' the body-mind complex, dedicate it to *Viswaroopa Isvara*; and, having dedicated your body-mind complex to *Viswaroopa Isvara*, make your 'contribution' to family and society, with the help of the body-mind complex as 'borrowed' instrument. This verily is *aanthara sanyaasam*. Let the body-mind complex wear off in the process; you need not worry about it. Never entertain the illusion of controlling the mind or body, in entirety, since it is impossible".

Aanthara sanyaasaa is the attitude "I am a contributor and never a controller". And, also the realization "even when I try to keep the condition of my body and mind as fit as possible, I should always note that my 'liberation' is not connected to the condition of the body-mind *anaathmaa* complex."

"By forgetting my real nature and by connecting my *mokshaa* to the fluctuations of *anaathmaa*, I will look upon life as a 'struggle' and therefore suffer *samsaaraa*. By remembering my real nature, and by disconnecting my *mokshaa* from the conditions of *anaathmaa*, I convert life into sport / entertainment" is an essential lesson in *Vedhaantha*.

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* also points out in this portion.

- एतस्मात् कारणात् - Because of this reason,
- अयं अर्थः - this following conclusion
- व्यवसीयताम् - is to be internalized .

The internalisation is achieved by preserving and promoting the *saankyaa* mindset, which *saankyaa* mindset consists in: "Looking upon myself as *nithya muktha*: and looking upon all my activities as *loka kshemaartham* - i.e. as intended for the benefit of the society. I do not look upon my activities as my spiritual *saadhanaas*, since I do not require any *saadhanaa*, because I am already a *muktha*: / I look upon *mokshaa* not as a goal, but, as my very nature. I maintain my *bakthi* also as *nishkaamyaa bakthi*, since I have nothing more to accomplish in life".

This is the idea given in the *sloka* that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 76 –

दुःखी यदि भवेदात्मा कस्साक्षी दुःखिनो भवेत् ।

दुःखिनः साक्षितायुक्ता साक्षणो दुःखिता तथा ॥ ७६ ॥

If the Self suffers, who is it that witnesses the subject of suffering? The subject of suffering cannot himself be the witness. Similarly the witness cannot be the subject of suffering.

This is a very beautiful verse.

The "*dhu:khee*" adjective or attribute can belong to the mind alone, because the word "*dhu:kham*" refers to a particular pattern of changing thoughts. Sorrow is nothing but a particular pattern of thought alone; there is no sorrow other than thought. That's why, quite often, one and the same experience is called 'sorrow' or 'pain' by a particular individual, while another individual may consider the same experience as 'happiness' or 'pleasure'. An example is the pop or rock Western music which is commonly seen to be enjoyed by youngsters, while people of the earlier, traditional generation may find the same music a real 'pain'.

'Sorrow' and 'happiness' are only two types of thought; thought belongs only to the mind; therefore, it follows, that, *dhu:kha vrutthi yuktha antha:karanam* alone can be *dhu:khee*; the *saakshi* which 'illuminates' the *dhu:kha vrutthi* cannot be the 'possessor' of the sorrow. The 'illuminator' of the 'sorrowful' thought of the mind – the *saakshi* – cannot be the 'possessor' of the sorrow. Therefore, whenever one undergoes 'sorrow', one should practice to think on the lines: "I am only the 'illuminator' of the sorrowful mind; I am not sorrowful; I am ever the happy 'witness' only; *chidhaanandha roopa: sivo ham*. I am the *aanandha aathmaa* illumining the unfortunately sorrowful mind. The consolation is 'this will also pass'. It is the mind's job (or lot) to enjoy or suffer – not 'mine' ".

- **यदि आत्मा दुःखी भवेत्** - Suppose you say sorrow is the attribute of Aathmaa,

What will happen then? The sorrow is an object of experience; if the sorrow is the attribute of *aathmaa*, the 'sorrowful' *aathmaa* will also become an object of experience, since the axiom is 'along with the attribute, the substance, which has that attribute, also becomes an object'. If, thus, both *aathmaa* and 'its' sorrow become objects of experience, who or what is the Subject? Another witness or *saakshi* will be required. Such a possibility is untenable. This is what the *Achaaryaa* points out.

- **कः दुःखिनः (आत्मनः) साक्षी भवेत्** - who will become the Witness of that sorrowful *aathmaa*?

This is not a question, but, a negation, based on the fact, that, there can be no further Witness/ observer than *aathmaa*.

Therefore, the *dhu:khee* cannot be the *aathmaa*; it can only be the mind. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- **दुःखिनः साक्षिता अयुक्ता** - A *dhu:khee* object can never become the Subject (of the *dhu:kham*)

- **साक्षिणः दुःखिता तथा (न युक्ता)** - Similarly the Subject cannot be the 'sorrowful' object.

The essence: Sorrow can never belong to 'I', the observer, because 'sorrow' is an observed / experienced object. Not only is 'sorrow' an experienced object; it is subject to arrival and departure, whereas 'I' am constant.

Therefore, since, thus, I do not have sorrow, 'I' **need not** eliminate 'my' sorrow. As for the sorrow of the mind, it **cannot** be totally eliminated, because, mind has got *praarabhdā* and therefore has to go through various emotions without any choice.

That's why, in his *Panchadasi*, *Vidhyaaranya Swami* beautifully states: "In certain choiceless emotional situations, we cannot remove the emotions; we can only 'blunt' the emotions – reduce the intensity – by remembering 'our' higher nature." This is called *abhibhava*: |

An analogy: In the day-time, the stars are not extinct; they are very much there, in the firmament; but, in the presence of the overwhelming light of the sun, they appear non-existent.

In the same manner, in some situations, certain mental conditions cannot be deliberately removed – fear, for instance, which even turns into panic – and the attempt need not be for 'removal' or negation of the mental conditions, but, should be for reminding oneself of one's higher nature. In the light of the higher Self – when the *aathma svaroopam* is invoked – the mental emotions get weakened or become feeble, if not eliminated. The only way of 'liberation' from the emotions, is the conviction "I am not that mind (which undergoes the emotions)".

Therefore the Achaaryaa asks: "*saakshina: dhu:kithaa katham?*" - "How can 'I' have sorrow? Sorrow is an emotion arriving helplessly, but only to my mind".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 77:

पूर्वस्यैव व्याख्यानार्थमाह ।

In interpretation of what is said, the following is added:

- **व्याख्यानार्थ** - For elaborating / clarifying / reinforcing / corroborating / substantiating,
- **पूर्वस्य एव** - what has been said in the *poorva sloka* / earlier verse,
- **आह** - the following is added.

"I am ever free; the mind is never free; and, I have only a limited control over the mind" are the implied messages of the earlier verse.

"Prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha moham eva cha Paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaaani na nivrutthani kaangshath!" – "Oh! Arjuna! He (a person beyond the three *Gunaas*) does not hate brightness, activity and delusion as they arise; not does he desire for them as they withdraw" declares the Lord (Verse 22 – Ch. XIV – Bhagavadh Geetha) , pointing out the fact that the three *Gunaas* will keep fluctuating.

What is the conclusion? "I am ever free. My body-mind complex is never free. Therefore hand over the body-mind complex to *Isvara - Viswaroopa Isvara.*"

Chapter II: Verse 77 –

नर्ते स्याद्विक्रियां दुःखी साक्षिता का विकारिणः ।

धीविक्रियासहस्राणां साक्ष्यतोऽहमविक्रियः ॥ ७७ ॥

Without change, there can be no suffering. How can he who changes, be the Witness? Therefore, the Self is the unchanging Witness of the thousand modifications of the mind.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "Sorrow is a form of thought and thought is an attribute of the mind. Thought is 'changing' and therefore mind is also 'changing', since changing attributes will change the substance (endowed with the attributes) also. The mind is therefore *savikaara vishaya*: - a changing object, distinctly witnessed by us. And, therefore, mind, the changing, witnessed object is never the Subject".

- **विक्रियां रुते** - Without undergoing change,

The word 'narthe' in the verse is to be split as 'na ruthe'. 'Ruthe', an indeclinable word, means 'without'.

- **दुःखी न स्यात्** - (the mind) cannot become a dhu:khee .

What type of change? Ans: 'Thought modification'.

"Vruthhi parinaama roopa vikaaram vinaa – without thought modifications, the mind or ahamkaaraa cannot become dhu:khee".

- **विकारिणः का साक्षिता** - How can that changing / sorrowful / objectified mind be the Subject or Saakshi?

"How (*kaa*) is it possible for the changing mind (*vikaarina*;) to have subjecthood (*saakshithaa*) " is the literal translation of this Sanskrit question or "How can the changing mind have the status of the Subject".

"I am not the mind", as in *Nirvaana Shadgam* of *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa* "mano bhudhyahamkaara chitthani na aham. Chidhaananda roopa: sivoham".

- धीविक्रिया सहस्राणां साक्षिन् अहम् - I am the *saakshi* of thousands of thought fluctuations of the mind

Dheevikriyaa sahasraanaam – Of thousands of thought fluctuations belonging to the mind.

Dhee – mind; *vikriyaa* – fluctuating; *sahasra* – thousand.

'Thought fluctuations' mean 'emotional fluctuations'.

- अतः - Therefore,
- अविक्रियः (साक्षिन्) अहं (अस्मि) - I am the unchanging witness / *nirvikaara: aathmaa aham asmi*

'I' do not have the six modifications that 'matter' has – *asthi, jaayathe, vardhathe, viparinamathe, apaksheeyathe, nasyathi* etc.

Nor do the emotional fluctuation belong to 'me'; they belong only to the mind.

My aim is not to 'remove' the emotional fluctuations of the mind; but, to disclaim the emotional fluctuations as 'not mine' and to hand them over also to *Viswaroopa Isvara*.

This is *sanyaasaa* - the result of which is *saanthi*.

86. Chapter II, Verse 77 to 80 (16-02-2008)

In these verses, as a part of *aathma anaathma viveka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is making the subtle distinction between *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*, *ahamkaaraa* also falling within *anaathmaa* only. But, even though *ahamkaaraa* is also within *anaathmaa*, we are not able to distinguish it from *aathmaa*, because, both *ahamkaaraa* and *aathmaa* are understood as the meaning of the word I. All the other *anaathmaas* are referred to by the words 'you' or 'this'; *ahamkaaraa* alone is the unique *anaathmaa* entity, which is included in the meaning of the word 'I'. And, since, thus, the *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* are integrally together as the meaning of the word 'I', one has to take pains to carefully sort out the two. And, therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to emphasise to the student, that, the word 'I' has got two components - one is the changeless/ invariable component, *aathmaa*, and the other the changing / variable component, *ahamkaaraa*.

Both are there, in the word *aham* or I; i.e. whenever we use the word 'I', we are experiencing both (1) the changeless component called *aathmaa* / *saakshi* and (2) the changing component called *ahamkaaraa*. It follows, therefore, that, we do not lack the experience of *saakshi*, which is experienced along with *ahamkaaraa*, every time we use the word 'I'. The problem is, that, we are *not conscious* of the experience of *saakshi*.

Therefore, the aim of *Vedhaantha* in *thvam padha viveka* is not 'giving' the experience of the *saakshi*, because we already do have the experience, but, only sorting out the experienced *ahamkaaraa* and the experienced *saakshi*. To repeat: The *ahamkaaraa* is always experienced in the form of the changing component of 'I' and the *saakshi* is always experienced as the changeless component of 'I'. But, the problem we face is, that, we are, all the time, so much interested in / absorbed in the changing component, that we do not pay attention to the changeless component, though we are experiencing it all the time.

The following analogy will make this fact clearer: when we look at any object – say, a moving hand – in our **experience** of the hand, there are, in fact, two components (1) a changing component, the moving hand and (2) the light, the changeless / motionless component, which is spread all over the hand. But, thus, though our experience is of both the components – the moving hand and the light, which light, in fact, is the factor that reveals the hand - generally, our attention is only on the moving hand; invariably, the light that makes the moving hand visible, is lost sight of, though it is also experienced along with the moving hand. In a similar manner, when the word 'I' is used, the tendency is to understand the word, as referring to the *ahamkaaraa* component alone, overlooking the truth that the *aathmaa* component is also very much behind the 'I' and is, in fact, the more important component.

A further extension of the analogy: Suppose that a second individual attempts to deflect the attention of the observer of the moving hand, from the moving hand to the non-moving light, which lights up the hand. But, even so, a new experience is not given by the second individual and need not also be given, since the observer already has the experience of the non-moving light, but, only has lost sight of it. The second individual is only drawing the attention of the first individual – the observer of the hand – from the hand to the light, which is revealing the hand.

The aim of *Vedhaantha* is similar to the attempt of the second individual in the above analogy – to point out that when one uses the word 'I', one is experiencing the invariable component '*chith*' also, in addition to the variable component called '*ahamkaara*', *ahamkaara* consisting of changing body, changing mind, changing thoughts, changing emotions – in short, the fluctuating '*chidh aabhaasa*'.

'*Chidh aabhaasa*', in keeping with the condition of the body, becomes bright in *jaagrath avastha* and dull in *sushupthi avastha*. The *chidh abhaasa* is therefore fluctuating; the conditions of the body, of course, keep fluctuating; and so are the conditions of the mind fluctuating.

And, when one uses the word '*aham*', one, is experiencing this *savikaara ahamkaara* and the *nirvikaara saakshi* - the variable and invariable *dvayam*.

But, most of the time, we do not turn our attention to the *saakshi*. Therefore, the teacher has to struggle to establish that we do refer to *saakshi* also, by the use of the word 'I'.

How does one establish this fact, that the word 'I' refers to the *saakshi* component also? Or, in other words, in which situation or context, is this fact most obvious? The answer: "Whenever we are equating the past 'I' and the present 'I'". For example, when the statement "'I' who attended yesterday's class on *Githa Bhashyam* am attending to-day's class on *Naishkarmya Siddhi*" is made, or in any such similar context, whenever the past 'I' and the present 'I' are equated, at the time of equation of the past 'I' and the present 'I', the attention is turned only on the invariable component, *saakshi*.

This 'equation' of the past 'I' and the present 'I', is technically known as *prathyabhijnaanam*. In verse 6 of the *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, this word, *prathyabhijnaanam*, is used, by the author of the *Sthothram* – "*Praak asvaapsam ithi prabhodha samaye ya: prathyabhijnaayathe*" – "who, on waking, remembers to have slept well".

Prathyabhijnaanam = "equating the past 'I' and the present 'I'".

Whenever one equates the 'yesterday's 'I' to the 'present 'I' or the 'dreamer 'I' to the 'waker 'I', one's attention is not upon the varying / variable components, because, if one's attention is on the variable components, one cannot equate the past 'I' and the present 'I' (since, obviously, an equation is not tenable between variables). But, quite often, we do equate the past 'I' and the present 'I', which means, that, at the time of equation, we are only unknowingly / unconsciously, referring to the changeless *saakshi thathvam*.

In a purely hypothetical situation, if all the components of the past 'I' and all the components of the present 'I' are totally variable, the result will be that the past 'I' and the present 'I' can *never* be equated; the past 'I' cannot even be referred to as 'I'; only the present 'I' alone can be referred to as 'I'.

But, it is common knowledge, that, we do refer to the past 'I', using a past tense verb, the present 'I', using a present tense verb and the future 'I' also, using a future tense verb. The conclusion of this fact is obvious: *Thrikaala sambhanda roopena* (by virtue of the relationship of 'I' to all the three times - past, present and future-) , the reference made, is, to one enduring 'I'; and that enduring / continuous *thri kaala avasthaayee 'I'*, the non-variable component of *aham*, is the *saakshi thathvam*. *Soothre maniganaa iva* - similar to the invisible thread running through the visible beads in a necklace – this invisible, non-variable *aathmaa thathvam* runs through the visible, variable *ahamkaaraa*, which is comparable to the *maniganaa* - the beads – in the necklace.

And, Sureswaraachaarya says: "We are experiencing this non-variable, enduring component, all the time, without requiring a special thought. Experiencing every thing else or anything else – which is *anaathmaa* - requires a directed thought pattern. For instance, to be aware of the *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class, the student's mind should entertain a specific thought, as even as the teacher addresses the class. The changing / variable words require thoughts to register them; but, the changeless 'I'- *saakshi* - does not require any specific, well directed attempt to register it . Without any effort, the continuous *saakshi* is ever available; to quote again the *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* of *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa*, verse 7 of the *Sthothram* runs "*Baalyaadishvapi jaagradhaadhisu thathaa sarvaavasthaastvapi vyaavrutthaasu anuvarthamaanam aham ithi antha: spurantham sadhaa*" – " (The Self) persists in all stages of age (childhood, boyhood, youth and old age), in all states (waking, dreaming and deep sleep) and in all other conditions and manifests itself inwardly as 'I'". *Saakshi anubhavaa* is effortlessly happening all the time.

Vedhaanthee wants to talk more about the ever-experienced *saakshi*. It does not give the **experience** of *saakshi*; it only gives the **knowledge** about the ever-experienced *saakshi*.

What is that knowledge? It avers: "Only in the presence of non-variable 'I', the body is experienced, the mind is experienced and the world is experienced; the experience of the mind and of the body requires the *saakshi*; whereas, the *saakshi* experience itself does not require any specific attempt. And, this *saakshi* is one with the *jagath kaaranam Brahman* (the *maha vaakyam*)".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya is turning our attention to the non-variable 'I' – *saakshi athoham avikriya*. That 'I' is available at all times; for instance, at the beginning of the class, half-way through the class and also at the end of the class; and if a student (who was in the class, all the time) is asked "were you continuously present in the class?", he replies, without a second thought: "Yes; I was continuously present". But, the body (of the student) had been changing all the time; the thoughts (of the student) had been changing. The student's confident reply, therefore, that he was in the class all the time, obviously refers to the invariable / *avikriya chaithanyam*, the *saakshi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 78:

एवं सर्वस्मिन् व्यभिचारिण्यात्मवस्त्वेवाव्यभिचारीत्यनुभवतो व्यवस्थापनायाह ।

Thus, to establish by experience, that the principle of the *aathman*, is the invariable factor in and through all variable phenomena, the following is enunciated:

Sureswaraacharya repeats the idea, that, one does not have to work for *saakshi anubhavaa*, because it is always there; and, that, *Vedhaantha* is only turning one's attention to the ever-experienced, non-variable *saakshi*.

- एवं - In this manner,
- सर्वस्मिन् व्यभिचारिणी) सति(– when everything else in the world / the entire *anaathmaa* is changing,

Even when everything else is changing, 'I', the *saakshi* alone, am not changing. When it is said, that 'everything' is changing, it should be understood that the body is changing, the mind is changing and the thoughts are also changing. This group put together is called *ahamkaaraa* – in other words, *ahamkaaraa* is a collective name for the body-mind-thought-sense complex. All these are of changing nature.

What is the one thing, which is changeless? 'I', the *saakshi*. That *prathyabhijnaanam* is always in the form of *soham*. *Soham* is a *maha vaakya manthraa*; but, it can also be interpreted as "the past 'I' is the present 'I'", in which statement, the common factor is the *saakshi* alone.

- आत्म वस्तु एव - the *chith* / Consciousness component alone
- अव्यभचारि - (is) changeless.

What is the proof for this? Ans: If the present 'I' is a **totally** changed 'I', the past 'I' cannot even be referred to as 'I'; the past 'I' has to be referred to as 'he' or 'that' (i.e., in third person). The very fact, that, the word 'I' is extended to the past entity also, along with the present entity, indicates that there must be a common factor.

This is technically known as *bhaagha thyaagha lakshanam*. *Baagha thyaagha lakshanayaa*, the *vaachyaartha* 'I' cannot be equated; *Baagha thyaagha lakshanayaa*, the *lakshyaartha* invariable component alone can be equated. We are doing that equation, whenever we equate the past 'I' and the present 'I'. The *saakshi anubhavam* is **constantly** there, though, of course unconsciously - similar to the experience of the light, whenever an object is observed (as in the analogy of the 'moving hand' earlier cited). The further unfortunate irony is, that even though, thus, the *saakshi anubhavam* is constant, we tend to wonder as to when we will ever get the *anubhavam* of the *saakshi*, and also yearn for *saakshi anubhavam*.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

इति अनुभवतः - This is (realized) through our daily experience.

What is the perfect example, in our experience? In the three *avasthaas* – *jaagrath*, *svapnaa* and *sushupthi* - the *ahamkaaraa* is variable; but, if we equate the waker, dreamer and sleeper, which we quite often do – i.e. we refer to the same individual, including oneself, as 'awake', as one who had dreams and as one who had sound sleep etc. - the equation can take place only through the awareness of the non-variable *chith amsaa*. Otherwise, the waker cannot refer to his dreamer state as 'I' – he should refer to himself in the dream state, as 'that dreamer', in the third person. But, it is common knowledge that an individual, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, always refers to his/ her dreams, as "I dreamed". The very fact that the 'waker' and the 'dreamer' are equated, indicates, that something different from both the 'waker' and the 'dreamer', but inherent in both, is being referred to. That something, referred to, is the 'awareness' component. While the body/ mind/ senses/ thoughts in the waking and dream stage are totally different, what is common is the *chaithanyam*.

- व्यवस्थापनाय - To assert this *saakshi* or to turn our attention to this *saakshi*,
- आह - the following verse is presented.

Chapter II: Verse 78 –

प्रमाणतन्निभेष्वस्या नोच्छित्तिर्मम संविदः।

मत्तोऽन्यद्रूपमाभाति यत्तत्स्यात्क्षणभङ्गि हि ॥ ७८ ॥

My Consciousness knows no cessation in all the valid modes of knowledge and also whatever else merely appears as valid knowledge. If anything appears as related to me and other than myself, then it may be transient and momentary.

Sureswaraacharya says: "In and through the changing/ variable thoughts, there is the changeless Consciousness, because of which, the inert thoughts are converted into live experiences".

Generally, Consciousness the five features of Consciousness are said to be:

- (1) Consciousness is not a part, product or property of the body.
- (2) Consciousness is an independent entity which pervades and enlivens the body.
- (3) Consciousness is not limited by the boundaries of the body.
- (4) Consciousness continues to survive / exist even after the death of the body.
- (5) But, the Consciousness surviving the death of the body is not accessible (available for transactions) because of the absence of the body-medium.

In the context of this verse, these five principles have to be applied, replacing the word 'body' with the word 'thoughts', as below:

- 1) Consciousness is not a part, product or property of any thought.
- 2) Consciousness is an independent entity, which pervades every thought and converts every thought into an experience i.e. makes the thought 'live'
- 3) Consciousness is not limited by the boundaries of thoughts; thoughts have locations; Consciousness does not.
- 4) Consciousness continues to survive even when the thoughts end and therefore, even after the experiences end along with the thoughts causing the experiences.
- 5) But, the surviving Consciousness is not available for a specific experience, because it requires the medium of 'thoughts' ; the surviving Consciousness continues, even when the thoughts and experiences end, thought it is not objectifiable.

- **प्रमाण तन्निभेषु - (सत्सु उच्छिन्नेषु) When varieties of thoughts (come and go),**

The words "*Ucchinneshu*" and "*sathsu*", meaning "subsiding" and "arising" respectively, are supplied, for easier understanding. Alternately, the word "*gathaagatheshu*", meaning the same, can also be supplied. "Varieties of thoughts" would also include "varieties of experiences".

Pramaanam - (in this context) *jnaana vrutthaya*: / varieties of knowledge, which take place in the form of thoughts, when the various *pramaanams* are operated. When *chakshu pramaanam* is operated, *roopa vrutthi* results. So also *rasa vrutthi*, *ghandha vrutthi* etc. result, when the respective *pramaanams* (tongue, nose etc.) are operated. The *vrutthis* are referred to, here, as *pramaanam*.

Thannibham - similar to that (i.e. similar to *jnaana vrutthaya*:).

The implied reference by this usage (*thannibham*) is to "other *vrutthis* similar to *jnaana vrutthaya*:, such as *samsaya* (doubts) *vrutthi*:, *viparyaya* (wrong understanding) *vrutthi*:, *moha* (delusion) *vrutthi*: etc." *Samsayam*, *viparyayam* and *moham* are **not** *jnaanam* and therefore, cannot be included in the meaning of *pramaanam*. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya, desiring to include all varieties of thoughts, uses the term '*pramaana thannibheshu*', referring to **all** varieties of thoughts.

- उच्छिति(अस्ति) न : - either departure or arrival (is) not there,

Ucchitthi: - the literal meaning is *naasam* (destruction); in this context, may be taken, as denoting 'arrival and departure'.

- अस्या :मम संविदः - for this non-variable component *saakshi* (the Awareness) of mine.

Thoughts go away and experiences end, temporarily in sleep and more permanently during *maranam*; but, the end of experiences is not the end of *saakshi-chaitanyam*.

But, once it is said that "Consciousness endures (the destruction/ erasure of thoughts)" a problem arises. The seeker tends to sit in meditation, because, quite often, the seeker forms a strong and firm but, wrong opinion that *saakshi* will 'come' only in meditation and after 'removal' of thoughts. He will strive to remove all the thoughts and 'look for' the Consciousness.

Sureswaraacharya is anxious to warn the student against this tendency. He, therefore, uses the adjective '*mama*' for the *saakshi*, stressing "I, the invariable component is my **real** nature. Allow *Ahamkaaraa* to come and go – as, in any case, it will. Do not claim *ahamkaaraa* as yourself. Let *ahamkaaraa* be only a medium for transaction- but, not you yourself".

मत्त :अन्यत् रूपं आभाति - Whatever experience, other than the non-variable enduring 'I', appears

'*Roopam*' means entity. '*Anyath roopam*' means 'any other entity'. In the word *roopam*, are included the physical body, the mind, the thoughts, the emotions and the individuality. '*Mattha: anyath*' - 'anything else other than 'me'', which is the variable component of the word '*aham*'.

- यत् तत् - that variable component
- क्षणभङ्गि स्यात् - is fleeting / changing in nature.

The physical body of any individual undergoes changes all the time; on a medical analysis, it can be confirmed that, over time, every component continuously undergoes decay; and, that, the cells get replaced as a continuous process. Under the circumstances, if an individual claims that his present 'I' is the same as his past 'I' of twenty years earlier, the 'equation' that is made, cannot be at the body / physical level; since every cell, over the years, had got replaced. Even so, one continuous 'I' is being recognized and that continuous 'I' is the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

'*Kshana bhanghi*' means 'quickly perishing'; *kshanam bhanjyathe ithi kshana bhanghi*.
Bhangha: means *naasa:* |

"Take the word 'I'; remove the variable components; turn your attention to the non-variable component, which is always available as 'I'; that 'I' is the *saakshi* – the real *aathmaa*' - is the message of this verse.

Chapter II: Verse 79 –

उत्पत्तिस्थितिभङ्गेषु कुम्भस्य वियतो यथा ।

नोत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशास्स्युर्बुद्धेरेवं ममापि च ॥ ७९ ॥

Just as space (i.e. ether) remains unalterably the same through the origin, subsistence and destruction of the pot, even so the origin, subsistence and destruction of mental operations do not enter into my being.

The *Aachaaryaa* conveys this with an example. He compares *ahamkaaraa* (consisting of the *sareerathrayam* endowed with *chidhaabhaasa*, the borrowed Consciousness - in other words, the live, sentient *sareerathrayam*, which has got three layers *viswa*, *thaijasa* and *praagnyaa*) to a pot. Just as a pot undergoes wear and tear, by usage, this three-layered *ahamkaaraa* also undergoes wear and tear i.e. the *ahamkaaraa* is proved to be 'variable'. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa compares the non-variable component, *chaithanyam*, to the *akaasaa* within the pot.

This concept can be used for meditation also: "'I' am the 'space' and *ahamkaaraa* is the 'pot' around me. And, 'I', the space, is, all the time, effortlessly available as '*aham*'; the other

components (of `aham'), on the other hand, are undergoing change constantly, similar to the pot which has got *uthpatthi*, (because of the 'pot-maker'), *sthithi* and *laya*. In the context of *aham* and *ahamkaaraa*, the 'pot-maker' is *Isvara*. "*Brahma ena kulaalavath niyamitha:*" - "*Brahma*, similar to a potter, has made this pot (our body) according to (our own) *karma*" , *Barthurhari* says in his *Vairaaghya Sathakam*.

This *ahamkaaraa*, may be slowly, but, surely, is fading away; on the other hand, 'I', the *saakshi* which enlivens the *ahamkaaraa* does not have *uthpatthi*, *sthithi*, *bhangha*: etc.

This is a beautiful verse, which can be used for meditation.

- यथा - Just as,
- कुम्भस्य उत्पत्तिस्थितिभङ्गेषु - (even) when there are the rise, existence and destruction of the pot,

Uthpatthi: – emergence; *sthithi* - existence – *bhangha*: - *naasa*: (destruction).

(An interesting Tamil song runs: "*Nandavanatthil ore aandi naalaaru maathamaaik kuvanai vendi kondu vanthaan oru thondi*" – in which the literal meaning of the word *thondi* is mud-pot and the implied meaning is the human body, which "mud-pot", unfortunately, most of us do not know how to make use of. This "mud-pot", the 'body', should be used only for one purpose - to claim "'I' am the pot-space and not the pot". Ironically, to make this claim that "'I' am the pot-space and not the pot", I need the "pot". But, instead of using the body-pot for this purpose of claiming "'I' am the pot-space", we pamper or misuse the body, to which fact, the song points out, by concluding the verse as "*athaik kooththaadik kooththaadip pottu udaithaandi*").

वियतः (न) - for the space inside the pot, there is no change,

Viyath - space / sky / ether / atmosphere.

- एवं अपि च – in the same manner,
- बुद्धेः (उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशेषु) - when the *ahamkaaraa* is constantly appearing and disappearing (in the forms of *viswa*, *thyjasaa* and *praagnyaa* daily and in the forms of *baalyam*, *kaumaaram*, *youvanam*, *jaraa* etc. throughout one's life),

Buddhi: - to be understood as *ahamkaaraa*, in this context.

Ahamkaaraa's temporary *naasam* takes place during *sushupthi* and *maranam*. In sleep, one does not have individuality, but, the invariable 'I' continues, the proof being (as already mentioned), one claims "Yesterday's I, is to-day's I". This shows that, the continuity of

saakshi does not require the *ahamkaara's* deliberate effort / invocation. This is called *svayam prakaasa*: | *Saakshi's* invocation **does** require *ahamkaara* as a medium, but its continuity **does not** require *ahamkaara*. Going back to the example earlier cited, the experience of the light (on any object) does not require one's deliberate effort ; to express it differently, without one's deliberate effort, the light on an object in front is 'experienced'; but, to 'talk' about the 'experienced' light, one needs to put in effort i.e. *ahamkaara* must turn its attention to the light. In the same manner, while *saakshi*'experience' is continuous, 'invocation' of *saakshi* requires *ahamkaara*.

मम उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशा :न स्युः - 'I' do not have the three (*uthpatthi sthithi naasaa*:).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 80:

सुखदुःखतत्संबन्धानां च प्रत्यक्षत्वान्न श्रद्धामात्रग्राह्यमेतत् ।

This need not be admitted on mere faith; it is a matter of direct experience, that pleasures, pains and the relation to them do not pertain to the Self.

The *Achaaryaa* introduces the 80th verse, in which verse, he further introduces a technical point.

The technical point is : "Whenever you talk about any relationship, you are, in effect, talking about two entities having the relationship, because a relationship is always *vidhishta*: , which word indicates 'it exists in two entities'. This aspect is analyzed in detail, in *tharka saasthraa*. There are certain properties which are *eka draviya nishtaa* and there are certain other properties which are always *dravya dvaya nishtaa*. But, whenever a 'relationship' is talked about, the 'relationship' requires two entities. In other words, *sambhandha jnaanam* requires *sambhandhi dvaya jnaanam*. One can never talk about a *sambhandhaa*, without the knowledge of *sambhandhee* (two *sambhandhis*). One should have the knowledge of both *sambhandhis*, if one wants to talk about the *sambhandham* between the two. Even if one of them is not known about, one cannot talk of a 'relationship'. For example, if one wants to talk of Rama's 'relationship', the other member has to be necessarily introduced – when *Dasaratha* is introduced, the relationship is 'father and son'; if *Lakshmana* is introduced, the relationship is 'brother and brother'; if *Sitha* is introduced, the relationship is 'husband and wife'. *Sambhandha jnaanam* requires *sambhandhi dvaya jnaanam* - to express it differently, *sambhandhi dvaya jnaanam* is the prerequisite for *sambhandha jnaanam*."

Sureswaraacharyaa, therefore, argues: "If *sambhandhaa* is the object of knowledge, then the *sambhandhi dvayam* also should be objects of knowledge. And, therefore, whenever one talks of a *sambhandhaa*, three objects are referred to – *sambhandhaa*, *sambhandhi 1* and *sambhandhi 2*. But, 'I', the subject, am different from all the three".

Sureswaraachaaryaa further argues: "When a person says '*aham dhu:khee*' (I am sorrowful), in this statement, a relationship is talked about. The relationship talked about, is 'possessor-possessed'. For this relationship, two *sambhandis* are required. Who are the *sambhandhis*, in this context? '*aham*' is one *sambhandhi*; *dhu:kham* is another *sambhandhi*; and the 'relationship' is the 'possessor-possessed' relationship between the two. '*aham*' is an object of knowledge; '*dhu:kham*' is an object of knowledge; the relationship between the two is the third object of knowledge. All these three are objects; *saakshi*, on the other hand, cannot be and is not any one of them. '*aham*' is '*ahamkaaraa*'. There is absolutely no relationship between *saakshi* and *dhu:kham*".

87. Chapter II, Verse 80 and 81 (23-02-2008)

Sureswaraacharya is continuing with the topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*: He is spending a lot of time on this topic, because discerning the *saakshi* distinctly from *ahamkaara* requires special observation.

Saakshi is not a particular object, which can be exclusively experienced at a particular time. If there is a possibility of exclusive *saakshi* experience, at a particular time/ place or under certain given conditions, the *Vedhaanthic guru* only needs to explain that conducive time/place and those conditions to the student, guiding the student to that particular time/place and those conditions, to enable the student to get the exclusive experience of the *saakshi*; the *guru* would also be able to confidently claim, that, he has himself experienced the *saakshi* exclusively, at that particular time / place and under those conditions ; and, based on the *guru's* own experience, the *guru* can give a description of such time / place and conditions, to enable the seeker/ student to have exclusive experience of the *saakshi*.

Unfortunately, there is no **exclusive** *saakshi* experience ; *saakshi* experience is invariably mixed up with *ahamkaara* experience; therefore, the seeker should use discrimination to discern the *saakshi*, which is always mixed with *ahamkaara* – like certain pictures in which the artist intentionally draws a hidden object , in and through another explicit object. The picture may seemingly / superficially be that of a forest or a river, but amidst the trees / river there will be a hidden form of a deity or a popular leader. The hidden form has to be carefully 'discerned' amidst the explicit object in the picture. The viewer of the picture may initially miss the hidden form; but, if and after the hidden form is pointed out to him, by another individual, every time the picture is viewed, the hidden form is seen as effortlessly as the explicit object is seen. In the same manner, using the *ahamkaara anubhava* alone, the *saakshi anubhava*, which is available all the time, has to be 'discerned'.

Generally, three experiences are introduced to make this 'discernment' easier:

- (1) the present *ahamkaara* experience - the *varthamaana ahamkaara anubhava*-, which is 'self awareness' with present attributes
- (2) the past *ahamkaara* experience - the *bhootha ahamkaara anubhava* - which is, again, 'self-awareness', with past attributes, the word *bhootham* meaning the 'past'
- (3) the "experience of the equation of the past 'I' and the present 'I'" - the *varthamaana-bhootha-ahamkaara-aiykya-anubhava*. This 'equation'/ experience is very commonly expressed in day-to-day conversations; for example, in saying "I attended the class yesterday; I am attending the class to-day"; where the 'past' and the 'present' are

connected, it is *ahamkaara-dvaya-eikyaa-anubhava*. The word '*eikyam*', in this context, means 'equation' (of the past and present).

The *guru* asks the student to study the meaning of the word 'I', based on these three *anubhavaas*, pointing out, that the *vaachyaartha*, the primary or literal meaning of the word 'I', cannot be taken for the purpose of *eikyam*, because the past *ahamkaaraa* had one set of attributes and the present *ahamkaaraa* has a different set of attributes and an equation between the two cannot obviously be made.

The 'equation' requires 'dropping' of the past attributes and also of the present attributes.

Of course, the attributes cannot be physically dropped, since the *ahamkaaraa* is always subject to some attributes or other - past attributes or present attributes or future attributes. The 'dropping' has to be done only intellectually / cognitively. When one thus cognitively distances oneself from the past attributes (*desa, kaalaa* etc.) of the past *ahamkaaraa* and the present attributes of the present *ahamkaaraa*, the only common feature left and available is the 'self-awareness'. This cognitive dropping of the attributes has to be done, by applying, what is technically termed, *bhaaga thyaagha lakshanaa* – taking the *soham-prathyabhignyaa-anubhava*: | '*Sa.*' (in this term) means 'that (past) *ahamkaaraa*' and '*aham*' means 'this (present) *ahamkaaraa*' | The past and present attributes, which are only incidental, should be dropped by applying *bhaaga-thyaagha-lakshanna*, and the remaining 'self-awareness' should be discerned. This *nirguna* (attributeless / attribute eliminated) 'self-awareness' should be understood as *saakshi* and later, the seeker should be able to claim "*aham saakshi asmi*".

But, ironically, while this statement "*aham brahma asmi*", has to be made by the present *ahamkaaraa* only, when making the statement, the *ahamkaaraa*, by the word '*aham*', refers only to the continuous 'self-awareness', rid of all attributes - past, present and future. The *kaumaaram, youvanam, jaraa* etc., in the well-known *Bhagavadh Githa Sloka* (Verse 13 – Ch. II) are the changing attributes – *vyaavruttha anubhavaa*., while the *anuvruttha* (uninterrupted) 'self-awareness' is the *saakshi* |

This is the major struggle involved, in *Vedhaanthic* study. If the seeker grasps this, he is saved (from *samsaaraa*).

Once the seeker has done the *saakshi-ahamkaara-viveka*, using this *prathyabhignyaa-anubhava-vicharaa* (*soham-anubhava-vicharaa*), thereafter, he should go to the scriptures to know more about the *saakshi*. *Sakshi-ahamkaara-viveka*: (discrimination between *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*) does not require *saasthra pramanam*; it can be arrived at, by reasoning.

But, to know about the nature of *saakshi*, the student has to resort only to *saasthra pramaanam*.

And, the *Saasthraas* say "the *saakshi* is the real Subject; *ahamkaaraa* is, in reality, only an object". On this *pramaanam*, the *ahamkaaraa* is to be understood as belonging only to the *anaathma prapanchaa*; this *ahamkaaraa* consists of the body-mind *chidhaabhaasaa* or more prominently, the mind; the various types of sorrow, *dhu:kham*, are also *anaathmaa*.

The mind is *anaathmaa*; *dhu:kham* is *anathamaa*; *anaathmaa* mind and *anaathmaa* sorrow are connected by possessor-possessed *sambhandhaa* (relationship).

Sureswaraacharya says "(1) the mind (2) sorrow (the attribute) and (3) the relationship between the two, in the form of 'sorrowful' – all these three are the objects of 'I', the *saakshi*. 'I' am not the mind; nor the sorrow; nor the relationship between the two. But, 'I', the *asangha aathmaa*, directly and changelessly, illumine the changing mind, the changing sorrow and the changing *sambhandhaa*".

But, unfortunately, instead of stating "my mind is sorrowful / miserable", one tends to mistake one's mind as "*aham*", and makes the statement "I am miserable". This is what the *Achaaryaa* points out, in this portion.

- सुखदुःखतत्संबन्धानां च – The happiness, the pain and their relationships (to the mind or *ahamkaaraa*),

Sukham means happiness and, in this context, refers only to the "reflected happiness/ the temporary experiential happiness (pleasure), that belongs to the mind / the *prathibhimbhaanandaa*", and not to the *bhimbhaanandhaa*, which is 'my' *svaroopam*. This temporary experiential pleasure (the *prathibhimbhaanandaa*) has gradations also – "*thasya priyam eva sira:; modho dakshina: paksha:; pramodha utthara: paksha:*" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Brahma valli* - paragraph 6) - all belonging to *anaathmaa*

- प्रत्यक्षत्वान् - all these three, clearly being objects of experience (of the *saakshi*, the changeless / *anuvruttha* Self-awareness),

But they (the mind, the sorrow and the relationship between them) are such 'intimate' objects, that, they are mistakenly included in the Subject; a mundane example is a pair of spectacles, which, though very clearly known as an 'object', once in use, is totally identified with the user and is almost looked upon as the 'subject'.

And, therefore:

- एतत् - this fact (that 'I' am the *saakshi* 'Subject', different from (1) the mind (2) the sorrow and (3) the relationship between the two)
- न श्रद्धामात्रं - is not a matter just to be believed (but is a crystal-clear fact , directly experienced and to be understood as such).

The statement "I am sorrowful" will only mean that "I am aware of the mind-object, which is sorrowful" or the statement "I am depressed" will only mean "I am aware of the depressed mind". Swami Dayandandaji remarks "Vedhaantic logic and worldly logic are diagonally opposite". Worldly logic is: "I experience sorrow; therefore, I am sorrowful"; whereas, Vedhaantic logic is: "I experience sorrow and therefore I am not sorrowful".

The problem is, that, in general, an individual is not possessed of sufficient *vairaghyam* and *jnaanam*, to make this bold claim; and, that is why, *Vedhanthaa* advises consistent and systematic study - *vichaaraa - sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani* - so that equanimity of mind will be automatic and natural. Verse 22 – Chapter XIV, of the *Bhagavadh Githa* runs "Prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha Paandava | Na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaangshathi" – "Oh! Arjuna! He (one who has transcended the three *gunaas*) does not hate the brightness resulting from *sathva guna*, the activity resulting from *rajo guna* and the delusion resulting from *thamo guna*, as they arise, nor does he yearn for them, as they withdraw".

"'I' am not the mind; mind is unpredictable / uncontrollable / unsustainable; while 'I' am the *anuvruttha* (uninterrupted) *saakshi*, not concerned with the mind" must become a firm conviction.

The *Achaaryaa* clarifies this fact further in the *sloka* 80 that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 80 –

सुखदुःखादिसंबद्धानं यथा दन्डेन दण्डिनम् ।

राघको वीक्षते बुद्धिं साक्षी तद्वदसंहतः ॥ ८० ॥

A man sees another holding a staff, though he is without one ; in the same way, the witness, though unconnected with what he sees, sees the mind characterized by pleasure, pain etc.

The idea in the *sambhandha gadhyam* is presented with an example.

- राघकः साक्षी – 'I' the *saakshi*, the Self-awareness, who proves (the existence of the inert mind) **OR** the self-evident *saakshi*

Raaghaka: means *saadhaka:*, and is a very significant adjective to *saakshi* – stressing the fact, that, 'the very existence of the inert mind is proved because of the self-awareful or evident *saaksh'*. The word ('*raaghaka:*') can also be interpreted as '*svayamprakaasaad*' or self-evident.

- **वीक्षते** - perceives / experiences

But, it should be clearly understood that this 'perceiving' or 'experiencing' is not a willful action done by the *saakshi*. It only means "in 'my' (*saakshi's*) presence, the mind gets perceived / experienced / awared". Since the mind gets experienced in 'my' (*saakshi's*) presence, 'I' (*saakshi*) get the figurative name 'experienter'.

"I' 'choice'lessly / 'action'lessly / 'change'lessly / 'will' lessly perceive".

What do 'I' perceive? Three things.

- बुद्धिं सुखदुःखादिसंबद्धां - (I perceive) the mind (the 1st object); (I perceive) the pleasure / pain / jealousy / hatred / compassion / sorrow etc. (the 2nd object) and the relationship between the two (the 3rd object),

Sukha dhu:khaadhi - the pleasure /pain / jealousy / hatred / compassion / sorrow etc.

"*icchaa dvesha: sukham dhu:kham sangaatha: chethana dhruthi: ethath kshethram*" – "desire, hatred, pleasure, pain, body-mind complex, sentiency, fortitude are all only *kshethram*" – Verse 7 – Ch. XIII – *Shrimadh Bhagavadh Githa*.

Mind is *kshekthram*; sorrow is *kshekthram*; their relationship is *kshekthram*. But, 'I' am *kshethragnya:* |

And, how do 'I' perceive these three?

- असंहतः - **without any connection with any one of these three / asangha: san.**

Just as the *surya prakaasaa* does not get wet by any body of water illumined by it and just as it is not scorched by any fire illumined by it, '*asangha: san aham veekshe'* – 'I' perceive without any connection.

The *Achaaryaa* gives an example for this.

When a person makes a statement "*dhandee gachchathi*", he refers to a *sanyaasi* holding a *dhandaa* - a staff. (The word *dhandee* generally means a *sanyaasi* holding a staff.)

The *sanyaasi*, the staff that is held by him and his act of holding the staff – all these three put together is referred to, by the word *dhandee*; i.e. the word *dhandee* has three factors – the person (*sanyaasi*), the staff (*dhandaa*) and the connection between the two. But, obviously, the person who observes the *sanyaasi* and makes the statement, is none of the three – neither the *sanyaasi*, nor the staff nor the relationship between the two (the holder-held relationship); he is only an observer of all the three. He is *asangha*., free from all the three, which three come under 'observed' group.

The *Achaaryaa* says:

यथा दण्डेन दण्डिनम् (वीक्षते) तद्वत् - similar to (a person) observing another holding a staff, as a *dhandee* (i.e. as one who is holding a staff, though the observer himself does not have / hold a staff).

Just as in the example, the observer is not the *dhandee*, the *dhandaa* or the *sambhandhaa* between the two, but is only the *asanghaa* observer, sorrow is present in / possessed by, only the mind, but 'I' am myself not sorrowful. 'I' only watch the sorrowful mind; 'I' have no relationship with sorrow.

Therefore, if the question, "when am 'I' free from sorrow?" is raised, the response should be "when did / do 'I' ever have sorrow?". This knowledge / conviction is *mokshaa*. This knowledge reveals that 'I' am the *nithya muktha aathmaa*. And, therefore, it follows, that the very common statement and the very common query of a seeker "I have understood that I am the *nithya muktha aathmaa*; but, when will 'I' get *mokshaa*?" is totally unwarranted.

Anvayam of the verse: *Yathaa (saakshi) dhandene (saha) dhandinam (asamhatha: san) veekshathe, thadhvath raaghaka: saakshee sukha dhu:khaadhi sambaddhaam buddhim asamhatha: (san) veekshathe /*

Asamhatha: is the crucial word in the verse, meaning *asangha*: - i.e. "without being tainted by sorrow etc."

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 81 :

एतस्माच्च हेतोर्धियःपरिणामित्वं युक्तम् ।

For this additional reason, it is right to hold that the mind is subject to modification:

From this, we can get the corollary also. What is the corollary?

The *dhandee* is walking; therefore, *dhandee* is *vyavruttha swarootpa*: - i.e. of the nature of "arriving and departing"; not only does he "come and go", even when he is stationery in a particular place, there are changes in him - his stance, the way of his holding the staff etc. All kinds of modifications are there in the *dhandee*, but, those *dhandee* modifications cannot belong to the observer of the *dhandee*; in other words, the observer is *asamhatha*: / In the same manner, the *raaghaka*: *asamhatha*: *saakshee* watches the modifications of the mind / the emotions / the relationships between the two etc., but, itself does not have the emotions or the consequent changes. *Ahamkaara*: *parinaami*; *aham avikriya*: /

This is what the *Achaaryaa* points out (in this *sambhandha gadhyam*).

- एतस्मात् हेतोः - Because of this reason only,
- धियः परिणामित्वं - (the fact) that the mind is subject to modifications
- युक्तं - is logical.

Mind *will* be subject to modifications; because mind is associated with emotions, emotions are associated with the world and the world is constantly changing.

Expressing this in the reverse manner: the world is changing; objects, people and situations change; therefore, the emotions, based on the changing world, are bound to change; and the mind, associated with emotions, also, suffers changes.

Anaathmaa mind is exposed to *anaathmaa* world; *Indriyaani indriyaartheshu, gunaa: guneshu varthanthe* (as the Lord pointed out in the *Bhagavadh Githa*). The interaction between the *anaathmaa* mind and the *anaathmaa* world is inevitable. Therefore, emotions are also inevitable. The changing world produces changing emotions; which, in turn, cause changes in the mind. And, in addition to the world thus changing the mind, past *karmaas* and *vaasanaas* also (which are again *anaathmaa*) affect the *anaathmaa* mind. The changing moods of the mind, such as optimism or pessimism, enthusiasm or lack of it etc., when they do not have any apparent cause, are results of the *karmas* and *vaasanaas* only. Age also influences the emotions and therefore, the mind. Mind is thus subject to various influences, which are all *anaathmaa*. The *Achaaryaa* warns: "Let the mind be subject to such influences; but, remember the fact, that, you are the 'witness' of the mind and not the mind".

Matter is subject to *vikaaraa* (and mind is matter).

“*Naanya: gunebhya: karthaaram yadhaa dhrashtaanupasyathi gunebhyascha param vetthi madhbhaavam sa: adhigacchathi*” - “When the seer finds the doer to be none other than the *Gunaas* and knows the Self, which is beyond the *Gunaas*, he attains My nature” declares Lord Krishna (in verse 19 – Ch. XIV of the *Bhagavadh Githa*).

In fact, the whole of Chapter XIV of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, is conveying the idea, that the mind is subject to the three *Gunaas*. While we do have some control over the mind, we do not have *total* control. Therefore, we have to, sometimes, helplessly watch the effects of the world on our emotions and our mind.

This fact that, the mind is subject to modifications, is further explained in the following verse 81.

Chapter II: Verse 81 –

येनैवास्या भवेद्योगः सुखकुम्भादिना धियः ।

तं विदन्ती तदैवान्यं वेत्ति नातो विकारिणी ॥ ८१ ॥

A mind may be associated at a particular time with pleasure or a pot. Now the mind cognizing these, cannot, at the very same moment cognize anything else, Therefore, the mind is ever-changing.

The gist of the verse (i.e. what Sureswaraachaaryaa says in this verse) is : “Since all the experiences are mutually exclusive, you can have only one mental experience at a (given) time; therefore, mental experiences are always in the form of a continuous flow ; you can never have multi-experiences simultaneously”.

When an observer sees a pillar, “pillar-experience” is taking place and the observer cannot have “man-experience” simultaneously. Every single experience excludes all other experiences; therefore, if an individual is having many experiences, they can only be and are ‘sequential’ or ‘flowing’. ‘Experiences’ cannot be simultaneous.

What is the implication of the statement of this fact? It is: “Because the experiences are sequential, mind must be undergoing ‘change’ (*vrutthi parinaama:*), corresponding to the flow of the sequential experiences”.

Sureswaraachaarya says: “Therefore *ahamkaara:* - the mind – is *parinaami*; whereas, ‘I’, the *saakshi*, ‘watches’ the *parinaamam*, without itself undergoing the *parinaamam*. If ‘I’ also undergoes *parinaamam*, (i.e. if the present ‘I’ is different from the past ‘I’) ‘I’ cannot claim, that ‘I’ had the past experience and the same ‘I’ is currently having the present experience – the equation cannot be made at all”.

- **अस्याः धियः** - For this mind,

The use of the word 'asyaa:' (meaning 'this') is significant. The *Achaaryaa* is keen to have the student distant himself from the mind and not claim his mind itself as 'I'.

- **योगः भवेत्** - when there is *sambhandha:* / relationship (at a given moment),
- **सुखकुम्भादिना** - with pleasant thoughts (internal objects) or with (external objects such as) pot etc.

Of course, connection with external object is always struck through one particular sense organ or other. "*Naanachchidhra ghatodhara sthitha mahaadeepa prabhaa bhaasvaram jnaanam thu chakshuraadhikaranadvaaraa bahi: spandhathe*" – "Indeed knowledge flashes through eyes and other sense organs, just like the bright light of a great lamp placed in a jar having many holes" (Quoted from verse 3 of *Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram*)

"*Asyaa: dhiya: sukhakumbhaadhinaa (saha) yoga: (varthathe)*" - "Mind may have association with internal pleasures (due to emotions or *karmas* / *vaasanaas*) or knowledge of external objects".

Sureswaraacharyaa says: At any particular time (1) mind (2) object and (3) their relationship are 'one unit'. Mind is fixed; object is fixed; and the emotion is also fixed.

- **तं विदन्ती** - that mind, which is experiencing the pleasure or the pot (at that specific time),
- **तदा एव** - at the same time (simultaneously)
- **अन्यं न वेत्ति** - does not (cannot) experience another object or another emotion.

For this to happen, i.e. if the mind has to experience another object or emotion, it should undergo a change and get connected with the different object, which may result in a different emotion. In short, at one time, the mind can have only one experience; and, at the time of that particular experience, other experiences are absent.

An example: When a father receives the news that his son has passed the examinations with creditable scores, he is elated. But, in a moment, the emotion of elation may give way to the emotion of anxiety- that the son should get a suitable employment. The 'passing of the examinations' caused happiness, while the thought of a suitable job causes anxiety. The 'switch' from happiness to anxiety is fast. The emotions change; as a consequence, the mind changes. But, the conviction of the seeker should be "I' am not this changing mind".

- **अतः** - Therefore (the conclusion is)
- **(धीः)** – the mind

-
- विकारिणी - (is) constantly changing

Obviously, one cannot physically see another's mind changing; but, from the changing experiences, the mental changes can be easily understood. Because the mind is thus ever-changing, it is referred to as *kshanikaa buddhi*: | "Deham praanam apeendriyaanapi chala buddhim cha"|

The *Achaaryaa*, in these portions, wants to emphasize that the mind is "changing"; later, he will arrive at the *saakshi* (the 'self-awareness') as '**not** changing'.

88. Chapter II, Verse 81 to 83 (01-03-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is engaged in *thvampadavichaaraa*, as a part of *mahaavaakya vichaaraa / thathvamasi vichaaraa*.

The main part of *thvam pada vichaaraa* is *aathma anaathma viveka*, the understanding of the real 'I', the *aathmaa*, separated from all the *anaathmaa*. Only when 'I', the *aathmaa*, is totally separated from *anaathmaa*, I am ready for claiming my oneness with *Paramaathmaa*. In other words, *anaathmaa* separation is a pre-requisite for *Paramaathmaa* claiming.

And, therefore, the *saasthraas* take lots of pains in segregating *anaathmaa* from *aathmaa*.

This segregation is done in two stages, by dividing *anaathmaa* into two. One is the external *anaathmaa*, which is outside the *panchakosaas* - which is outside the *sareerathrayam* - the external world. Separating the external *anaathmaa* is relatively easier and during this stage, this *anaathmaa*, the external world, is called *dhrusya prapancha* and 'I', the *aathmaa*, am called *dhruk* or *dhrastaa*. This *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka* is done as the first step.

After separating the external *anaathmaa*, which, as already indicated, is relatively simpler, we come to the next *anaathmaa* consisting of *sareerathrayam* or *kosapanchakam*. This *sareerathrayam* is also *anaathmaa*; is also *paancha bhouthikam* (made of the five elements); is also *jadam* (inert); is also *savikaaram* (subject to modifications) ; but, this *anaathmaa* is more intimate to 'I', the *aathmaa* and therefore, separating this *anaathmaa* from *aathmaa* becomes a tougher proposal.

One reason is that, the *sareerathrayam* is serving as the medium for 'I', the *aathmaa*, to experience the world. To understand this more easily, a pair of 'spectacles' may be considered as an example; even though the pair of spectacles is serving only as an instrument for perception and thus, only an object, albeit an intimate object, it becomes almost part of the Subject, the user of the spectacles. In the same manner, the *anaathma-sareerathrayam* also, though only an instrumental object, is very close to the Subject 'I', the *aathmaa*, because of its being the medium (in fact, the only medium) for the *aathmaa* to experience the external world. Because of this 'intimacy', segregation of the *sareerathrayam* from the *aathmaa* is tougher. A *Vedhaanthic* student may gear himself up to declare "I am not the body"; but, the statement, more often, will be only lip-deep; actual internalization of the fact is not easy.

The second reason for the difficulty in the segregation of the *sareerathrayam* from the *aathmaa*, is that, even though the *sareerathrayam* is also *anaathmaa* **like** the external

world, it has got borrowed *chidhaabhaasa* permanently ('permanently' means 'throughout one's life'), **unlike** the external world, which is explicitly *jadam*.

(Incidentally, it should be remembered, that, *aathmaa* need not 'give' *chidhaabhaasaa* to the *sareerathrayam*; even without the 'will' of or 'wanton' effort on the part of *aathmaa*, the *sookshma sareeram* and *kaarana sareeram* 'borrow' – in fact, 'snatch' may be a more appropriate term - *chidhaabhaasaa* from *aathmaa*).

Because of this permanent *chidhabhaasaa*, the *anaathma-sareerathrayam*, is sentient exactly like *aathmaa*; and, therefore, it 'imitates' *aathmaa*. The world does not have the capacity to imitate the *aathmaa*, because it is explicitly *jadam*, whereas *sareerathrayam* imitates/ mimics *aathmaa*, because of its borrowed sentiency. Because of this reason also – that, it is sentient like *aathmaa* - segregating *sareerathrayam* from *aathmaa* is difficult.

Thus, the first uniqueness of *sareerathrayam* is its 'intimacy' with *aathmaa*; and, the second uniqueness is, its 'sentiency', similar to / in imitation of *aathmaa*.

There is one more factor; a third uniqueness, which, actually, is a result of the above two unique factors. Because the *sareerathrayam anaathmaa* is intimate to the *aathmaa* and is sentient like *aathmaa*, the individual invariably uses the word 'I' *falsely* for this *sareerathrayam* (instead of using it only for *aathmaa*, as he should be doing); the *sareerathrayam* is a pseudo-'I', also called *ahamkaara*: - the suffix 'kaara:' implying *aabhaasam* (reflection), the word *ahamkaaraa* implying "aabhaasam of aham". All through one's life, one falsely uses the word 'I' for this *anaathma sareerathrayam*. Thus, the third uniqueness of the *sareerathrayam* is, that, it is serving as *aham* – *ahamkaara*, pseudo 'I'.

The intimacy status, sentiency status and pseudo 'I' status are the three unique statuses of *sareerathrayam*, which statuses, the external world does not possess, even though the external world and the *sareerathrayam* are both only *anaathmaa*.

Therefore, *saasthraas* name these two separately – i.e., they coin two different names for them. The *anaathma-prapanchaa* (the external world) is called *dhrusyam* and the *anaathma-sareerathrayam* (the pseudo-'I', *ahamkaaraa*) is called *saakshyam*. There are many common features between the two, as already explained; both are *anaathmaa / jadam / savikaaraa / paancha boudhikam* etc. Then why differentiate between them? Because, one (the *dhrusya prapanchaa*) is external, not intimate to *aathmaa*, not sentient and is not the pseudo 'I', while, the other (*sareerathrayam*) is more internal, intimate to *aathmaa*, sentient and *is* the pseudo 'I'.

The *aathmaa* also is given two different names in the two different contexts.

“When I separate myself from the *dhrusya prapancha* and claim that I am the *aathmaa* different from the *dhrusya prapanchaa*, I am called *dhrashtaa aathma*”.

Thereafter, “when I separate myself from the *saakshya anaathmaa* (the *sareerathrayam*) and I claim I am the *aathmaa* different from the *saakshya sareerathrayam*, I am called *saakshi*”

The process of segregation – *viveka:* - is also categorized into two. Even though both are *aathma-anaathma-viveka:*, the first stage, “segregation from the external world” is called *dhrashtaa-dhrusya-viveka:* and the second stage “segregation from the more internal, intimate *anaathma-sareerathrayam*” is called *saakshi-saakshya-viveka:* | Obviously, the first stage is comparatively easier than the second, similar to disowning a neighbour being easier, than disowning a son. And, one’s *sareerathrayam* is even closer to one, than one’s son.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya is devoting more time for ‘*saakshi-saakshya-viveka:*’, (otherwise called ‘*aathma-ahamkaara-viveka:*’, otherwise called ‘the real ‘I’- pseudo ‘I’ *viveka:*’), than for ‘*dhrashtaa-dhrusya-viveka:*’ |

The *Aachaaryaa* highlights one main distinction between the real ‘I’ and the pseudo ‘I’. He points out: “The pseudo ‘I’ is a constantly changing ‘I’; the real ‘I’ is the continuous / non-changing ‘I’, obtaining in and through the changing ‘I’” and exhorts: “Therefore, may you focus your attention on the continuous ‘I’ which is available now, which was available in the immediate past and which was available in the distant past also. My experiences vary; even the experiencing thoughts vary; but ‘I’, the *chaithanyam* am the continuous entity.” Sureswaraacharya thus tries to show-case the continuous *saakshi*.

This topic, viz., *saakshi-saakshya-viveka:*, started from verse 58.

Saakshyam, as it was explained, consists of *sthoala sareeram*, *sookshma sareeram* and *kaarana sareeram*; and the most important component in the *saakshyam* is the mind. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya specifically talks of the mind and states “you are not the mind; mind is *saakshyam*; whereas, you are the *saakshi*”.

In verse 81, the *Aachaaryaa* says : “*asyaa: dhiya: sukha kumbhadhinaa yoga: bhaveth tham vidhanthee thadaiva anyam vetthi natho vikaarini*” implying “when the mind illumines a particular object / experience, it does not experience anything else; if it has to have a different experience, it has to undergo change”. This statement further implies: “but ‘I’ illumine the mind, without undergoing any change”.

(The word 'vidhanthee' is *aarsha prayogam* or poetic usage. The grammatically right word will be 'vidhathee').

The conclusion: Mind is pseudo-I, the changing I; while 'I', the *aathmaa* am the real 'I', the changeless 'I'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 82:

अस्याश्च क्षणभङ्गुरत्वे स्वयमेवात्मा साक्षी । न हिकूटस्थावबोधमन्तरेण बुद्धेरेवाविर्भावतिरोभावादिसिद्धिरस्ति ।

In the matter of the mind being ever-changing, the Self itself is the witness. Surely in the absence of an unalterable consciousness, the appearance and disappearance of the mind would not be matters of experience.

The pseudo-I, the mind, is 'changingly' experiencing the world; 'I', the *saakshi*, am 'changelessly' experiencing the mind.

And, Sureswaraachaarya says "the changes of the 'pseudo- I' are proved, because of the changeless *saakshi* only and also the proof for the very existence of the changeless *saakshi*, is, that, we are able to talk about the changing pseudo-I."

When an individual says "I was unhappy; now, I am happy" or "I was disturbed; now, I am calm" etc., such statements, which talk about the different conditions of the changing I, are themselves possible, only because of the presence of the continuous *saakshi* 'I', which witnessed and illumined the past unhappy / disturbed I, and which witnesses and illumines the present happy / calm I.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- अस्याः (बुद्धेः) च - Of this pseudo 'I' / the mind / the *ahamkaaraa* / the *saakshyam*,
- The feminine gender is used for the pronoun (*asyaa:*), since the noun *buddhi*: is feminine.
- क्षणभङ्गुरत्वे – in the matter of constant changing,

The pseudo 'I' is constantly changing along with every emotion; *raaghee* 'I' comes and goes away; *dveshi* 'I' comes and goes away; *kaami* 'I' comes and goes away; so also the *krodhi* 'I', the waker 'I', the dreamer 'I' etc. The *ahamkaaraa* is continuously changing and is therefore, called *kshanabhangura*: /

'*Bhangha:*' mean '*naasa:*';

'*Bhanguram*' means 'dying' / 'fleeting' / 'having momentary existence';

'*bhangura:*' means '*naasavaar*' / '*nasvara:*';

'*kshana bhangura:*' means '*kshana naswara:*' / 'one perishing every moment';

'*kshana bhangurathvam*' means the 'nature of perishing every moment' / 'nature of undergoing changes constantly'

What is the proof for the changing 'I'? Sureswaraachaarya says that the changing I, (the mind / *ahamkaaraa*), by itself, can never know the changing I, because the present I was non-existent in the past and will be non-existent in the future. The changing I cannot know the previous condition or the future condition. Therefore, there must be a changeless *saakshi*, which only can know the constantly changing I.

An example from the mundane world can be given. If three trains arrive at and depart from a station successively, the passengers in the trains can never talk about the arriving and departing trains; because, the passengers of the first train will not know of the arrival /departure of the second and third trains; the passengers of the second train will not know of the arrival/ departure of the first and the third trains and, the passengers of the third train will not know of the arrival /departure of the first and second trains. Only a non-passenger, a person not traveling in any of the train, but, standing on the platform (the *saakshi*, in this case) will know of the arrival and departure of all the three trains.

In the same manner, the *viswa*, *thyjasa* and *pragnyaa* conditions (of an individual) can be talked about only by *thureeyam*. Therefore,

- स्वयं एव (तुरीय) आत्मा साक्षी (भवति) - the Self itself is the witness.

What is the proof?

- कूटस्थ अवबोधं अन्तरेण – Without a changeless witness Consciousness

Kootastha – changeless; *avabodha* – witness; *antharena* – without (indeclinable).

- बुद्धे :आविर्भाव तिरोभावादि – the arrival and departure of the mind (and the thoughts)

Buddhi: - Mind / Intellect; *aavirbhaava* – arrival; *thirobhaavaa* – departure.

In the *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas*, *buddhi* arrives and in the *sushupthi avastha*, *buddhi* resolves.

- न हि सिद्धि :अस्ति - can certainly never be proved.

The arrival and departure of the mind, in the three *avasthaas* cannot be proved without the *thureeya aathmaa*- the *avasthaathraya saakshi*. And, that *avasthaathraya saakshi* is the real 'I', while the *avasthaathrayam* belong to the pseudo 'I'.

This the *Aachaaryaa* clarifies in the *sloka* that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 82 –

परिणामिधियां वृत्तं नित्याक्रमद्गुणत्मना ।

षड्भावविक्रियामेति व्याप्तं खेनाङ्कुरो यथा ॥ ८२ ॥

Just as a plant sprouts up only as pervaded by space, does the activity of the changing mind assume its sixfold forms of change, pervaded by the Self, constituted of eternal and non-successive awareness.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "the pseudo-I (the mind) 'changingly' perceives / experiences the external world, only because the pseudo-I mind is pervaded / illumined / enlivened by the changeless Consciousness/ the Real 'I' / the Awareness". But, the pseudo-I and the real 'I' are so intimately together, that, it becomes impossible to physically separate the mind and the Consciousness. In the case of *dhrashtaa-dhrusya-viveka:*, there is a clearly perceivable physical distance between the *dhrashtaa* and the *dhrusyam*, and therefore the segregation (*viveka:*) of the two can be physical and therefore easy. But, the *saakshi-saakshya-viveka:* (segregation of Consciousness and *ahamkaaraa*) cannot be physical but only cognitive and therefore, appears difficult.

- **परिणामिधियां वृत्तं** - The changing nature of the changing mind
Vruttham mean 'nature' / *svaroopam* and in this context, will imply 'changing nature', as it talks of the nature of the changing mind (*parinaami dhe:*)
- **षड्भाव विक्रियां एति** - goes through six types of modification,

Yethi – attains / *praapnothi*.

"*Asthi, jaayathe, vardhathe, viparinamathe, apaksheeyathe, vinasayathi*" are the six types of modification.

Like a wave rising and setting, the mind also rises and sets. And, when the mind undergoes these changes, every change is a form of its experience. Every change in the mind – minor or major - causes violent emotions, which disturb us in our life.

(It is interesting to note that the mental disturbances cause changes in the chemistry of the body, as modern medical science shows. The emotion 'mental depression' causes reduction

of sodium in the body and *vice versa*; and the very common disorder 'blood pressure' also results from mental disturbances and also *vice versa*).

Vedhaanthaa says "all *samsaaraa* is nothing but some fluctuations in the micro-matter or macro-matter. And, 'I' pervade the fluctuating mind and empower the mind to undergo the fluctuations and go through the 'drama'."

"If I remember 'my' nature, all the fluctuations in the material body are only a 'drama'/ sport / entertainment; but, the moment I forget 'my' nature, life becomes a struggle" (Swamiji's repeated exhortation as the fifth capsule of *Vedhaanthaa*).

And, looking at life as a struggle, sometimes even results in loss of interest in living, and the resultant prayer for early death, to be relieved of the 'struggle'. But, ironically, the prayer for a long life to enjoy the perceived pleasures of life or the prayer for an early death to escape the perceived miseries in life are both *samsaaraa*, both results of ignorance. "I should not pray for either of the two, because 'I' do not have life; nor do 'I' have death; 'I' am the *eka-nithya-muktha-aathmaa* in which billions and trillions of minds are going through fluctuations and if, one among these minds (i.e. mine), gets depressed, why should it disturb me? After all, *praarabhdtaa* has to be gone through" should be the attitude of the informed seeker.

The mind goes through emotional fluctuations (*shadbhaavavikriyyam yethi*), while:

- व्याप्तं - pervaded
- आत्मना - by the (fluctuation-free) 'Self'.

Parinaamidhiyaam vruttham vyaaptham (sath) aathmaana - The mind undergoes fluctuations, pervaded by the Self.

Let the mind undergo fluctuations; why should 'I' worry about it; because 'I' am not affected. And, what type of 'I'?

- नित्यद्रुक् - ('I' am) the eternal witness (of the mind)
- अक्रमद्रुक् - ('I' am) the changeless (witness of the mind).

'I' am not a sequential observer; but, 'simultaneous', 'changeless' observer.

Again, it should be remembered, that the word 'observer' does not convey the message that 'I' am doing the action of 'observing' deliberately. It only means "in 'my' presence, the mind gets observed". From the point of the enlivened mind, 'I' am figuratively called 'observer'. 'I' am not an 'observer' in the literal sense of the word; 'I' am only a 'witness'.

"*Nithya akrama dhruk aathmaa*" is a compound word, meaning "the Self, which is the eternal , changeless witness".

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an example – the best example. He says:

- **खेन (व्याप्तः) अङ्कुरः यथा** – similar to the seed pervaded by *aakaasaa*.

Kham – *aakaasa*; *khen* - by *aakaasaa*; the word '*vyaaptha*:' is to be supplied for easier understanding.

Ankura: means a 'seed'. A seed has the capacity to undergo changes; it can become a sprout, it can become a plant and it can become a tree; these are all modifications, which are intrinsically there in a seed. But, all these are possible only because the seed has got a place of location, which we always take for granted. If we talk about any object, it requires a location. And, that location is called *aakaasa*: or space; the very existence of any object presupposes the space which is the locus of that object. And, where is this space? The space is all-pervading, which means, the space pervades the seed also.

The *Achaaryaa* says "the seed exists, because it has the location of space ; seed grows into a sprout because it has a location of space; in fact, seed exists and undergoes all modifications because of the one thing that pervades the seed and is the locus of the seed but which is taken for granted; that pervading/ locus factor is *aakaasa*:" | The *Achaaryaa* further points out " but, even though the seed exists because of space and even though the seed undergoes modifications because of space, the space itself does not undergo any one of the changes"

"I' am similar to the space - *aakaasa samaana chaithanyam*;" is the meditation required to be done by the seeker. "And, in 'me' and because of 'me', the mind exists, similar to the seed existing in space and pervaded by space ; and the mind which exists in 'me' and because of 'me' undergoes *shadbhaava vikaaraa*, which is called the play of emotions. Mind undergoes *shadbhaava vikaaraa*, existing in me and existing because of me". But there is a more crucial fact: "I' do not undergo any one of these fluctuations, even though they happen in 'me'".

"Just as the seed pervaded by *aakaasaa* undergoes changes, without bringing about any change in the *aakaasaa*, the mind pervaded by 'me', undergoes changes, without causing any change in 'me'" is the essence of this verse 82. In the well-known Githa verse (Ch. II – Verse 20) "*Na jaayathe mriyathe vaa kadhaachith naayam boothva bhavithaa vaa na bhooya: ajo nithya: saasvatha: ayam puraana: na hanyathe hanyamane sareere*", the word

“*ayam*” can be replaced by the word “*aham*”, to suit the context in this portion. And, this thought should be dominant in the sub-conscience, when the mind goes through tribulations.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 83:

सत आत्मनश्चाविकारित्वे युक्तिः ।

The argument for the unchanging character of the Self is this:

That “‘I’, the Consciousness, do not undergo any change”, is regularly proved also by our experience. That “I am changeless” is not merely revealed by *sruthi*; it is not a matter to be believed based on *sruthi vaakyam* alone; but is something which is proved through our day-to-day experience. What is that day-to-day experience? The one who talks about the changing *ahamkaaraa* must be a changeless *saakshi*. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* says (in this portion).

- आत्मनः अविकारित्वे - With regard to the changelessness of *saakshi*,
- सतः - which is the real ‘I’ / which is the *paaramaarthikaa* ‘I’,

Satha: is adjective to *aathmana*: |

- युक्तिः च - there is proof also (presented in the following verse)

As earlier discussed, if one equates the past *ahamkaara* and the present *ahamkaaraa*, the equation must be **only** because of something inherent in the past and present *ahamkaaraas*. **That** inherent part is the *saakshi*; emotions are not inherent or intrinsic, because, past emotions need not be present now and present emotions need not have been present in the past. The very fact that emotions are subject to arrival and departure, indicates that they are only incidental. What is intrinsic is the *chaithanyam* part alone. That is why *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* declared: “*Na me dvesha raaghau na me loba mohau madho naiva me naiva maathsarya bhaava: na dharmo na chaartha na kaamo na moksha: chidhaanda roopa: sivoham sivoham*” (Verse 3 – *Nirvaana Shatkam*).

“‘I’ need not be free from emotions, because ‘I’ do not have emotions to be freed from”. If one has rightly understood the *Vedhaanthaa* philosophy, one will realize this fact; therefore, if a student makes a statement “I have understood the *Vedhaanthaa*; but, I am not free of emotions”, the statement will only show that, contrary to what he believes, he has not understood the philosophy at all. Proper understanding of the philosophy **will** lead to the conviction: “‘I’ do not have any emotion to be free of ; the emotions belong to the pseudo ‘I’; and of course, the pseudo ‘I’ can never be free from emotions. It *is* subject to emotional fluctuations”.

Verse 83 – Chapter II :

स्मृतिस्वप्नप्रबोधेषु न कश्चित्प्रत्ययो धियः।

द्वाशाऽव्याप्तोऽस्त्यतो नित्यमविकारी स्वयंद्रुशिः॥ ८३ ॥

Among remembrance, dream and awakening, not one presentational modification of the mind occurs unpermeated by consciousness and hence, consciousness in itself is abiding and changeless.

The *Aacharyaa* says "all the emotions which we are calling as *samsaaraa*, are really speaking not a problem of 'mine'; all the emotions and various states of experiences are conditions of the *mind*, having varieties of thought pattern".

The mind is akin to the seed and 'I', the *aathmaa* is akin to the *aakaasa*, in the seed-*aakaasaa* example cited.

- **स्मृति** – When there is remembering condition (of the mind),

Smruthi is a condition, of, **not** 'me', but the mind. (When the mind has got memory *vrutthi*, it is termed *chittham*.)

- **स्वप्न** - when there is dream-state (of the mind - again another condition **only** of the mind),
- **प्रबोधेषु** - (and) when there is the waking condition (also a condition of **only** the mind, **not** that of the *aathmaa*),

Only difference between 'waking mind' and 'dreaming mind' is that, the waking mind has got thoughts generated from external world, while 'dreaming mind' has got thoughts generated from internal *vaasanaas*.

The types of thoughts are different based on what triggers the thought; the triggering factors are different and the mind gets the different states - of remembering, dream or waking etc. (But, 'I' am not 'waking' or 'dreaming' or 'remembering'. 'I' do not go through any condition).

But, even though the thoughts (and consequently the mind) undergo modifications, they are always pervaded by 'me', the space-like Consciousness.

Sureswaraacharyaa wants to convey this message, that, the mind and every thought are pervaded by Consciousness. Instead of presenting it in positive language, he presents it in double-negative language. Instead of directly saying "every thought is pervaded" the *Aacharyaa* presents the idea as "no thought is un-pervaded by Consciousness".

"*Dhiya: prathyayaa: dhrusaa vyaaptha:*" – "the various thought modifications of the mind, which modifications are never uniform, are pervaded by the space-like Consciousness, which is the real 'me'" – is the message being conveyed by:

- न कश्चित् प्रत्ययः धियः - not one of these thought modifications of the mind
- दशा अव्याप्तः - is un-pervaded by Consciousness.

But, who am 'I'?

- स्वयंदृशि :नित्यं अविकारी - I, the Self, am ever changeless.

"The ever comfortable free *aathmaa* that 'I' am, let me never worry about liberation".

89. Chapter II, Verses 83 and 84 (08-03-2008)

As a part of *anaathma-aathma-viveka*, Sureswaraacharya is differentiating *buddhi* and *aathmaa*, the *saakshi chaithanyam* and points out that the *buddhi* alone serves as the knower, when it is pervaded by the *saakshi chaithanyam*. And, *buddhi* alone appears as different forms of experiences, when it entertains varieties of thoughts. Therefore, what we call as emotion, knowledge, memory, experiences, the three stages like waking, sleep, dream etc., are nothing but a series of experiences.

All experiences have two components – one is the thought component and the other is the Consciousness component. Consciousness, by itself, does not become an experience; thought, by itself, does not become an experience. Only when Consciousness and thought are together, an experience can result. And, in that experience, the specific nature / attributes/ *guna* of the experience as pleasure, pain etc., i.e., the quality of the experience, is determined only by the type of thought; whereas, the Consciousness pervading the thought does not have any specific nature. Even the arrival / departure of the experience belongs to the thought alone ; the Consciousness does not have even the arrival / departure nature. But, unfortunately, we look upon every experience as a stable unit, not recognizing that every experience has the two components - thought and Consciousness.

An example was already cited: when a student sees an object, say, the mike on the stage, he takes it as an unitary object experience; but, in the mike experience itself, there are two components, which fact goes unnoticed by the student – one is the 'mike' part and the other more powerful, important, necessary component is the 'light' part, which is spread over the mike but is taken for granted. The 'light' part is significant and therefore when the teacher turns the student's specific attention to the 'light' component, the student, in the mixture of the mike and the pervading light, should pay attention to the *nirvikaara, niraakaara, mikeness-rahitha* (mikeless) light.

"Similarly" Sureswaraacharya says "in every experience, you are aware of the thought, which determines the quality of experience; but, then, there is the 'awareness' also in that experience, which 'awareness', unfortunately, is taken for granted. The 'awareness' is the truth of the thought and in fact, the 'awareness' is 'you'".

"*Smruthi svapna prabodheshu*" (in verse 83 – Ch. II) implies "the passing experience-flow".

"*na kaschith dhiya: prathyaya: dhrusaa avyaaptha:*" literally means "no specific experience is unpervaded by Consciousness" or in effect means "every specific experience is a thought pervaded by Consciousness".

Dhrusaa – chaithanyena (nirvikaara, nirguna, asangha chaithanyena).

Atha: - Consequently (it is understood),

Svayamdhrusi: nithyam avikaaree- Consciousness is the changeless part (and thought is the changing part)

That enduring Consciousness alone is *saakshi*; that alone is the meaning of the word 'I'. "*Baalyaadhisu, jaagradhaadhisu, sarvaasu avasthaasu*" (*Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram – Verse 7*) the only constant part is *chaithanyam*. All the other physical attributes, emotional attributes and intellectual attributes are subject to arrival and departure. Non-arriving, non-departing, continuous factor is 'I am', in which 'I' is the *chith* and 'am' is the *sath*. *Sath chith aathmaa* is my real nature, which is called *svayam dhrusi*: (in this verse 83). *Svayam dhrusi*: means *svayam prakaasa chaithanyam*. Thought is known because of Consciousness; the converse statement, that, 'Consciousness is known because of thought' should never be made. In the 'mike' example given above, the mike is known because of light; but, it can never be said that light is known because of mike. Light is ever the illuminator and never the illumined. In the same manner, Consciousness is ever the 'experiencer' / 'illuminator' and never the 'illumined'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 84 :

एवं तावत्पराभ्युपगतप्रक्रियाप्रस्थानेन निरस्ताशेषविकारैकात्म्यं प्रतिपादितमुपपत्तिभिः। अथाधुना श्रौतीं प्रक्रियामवलम्ब्योच्यते ।

Thus, the unity of the Self, divested of all changes, has been set forth in terms of reason in the manner adopted by other schools. Now the argument is presented in accordance with the procedure of the *sruthi*:

This verse 84 is an 'aside' verse. The flow of the current discussion will be picked up from verse 85 again; in this verse (84) is an 'aside' note – a very important and very subtle note.

Sureswaraachaarya says "we have been saying that *buddhi*, the *anaathmaa* **alone** is the changing 'knower', the *kartha*, the *boktha* etc., by undergoing changes in the form of 'knowing' thought, 'doing' thought, 'enjoying' thought etc. Thus, *anaathmaa* has the attributes of 'knower'hood, 'doer'hood, change etc. All attributes including change belong to *buddhi*, the *anaathmaa*. *Anaathmaa saguna*:".

What is the purpose of this approach? The *Aaachaaryaa* explains: "This method of teaching is employed, so that all the attributes, 'knower'hood, 'doer'hood, 'enjoyer'hood, *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *kaamaa* etc. are all dumped on the *buddhi*, otherwise called *ahamkaaraa*, the *anaathmaa*. Once all the *gunaas* are, thus, transferred to *anaathmaa*, it can be established

that "*aathmaa nirguna: asthi*"; that, "for the *aathmaa, karthruthava guna: naasthi, bokthruthvam naasthi, pramaathruthvam naasthi, raagha: naasthi, dvesha: naasthi* etc.; *aathmaa nirguna: asthi*" / (In a lighter vein, this is similar to one dumping all the household garbage on the road, so that the house can be free of garbage.)

"Transferring the attributes to *anaathmaa*" helps in establishing the "attributelessness of *aathmaa*".

"But" Sureswaraacharya says "this method of teaching is a 'compromised' method, borrowed from *saamkyaa* philosophy". In *saamkyaa*, a clear differentiation is made between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, using the names *purushaa* and *prakrithi*, for *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* respectively. And, in the form of *purusha-prakrithi-viveka*: (differentiation between *purushaa* and *prakrithi*), the teaching is done in *saamkyaa*, that all attributes/*gunaas* belong only to the *prakrithi* and that the *purushaa* is *asangha*: | "But" Sureswaraacharya again says "this is **not** the teaching of the *Upanishads*; this teaching is not *srouthi prakriyaa*" |

This is because there is a problem in this *prakriyaa*, (the problem had already been referred to, earlier, in a different context, in the course of these *Naishkarmya Siddhi* classes), which problem is as follows : Since, in the course of establishing this view, that *prakrithi* (*anaathmaa*) is *saguna*: and *purushaa* (*aathmaa*) is *nirguna*: - *ahamkaaraa* is *samsaari* and *aathmaa* is *asamsaari* etc. - , the teacher repeatedly talks about *prakrithi* and *purushaa* or *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* - the student comes to the conclusion that there are two distinct things. He asks: "I have realized that *aathmaa* is *asamsaari*. But, how can 'I', the *ahamkaaraa*, become free from *samsaaraa*?" Thus, he ends up in *dvaitham*. And, in *dvaitham*, there are further problems – the worst problem being that *aathmaa* becomes an isolated, remote entity. "The world, the body, the mind are different and 'I' am different" becomes a strong conviction. And, once duality is accepted, body becomes real, mind becomes real and problems become real. Even after *Vedhaanthic* study, the student will consider the removal of mental problems as a serious task which he has to do. He might think: "I have completed my study of *Vedhaantha*. Hereafter, my struggle in life is, that, since I have a mind, which is *anaathmaa* and which has got worries/problems, I have to use *Vedhaantha* to remove the 'real' problems of the 'real' mind'. So what *saadhnaas* should I resort to, for this purpose? "

The student may only change his earlier language. He may now (i.e. after *Vedhaanthic* study) ask: "I have no problem as *aathmaa*; that I have understood. Now I have problems as *anaathmaa*; so, what type of *saadhanaas* / special *nidhidhyasanam*, should I do, to remove the *anaathmaa* problems?" *Aathma-anaathma-viveka-vichaara* may lead to this misperception / misconception. This is the fundamental flaw in *aathmaa-anaathma-viveka*.

Therefore, even as we use this *prakriyaa* in the initial stages of *Vedhaanthic* study, we should be aware of this deficiency in this *prakriyaa*.

And, if this is a deficient *prakriyaa*, then what should be the right approach? Sureswaraacharyaa says: "You should never accept *buddhi* as a separate / second entity at all. The moment you accept *anaathmaa* / *ahamkaaraa*/ *chidhabhaasa* etc. as separate entities and keep on distancing yourself from them – the more you distance yourself from them, the more reality you are giving them. Therefore, though, initially you may apply *saamkya prakriyaa*, you should really understand that *buddhi* is **not** a separate entity; but, *aathmaa* alone is **appearing** as *anaathmaa* . Really speaking, *aathmaa* is **not** different from *anaathmaa*; if *aathmaa* is different from *anaathmaa*, there will be duality. Therefore, we should say that *anaathmaa* is an appearing lower version of *aathmaa* itself; just as I, the 'waker' myself, am appearing as 'dreamer' in a lower plane of reality, 'I' alone am appearing as the body; 'I' am the seeming body; 'I' am the seeming mind ; 'I' am the seeming thought; and 'I' am the seeming 'knower' also".

To repeat: If you say "mind is the 'knower'; 'I' am not ; 'I' am only the *saakshi*" the problem of duality results, there being two entities, the 'knower' mind and the *saakshi chaithanyami*. To avoid this problem of duality, instead of saying that the mind alone is the 'knower', i.e., instead of saying "mind is 'knower'; I am the *saakshi*", you can probably learn to say: "I am the 'knower' mind also; I am the *saakshi* also". But, this results in the original problem (of *samsaaraa*) returning i.e. if I consider myself as the 'knower' mind / *ahamkaaraa*, I become a *samsaari*. Therefore (to get over both these problems) the *Achaaryaa* says "add an adjective 'seeming' to the 'knower'hood etc."

"I' am the **real** *saakshi*; 'I' am the **seeming** knower, **seeming** doer, **seeming** enjoyer and **seeming** *samsaari*. And, since 'I' am only a seeming *samsaari*, I do not have to seriously worry about the removal of *samsaaraa*" should be the attitude.

Thus, who is *saakshi*? 'I' am. Who is 'knower'? 'I' am. From *paaramaarthaka dhrushti*, I am *saakshi* and from *vyaavahaarika dhrushti*, I am 'knower'. The *samsaaraa* is only *mithya samsaaraa*; even when I am experiencing *samsaaraa*, I am free from *samsaaraa*.

For easier understanding, an example may be cited: "If you show an old group photograph in which you figure, to one of your friends, and ask him to identify you in the photograph, since your appearance has changed considerably over the years since the photograph was taken, your question invariably will be "where am I in the photograph?" and not "where is my picture?". The friend also understands your question, scans the photograph, identifies your figure and points out "this is you". You agree with his answer. Both you and your friend have not made any distinction between the real 'you' and your figure in the photograph. You

have used the word *aham*, for the real 'you' and also for your picture and your friend has used the word 'you' for the real you and also for your picture. But, then, if, subsequently, the photograph wears out or gets destroyed, you do not say "I have worn out"/ "I have been destroyed"; similarly, if there are ten copies of the photograph, you do not claim that there are ten of 'yourself'. In such circumstances, you make a clear distinction between you and your picture and say "the photograph has worn out/ has been destroyed" or that "there are 10 copies of the photograph". You know that you have earlier used the word 'I' only figuratively for your picture. You are seemingly your picture; but, in reality, you are not".

What Sureswaraacharya says is similar to this. He says: "In reality, 'I' am *saakshi* the changeless one; but, in the *vyaavahaarika* plane, I am also *ahamkaara*. I am **not** *ahamkaara*, when I talk about my real nature".

And, just as the photograph has its utility, *ahamkaara* also has got utility. We use the picture, knowing fully well that the picture is not the real person. So is the *ahamkaara* useful in the *vyaavahaarika* plane.

The Aacharya says : "*Aathmaa* is the *saakshi*; *aathmaa* alone appears as *buddhi* / as the changing 'knower'; but, that changing knower does not make the original 'I' subject to change".

In *srouti prakriyaa*, there are **no** two entities as *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. *Aathmaa* alone **is** and that one *aathmaa* alone appears as *anaathmaa*. Therefore, initially you say "I am different from the world"; but, later, you claim "'I' alone am in the form of the world". "'I' am different from all" gives way to "'I' am all". This is *Vedhaantha darsanam*.

Therefore, the *Aacharya* says:

- एवं तावत् - In this manner,
- पर अभ्युत प्रक्रिया प्रस्थानेन - by temporarily adopting the course of the method of teaching by other schools, (the *saamkyaa* school of philosophy),

Prasthaana – course; *prakriyaa* – teaching; *abhyupagama*: - granting / accepting to be true / admitting. *Para* – the other; in this context, indicates *saamkyaa* philosophy.

In *saamkyaa* philosophy, *purushaa-prakrithi-viveka* is talked about; in *Vedhaantha* also, *purushaa-prakrithi-viveka* is talked about. The whole 13th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa* is dedicated to this topic, in which the Lord exhorts Arjuna "*prakrithim purusham chaiva viddhi anaadhi ubhau ap*" (verse 20 – Ch. XIII) – "May you know both *prakrithi* and *purusha* to be beginningless". "Consciousness" (*purushaa*) and "matter" (*prakruthi*) are repeatedly talked about, by the Lord, in this portion of the *Githa*.

But, there is a difference between *saamkyaa* and *Vedhanthaa* philosophies : *saamkyaa* starts with *purushaa-prakrithi* and ends with *purushaa-prakrithi*, whereas *Vedhaanthaa* starts with *purushaa-prakrithi*, but ends with *purushaa* alone; there is no *prakrithi* or matter, **other** than *purushaa*. And, what is that '*purushaa*'? 'I' am that *purushaa*; 'I' appear as the body; 'I' appear as the world; 'I' appear as the 'knower'; 'I' appear as the 'known'. "*Aham annam / aham annaadha: / aham lokakrith /*" (*Thaithireeya Upanishad – Bhrgu Valli*).

Therefore, *mokshaa* is not 'escaping from the world'; if *mokshaa* is understood as / taken as 'escaping the world, by avoiding *punarjanma*', it would mean that the world is taken as 'real'. If one prays "I should not come back to this world again", it only means that one has wrongly understood *mokshaa*. A *Vedhaanthic* teacher, might start with saying "*mokshaa* is 'escaping from *punarjanma*'"; but, that statement is meant to serve only as an incentive to attract the seeker in the initial stages. Really speaking, this definition of *mokshaa* (that it is 'escape from *punarjanma*') is not approved by *Vedhaanthaa*, because, if one wants to escape from *punarjanma* in the world, that would mean, that, one is afraid of the world, which would further mean that one attributes 'reality' to the world. But, "as a *Vedhaanthin*, why should 'I' be afraid of the world, when it is 'I', who am appearing as the world, with '*my maayaa sakthi*, for the purpose of pure entertainment? (the 5th Capsule of *Vedhaanthaa*, as enunciated by Swamiji)". Therefore, before a study of *Vedhaanthaa*, one may say "I do not want *punarjanma*"; but, if one makes the same statement after a thorough study of *Vedhaanthaa*, it will only show that one has not understood the import of the philosophy.

"Whatever happens in the world - including *janma, mrithyu, jaraa, vyaadhi* to my body - *asanghoham, asangoham, sachchidaanandha svaroopoham*" should be the conviction of a *Vedhaanthin*. Concern or worry about one's body, is as immature as the concern for one's photograph wearing off, about which photograph at least, one has no doubt at all , that, the photograph is *mithyaa*. (One should realize that one's body is also equally *mithyaa*).

In short, what, then, is *mokshaa*? The conviction: "I am neither worried about birth; nor death; all the changes are happening in the changeless 'me', which is ever free; I am not worried about the continuing process of the world phenomenon".

(The topic of '*mokshaa*' and its misconception / right conception, elaborately discussed in the above few paragraphs, is only incidental.)

- निरस्त अशेष विकार ऐकात्म्यं – the unity of the Self, divested of all changes

Eikaathmyam - the non-dual nature (of *aathmaa / saaksh*); *nirastha asesha vikaara*— free from all modifications.

By saying it is *anaathmaa* which is *saguna*, we could establish *aathmaa* is *nirgunaa*. Therefore, we temporarily accept *anaathmaa*; but this acceptance is only temporary. Really speaking, there is no *anaathmaa* at all. "Brahma eva idham amrutham purasthaath brahma paschaath brahma dakshinatha: cha uttharena" – "All this in front is the immortal Brahman alone; Brahman alone is behind ; Brahman is on the right as well as on the left" (*Mundaka Upanishad* – II . 2 . 12).

- प्रतिपादितं - was established
- उपपत्तिभिः - by using the reasoning of dhruk-dhrusya-viveka.

By a compromise method of transferring all modifications to *anaathmaa*, we established that *aathmaa* is devoid of changes. This compromise method has an advantage and also a disadvantage. 'Finding a place/ locus for the transfer' is an advantage; the disadvantage is that, it leads to the thinking, that there is a second entity, apart from *aathmaa*.

A similar predicament, in a different context, is pointed out by Dayaananda Swami. He says, that, though the popular *Nirvanaa Shatkam* verse "Mano buddhi ahamkaara chitthaani naaham" is very useful for *Vedhaanthic* meditation, it has a terrible disadvantage also; because, even as the meditator says "I am not the mind, intellect, *ahamkaara*, *chittham* etc.", he is attaching a 'reality' value to these. Therefore, Dayananda Swami says, that, this meditation has to be supplemented by a further meditation: "'I' alone am appearing in the form of *mano buddhi ahamkaaraa chitthani*. They are 'my' own inferior manifestations. I am not worried about their existence. I do not want to 'escape' from them; in fact, there is no question of 'escaping', because, there is no second thing (apart from 'my' Self), from which I need to run away".

A *Vedhaanthin* should remove the 'running-away' mode of thinking. He should not pray for a long life nor for an early exit from the world, because, for a *Vedhaanthin*, "the whole life is only a 'drama' happening in 'me', without affecting 'me'; therefore, I am not threatened either by a long life or a short life". (On the other hand, we commonly observe, that, an ordinary *samsaari*, till he turns fifty, is anxious and eager to live a long life, but, once he turns fifty, tends to pray for an early painless death.)

The definition of *Mokshaa* is "no *raagha-dveshaa* towards life; no *raagha-dveshaa* towards death also". This is *sroutha-moksha*: /

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- अत अधुना - Now (hereafter in the *sloka* that follows),

This verse covers an 'aside' (incidental) topic only.

- श्रौतीं प्रक्रियां अवलम्ब्य - by taking recourse to the *Vedhaanthic prakriyaa*

This *Vedhaanthic prakriyaa*, of course, resembles *saamkyaa*. In fact, in the second chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, *Vedhaanthaa* itself is called *saamkyaa*. The very name of the chapter is *saamkhyaa yoga*:/ But, there is a very important, fundamental difference (*bedha*), between the two philosophies. *Saamkyaa* is *dvaitha darsanam*, while *Vedhaanthaa* is *advaita darsanam*.

- उच्यते - (the following) is being said.

Chapter II: Verse 84 –

अस्तु वा परिणामोऽस्य दृसेः कूटस्थरूपतः ।

कल्पितोऽपि मृषैवासौ दण्डस्येवाप्सु वक्रता ॥ ८४ ॥

Let it be admitted that there is even modification ascribed to Consciousness. But, as Consciousness is absolutely changeless, the modification cannot but be unreal, like the seen crookedness in a straight stick placed in water.

Until now, it was said "I am the changeless *saakshi*; *buddhi* or the mind is the changing 'knower'". This was the statement being made till now. Now, Sureswaraachaarya says: "I am the changeless *saakshi*. 'I am the changing 'knower' also". Both statuses are attributed to 'me' only.

- अस्य दृशेः - For this *saakshi chaithanyam*,
- कूटस्थ रूपतः - which has got the changeless nature,
- परिणामअस्तु : - let there be modification.

Let Consciousness be considered as the *parinaami pramaatha* i.e., instead of attributing the changing 'knowerhood' to the mind, let it be attributed to the Self (*aathmaa*) itself.

So, what is the *Vedhaanthic* teaching? "I am the changeless *saakshi*; 'I am the changing 'knower'; 'I am the *ahamkaara*; 'I am the *karthaa*; 'I am the *bokthaa*'.

This gives rise to a doubt / question. How can 'I' be both, when the two are diagonally opposite? How can the opposite attributes 'changelessness' and 'change' co-exist in the same substance? How can this 'illogicality' be explained?

The answer: Opposite attributes *can* co-exist in one and the same substance, if they (the attributes) belong to two different 'orders of reality'. For instance, in the well-known *rajju-sarpa* example, the 'ropeness' and 'snakeness' *can* co-exist, 'ropeness' from *vyaavahaarika*

dhrushti and 'snakeness' from *praathibhaasika dhrushti*. I am the 'waker'; I am the 'dreamer' also. Both 'wakerhood' and 'dreamerhood' can and do co-exist in one and the same person, because one is *vyaavahaarikam* and the other is *praathibhaasikam*. Similarly, 'I' am really an *asamsaari*; but, 'I' am *playing* the role of *samsaari*. The 5th capsule of *Vedhaantha* (as enunciated by Swamiji) runs: "When I remember my real nature, life is entertainment; when I forget my real nature, life is a struggle".

This is what the *Achaaryaa* says in this verse.

- **कल्पितः अपि** - Even when the 'knower' status is attributed to 'me', the '*saakshi chaithanyam*' / even when the *samsaari jeevathmaa* status is attributed to 'me', who, (in reality) is the *paramaathmaa*

Kalpitha: - attributed.

Even under such a situation, I am not worried. Why?

- **असौ मृषा एव** - this (*samsaari* status) is of the 'lower order of reality' only,

Asau - this (meaning the *samsaari* status); *mrushaa* – *mithyaa*.

This, of course, can also be expressed as "Saakshi is 'my' higher order of reality". The essence of the statement is: "*Brahman* or 'I' am not affected by whatever happens at the *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* triangular level".

Sureswaraacharya gives an excellent example.

दण्डय अप्सु वक्रता इव – similar to the seeming crookedness in a straight stick, partly immersed in water.

It is common knowledge that, when a straight stick (without any bend) is partly immersed in water contained in a transparent bowl or vessel, the stick will appear to be bent at the surface of the water. Though the stick is really straight (*avakram*), experientially it is bent (*vakram*) i.e., though *vakrathaa* is experienced, it is only a 'seeming' *vakrathaa*, caused by the immersion in the water. The stick does not undergo actual *vakrathaa*, when immersed in water, for it to *become avakram*, when removed from the water. Even when the stick appeared *vakram*, it had all along been and is *avakram* only. *Saakshi* is comparable to the stick in the example; and, *maayaa* or *avidhyaa* to the water. In the *maayaa/ avidhyaa* waters, the *avakra saakshi* appears as *vakra ahamkaaraa*. 'I' am *saakshi*; 'I' am the *vakra ahamkaaraa* also. The *vakra ahamkaaraa* is not a second entity; it is 'my' own *appearance*. Therefore, to 'become' *saakshi*, no *saadhanaa* is required; but, only the firm knowledge and conviction that 'I' am the *nithya avakra muktha svaroopaa*: |

90. Chapter II, Verse 84 to 87 (15-03-2008)

In the verse 84, Sureswaraachaaryaa is getting away from the main discussion and is adding an important 'aside' note, so that the student will avoid a misconception.

But, the student should not lose sight of the main topic under discussion, which is *aathma-anaathma-viveka*, as a part of *thvam-padha-vicharaaaa*, which, in turn, is a part of *mahaa-vaakya-vichaara*.

While doing *aathma-anaathma-viveka*, the *Vedhaantic* teacher is deliberately creating a division between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, which means, that, he is deliberately introducing duality. Even though his ultimate aim is to negate duality and reveal non-duality, this *Advaitham* teacher himself, is compromising with his teaching. For the sake of the students' benefit, he is making a provisional / temporary division between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, drawing a line between the two. The teacher elaborately proves this division by saying, that, *anaathmaa* is *dhrusyam* and *aathmaa* is *dhruk* / *anaathmaa* is *sagunam* and *aathmaa* is *nirgunam* / *anaathmaa* is *jadam* and *aathmaa* is *chethanam* / *anaathmaa* is *savikalpam* and *aathmaa* is *nirvikalpam* / *anaathmaa* is *dhu:kham* and *aathmaa* is *su:kham* etc. Thus, he gives a list of opposite qualifications and through all these qualifications, the teacher builds a wall between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to make a note: In *saamkhyaa* philosophy also, a 'wall' is built between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* and in *Vedhaantha* philosophy also, this 'wall' between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* is built. But, the main difference is that, in *saamkyaa* philosophy, the 'wall' is a permanent, unbreakable 'wall', confirming permanent *dvaitham*; and because the 'wall' is permanent in *saamkyaa* philosophy, we call the followers of *Saamkyaa* philosophy 'dvaithins'. (*Madhvaacharyaa* is not the only *dvaithin*; *saamkyaa*, *nyaayaa* and *vaiseshikaa* are also *dvaitha* philosophies).

In contrast, in *advaitam*, this 'wall' (the division between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*) is similar to a temporary, decorative partition, which is installed in position only when required. The *Vedhaanthin's* ultimate aim is not to segregate the Self permanently from *saguna anaathmaa*; because, segregation is isolation, isolation is limitation and limitation is *samsaara*; therefore, only temporarily, the *Vedhaanthin* says "'I' am *aathmaa*; the world is *anaathmaa*"; but, the ultimate teaching of *Vedhaantha* is: "*anaathmaa* is also not different from 'me', the *aathmaa*; it is not a separate entity; it is not a frightening entity; *mokshaa* is not 'running away from the world'; *mokshaa* is not 'running away from *anaathmaa*'; *mokshaa* is not 'running away from *sareerathrayam*; *mokshaa* is understanding that, 'I'

alone am appearing as *anathmaa* also, with non-substantial *naamaroopas*, which, therefore, cannot threaten 'me' at any time".

To convey this idea, that, " 'I' am the *aathmaa*; 'I' only appear as *anaathmaa* ; therefore, there is only one entity ; the division is only a 'seeming' division", Sureswaraacharyaa gives an example: "Just as a straight stick appears as a *vakra*: (a crooked one), when partly immersed in water, (the illusory crookedness disappearing, when the stick is pulled out of the water), 'I' alone am *aathmaa* also; and, when I look through the mind / *maayaa* waters, I alone appear as *anaathmaa* also. 'I' am *aathmaa*, the changeless *saakshi*; I am *buddhi*, the seeming 'knower' also".

Sureswaraacharyaa warns: "Do not make this 'wall' (division between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*) strong and permanent. When the *mahaa vaakyam 'thathvamasī'* is to be assimilated, this division should go".

He says:

- *Kalpitha: asau mrushaa eva* - This division between *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* is only an apparent division,
- *apsu dhandasya vakrathaa iva* - similar to the crookedness of a straight stick placed (partly immersed) in water.

The student should remember, that, in the example, to make the *dhandaa avakram* (i.e. to straighten the stick), what he has to do, is not necessarily 'removal of the stick from the water'; but, to cognitively see the stick for what it is - *avakram* -, even while the stick is under water. In the same manner, to be 'liberated', one need not give up the body / one need not wait for *videha mukthi*. Even when the body is there / even when many bodies 'come and go' (i.e. even when caught in the cycle of *punarapi jananam punarapi maranam*), the *muktha*., even if he appears to be a *vakra samsaari*, would not be frightened or disturbed. This is "*jnaanaath / jnaana maathrena kaivalyam*". "Do not look for *videha mukthi*; you are ever / even now a *muktha*." is the *Advaitic* teaching and not 'running away' from *sareeram* or *prapancha*!]

Chapter II: Verse 85 –

षट्सु भावविकारेषु निषिद्धेष्वेवमात्मनि ।

दोषः कश्चिदिहासक्तुं न शक्यस्तार्किकश्वभिः ॥ ८४ ॥

When once the sixfold forms of change are negated of the self, no deficiency or evil can be demonstrated in it by the dog-like logicians.

This verse is a continuation of the 'aside' note.

Therefore only, instead of saying *buddhi* is the changing 'knower', one can boldly declare "'I' myself am appearing as the changing 'knower'". Instead of saying "there is a *buddhi* which is an *anaathmaa* and that *buddhi* is the changing 'knower'", one can say "'I', the *aathmaa* alone am the changing 'knower' also; and this changing 'knower' status is a superimposed status; and therefore, 'I' continue to be changeless *aathmaa*, even when 'I' appear as the changing 'knower' because of the *vyaavahaarika maayaa* medium; 'I' am not affected by the changes".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- **एवं** - In this manner,

Instead of saying *buddhi* is the changing 'knower', even if and when I say "'I' am the changing 'knower' / the seemingly changing 'knower', none of the changes affects 'me', because my 'knowerhood' is *mithyaa* and the changes are also all *mithyaa* .

- **षट्सु भावविकारेषु** - (when) all the six modifications (which belong to the changing knower *ahamkaaraa* or *pramaatha*)
- **आत्मनि निषिद्धेषु** - are negated (as *mithyaa* superimpositions) on the *aathmaa* (i.e., as not really present in the *aathmaa*)

Aathmani – in the higher/ real 'me'; *nishiddeshu* - falsified / negated

When it is said that the changes are negated, it does not mean that the changes are not experienced; the experiential changes are accepted, because (it cannot be denied, that) "at one moment, I am a pot 'knower' – then from a pot 'knower', I move on to a cot 'knower', to a tree 'knower', to a man 'knower', to a woman 'knower' and so on". The experiential changes will continue; but, the experiential changes are *mithyaa* and therefore, they are as good as 'not there'. The word '*nishiddeshu*' conveys the meaning 'once the modifications are falsified or negated, as *mithyaa*'

- **कश्चित् दोषः** - no deficiency (in the form of *samsaaraa*),

'Knower' includes 'experiencer' also; and the 'experiencer' is called *samsaari*, because 'experiencer' alone experiences varieties of *praarabhdhaa*-caused situations; the 'knowerhood' is *mithyaa*; 'experiencerhood' is *mithyaa*; the experiences are *mithyaa*; the changes also are *mithyaa*. 'I', the *sathya aathmaa*, am not affected by any one of them.

- **आसक्तुं न शक्यः** - can be attributed,

Aasakthum - to attribute; *na sanya*: - not possible.

- इह – in the *aathmaa* / in the *paaramaarthika* 'I' (here upon 'me', the *avakra aathmaa*)

Even when there is an appearance of *vakram*, 'I' am a *nithya avakra*: |

By whom can it not be attributed? By a *poorvapakshin* who is either a *saamkyaa* or an *yogi* or a *naiyaayikaa* or a *vaiseshikaa*.

All these four philosophers – *saamkyaa*s, *yogis*, *naiyaayikaa*s and *vaiseshikaa*s - are generally called '*thaarkikaa*s'. The reason (why they are called *thaarkikaa*s) is explained as below:

No doubt, that, all four of them are *vaidikaas* - i.e. they do accept *Vedaas* as *pramaanam*. (The philosophies of *Buddhism* and *Jainism* do not accept *Vedaas* and are therefore, referred to as *avaidhikaas* or *naasthikaas*. Sureswaraachaaryaa is not talking about *Buddhism* or *Jainism* here). But, even though the *saamkyaa*s, *yogis*, *naiyaayikaa*s and *vaiseshikaa*s accept *Vedas* as *pramaanam*, they primarily resort to *yukthi* or reasoning to establish their philosophies. They give more importance to *tharkaa* and less importance to *Vedaas*. They are *tharka pradhaanaa*: *veda apradhaanaa*: | Because of this fact, these four philosophers are called *thaarkikaa*s.

In contrast, *poorva meemaamsakaas* and *Vedhaanthins* (also called *utthara meemaamsakaas*) are *Veda pradhaanas*. *Vedhanthins* do not wholly reject *tharkaa*, but, consider *tharkaa* only in keeping with *sruthi*, i.e., as subservient to *sruthi*.

And, according to the *Advaithin*: "The primary teaching of the *Vedas* is '*thathvamas'*'; the *Vedaas* repeatedly emphasize '*jeevaathma-paramaathma-eikyam'*'; and, therefore, 'I am free' is the primary teaching of the *Vedaas*. According to the *Vedhaanthin*, *Tharkaa* or reasoning should be adjusted to be in keeping with this primary teaching. 'I am free' must be accommodated by any reasoning that is used."

The *Vedhaanthin* does not approve of changing or compromising the *Vedas*, to suit *tharkaa*.

Once the approach is made in this manner, the result will be "I am free', from the perspective of my real nature and 'I am bound' will be from the standpoint of the lower *vyaavahaarika svaroopam*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "once you thus have two orders of reality, the *thaarkikaa* can never challenge the teaching". He says:

- **तार्किकश्रुतिः** - by the 'barking' *thaarkikaas*.

The literal meaning of 'Sva' is a dog; but, the *Achaaryaa* does not use the word here, in a derogatory sense; but, only to highlight the constant / continuous loud proclamations of these philosophers "you are *samsaari*; you have to be liberated". In contrast, the *Vedhaanthin* claims "I am not *samsaari*; I do not need to be liberated"; because, to him, *samsaara* is like the seeming *vakra dhandaa*, while "aham nithya avakra aathmaa asmi".

Sureswaraachaaryaa declares: The *saamkya*, *yoga*, *nyaaya* and *vaisesika thaarkikkaas* can never challenge the *Advaitic* teaching "I am free, here and now".

"Even when tears roll down the eyes, the rolling tears are, like *vakra dhandaa*; whereas 'I am the tearless, fearless, tireless, divisionless *aathmaa*' is the *Vedhaanthic* teaching.

Sambhanda gadhyam to Verse 86 :

प्रकृतमेवोपादाय बुद्धेः परिणामित्वमात्मनश्च कूटस्थत्वं युक्तिभिरुच्यते ।

Taking up this matter, the changeable character of the mind and the changelessness of the Self are urged through arguments.

Now Sureswaraachaaryaa comes back to the original topic.

In the previous three verses, his aim was to show that "aathma-anaathma division is not there at all" is our destination.

"But" he says "now provisionally I am making a division, that, 'I am the *aathmaa*; *buddhi* is *anaathmaa*; I am the *saakshi*; *buddhi* is the 'knower'. This division I am temporarily allowing".

Therefore, he says:

- **प्रकृतं एव उपादाय** - Coming back to / reverting back to our present topic of *aathma-anaathmaa* division,

Prakrutham means 'duality' (the temporary duality of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*); *upaadhaaya* – accepting.

- **बुद्धेः परिणामित्वं** - the changeable character of mind

(The *Achaaryaa* says:) "We are going to establish that *anaathmaa buddhi* alone is the changing 'knower' principle, called *pramaathaa ahamkaaraa*"

How does the *anaathmaa buddhi* become the 'knower'? By itself, it cannot become a knower because it is *jadam*; only, blessed by 'me', borrowing *chidhaabaasaa* from 'me', the insentient *buddhi* becomes the sentient changing *ahamkaaraa pramaathaa* 'knower'.

And, who am 'I'? "I am the "Original Consciousness"; neither the *chidhaabasaa*, nor the *buddhi*, nor the 'knower', nor a changing entity" is the current approach.

- आत्मनः कूटस्थत्वं च - and the absolute changelessness of the Self

In contrast to the 'changing' mind, what about *athmaa*? How do 'I' stand? 'I' stand as the *saakshi* – this *athmaa* is *saakshi*; he is neither the mind, nor the *chidhaabaasaa*, nor the *ahamkaara*, nor the 'knower', nor the changing entity, but *kevala saakshi*.

And as a *saakshi*, 'I' am *kootastha*; which means, 'changeless entity'. 'I' am the 'observer'; the knower is 'observed'.

- युक्तिभिः उच्यते - are established using appropriate 'reasoning'.

Chapter II: Verse 86 –

प्रत्यर्थं तु विभिद्यन्ते बुद्ध्यो विषयोन्मुखा :।

न भिदावगतेस्तद्वत्सर्वास्ताश्चिन्निभा यतः ॥ ८६ ॥

The cognitive functions of the mind directed to external objects differ from object to object. But the element of Consciousness in them does not differ in the same way, for all those functions, are forms of Consciousness.

So, Sureswaraacharya says: "Now, we have become dualists; we have accepted *dvaitham*. I am the *saakshi*; there is a mind; I am accepting mind as a separate entity; mind is *jadam*; mind is known by the name *buddhi*; *buddhi* has got *chidhaabhaasa*; because of the *chidhaabaasa*, *buddhi* has become sentient; therefore, the *buddhi* can function as 'knower'; and to know the world, the *buddhi* can generate thoughts. (Just as, blessed by the electricity, the fan works)".

The thought is also called *buddhi*. Thus, the word *buddhi* is used for the mind; and for a thought also.

Now Sureswaraacharya is explaining how the 'knowing' process takes place; how, thoughts are generated ; how every thought gets associated with a particular object; and how, when the thought is associated with the object, thought assumes the shape of the

object, '*gataakaara vrutthi*', '*pataakaara vrutthi*' etc. This sequential *vrutthis* is the process of 'knowing'.

What do 'I' do in the meantime? 'I' do not do anything – I am just *saakshi*, in front of which the *buddhi* develops thoughts (*vrutthis*), resulting in varieties of cognitions and varieties of experiences.

Thus, the mechanism of the process of 'knowing' is explained here.

- बुद्धयः - (In this context, means) Many thoughts / *buddhi vrutthaya:*,

In the language of English also, the word 'mind' is, at times, used to mean 'thought'; for instance, when the statement 'I was in two minds' is made, the word 'minds', being in plural, obviously means 'thoughts'. In the same manner, in *Vedhaanthaa*, when the word '*buddhi*' is used in singular, it means 'mind' or 'intellect'; when it is used in plural, as '*buddhaya:*', it can denote 'thoughts' also.

What type of thoughts?

- विषय उन्मुखाः - which are directed towards various sense objects (*sabda, sparsa, roopa, rasa, gandha* etc.),

Unmukhaa: - turned towards / facing.

Many thoughts turned towards many sense objects are generated. These thoughts:

- विभिद्यन्ते - differ,
- प्रति अर्त - in keeping with every sense object.

Though one common word 'thought' is used, the thoughts are not the same; *sabda vrutthi* is different from *sparsa vrutthi*; *sparsa vrutthi* is different from *roopa vrutthi* and so on. The thoughts are constantly changing in the mind (in fact, even during the one hour of the class).

The conclusion: The 'mind' (the locus of the changing thoughts) is also '*parinaami*'.

But, it should be noted, that, every thought is *jadam* / inert in nature and therefore, the thought, by itself, cannot become 'knowledge' / 'cognition' / 'experience'. What actually happens? Even as the inert thought arises, it gets associated with 'Me', the changeless medium, the all-pervading / space-like Consciousness (just as every created object is in

association with *aakaasaa*, because every object originates in *aakaasaa*). Every thought, in fact, originates / rises in 'Me', the space-like, changeless Consciousness alone. And, the moment the *buddhi vrutthi* gets *sambhandhaa* (association) with 'Me', the thought becomes a specific 'awareness' (This is possible because the thought gets associated with *chaithanyam*).

Therefore, 'pot-thought' blessed or associated with *saakshi* becomes 'pot-awareness'.

Changing 'pot-thought' + changeless Consciousness = 'pot-awareness' / 'pot-cognition' / 'pot-experience' / 'pot-knowledge'.

When, thus, 'pot-thought', in the presence of Consciousness becomes 'pot-awareness' / 'pot-cognition' / 'pot-experience' / 'pot-knowledge', we say, that, *buddhi* is the 'knower' or 'experiencer' of the pot.

Now, Sureswaraacharya says: "When there is a change from 'pot-experience' to (say) 'tree-experience', one type of thought (the 'pot-thought') gets replaced by another type of thought (the 'tree thought'). But, the 'tree-thought' also cannot become 'tree-knowledge' or 'tree-experience' by itself; it has to be associated with Consciousness. This will go to show that even though the 'pot-thought' goes away, to give place to 'tree-thought', the Consciousness cannot go away / disappear along with the 'pot-thought'. If the Consciousness disappears along with the disappearing 'pot-thought' / 'pot-experience', the 'tree-thought' will have to, helplessly, remain as inert 'tree-thought' only and can never become 'tree-knowledge' or 'tree-experience' or 'tree-cognition'".

What is the conclusion? "When the thoughts flow, the Consciousness cannot and should not 'flow', which shows, that, that Consciousness, 'I', am *aparinaami* (changelessly present)".

The proof is (thus), that the second 'thought' (subsequent to the first thought) has become a 'cognition', only because of 'my' continuity. If 'I' do not continue, when the first thought / knowledge disappears, 'I' also would have disappeared and in 'my' absence, the second and subsequent 'knowledge' would not be possible.

The series of experiences is a result of the changing thoughts, in the presence of the changeless 'Me', the Consciousness. If the changing thoughts are not there, 'changing experiences (or flow of experiences)' cannot be there; and, if the Consciousness is not 'changeless' also, the flow of experiences cannot be there. The flow of experiences, therefore, proves two things: (1) the **changing** flow of thoughts and (2) the **changeless** 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

"I' am eternally 'changeless'; that is 'my' real nature; do not be carried away by the changing flow of experiences; and do not ever ask 'I have got problems; when will I get freedom from *samsaaraa*? " is the appeal of the *Vedhaanthic guru*. The greatest *vipareetha bhaavanaa* is 'looking for *videha mukthi*'.

Sureswaraacharya says: "Make liberation the present reality. Do not look for 'that' day, when you will be liberated". (The word 'present', in this statement, is also not quite appropriate, since 'liberation' is ever real.)

This is the essence of the *Vedhaanthic* teaching, which the *Aacharya* points out here (in the second line).

- अवगते: भिदा न (अस्ति) - (But, during the flow of thoughts) the Consciousness does not have flow / change / arrival and departure.

Another possible misconception of the student is that, since different types of thoughts flow in the Consciousness, the Consciousness can get sullied and may need to be 'changed' or 'cleansed'. Swamiji warns against this possible misconception citing a simile: "Some people rear goldfish in a glass tank of water, as a hobby. To keep the fish healthy, the water in the tank has to be periodically changed. **Unlike** this, Consciousness, in which thoughts 'flow' (similar to the goldfish in the water) does not need to be cleansed or changed once in a while". *Sankara Bhagavadhpaadhaa*, in his *Aathma Bodha*, declares: "I, the *aathma salilam*, can be never polluted even by the most terrible form of *samsaaraa* or biological pains or psychological pains or emotional upheavals, which are all nothing but forms of thoughts, which will come and go".

Avagathi – *chaithanyam*; *avagathe*: - for the *chaithanyam*; *bhidhaa* – difference / separation.

'I', the *avagathi*, do not change; 'I' do not get polluted; 'I' do not have to go anywhere. How do you know this? Sureswaraacharya explains "*Sarvaa: thaa: chinnibhaa: yatha:*" |

What is the proof that 'I' am continuously there? An example can be given: (Sureswaraacharya has not given this example) " Suppose there is a mirror in front of me; I see two things – one is the mirror and the other is my reflection; suppose the mirror is removed and another mirror is placed in its position; I see a different mirror; and I see my reflection also; if thus a series of mirrors is placed, in front of me, one after another, the mirrors 'come and go'; but, I continue to see my reflection in each mirror. The reflection in each mirror is only because of my continuous presence. Every

thought is a passing mirror; every thought becomes 'knowledge' because of *chidhaabhaasa*, which *chidhaabhaasaa* proves that 'I', the *chith*, is continuously there".

Going back to the text:

- यतः - because,
- सर्वाः ताः - all the flowing thoughts (which are similar to the mirrors in the above example)
- चिन्निभाः - are endowed with *chidhaabhaasa* (the reflection)

Chinnibhaa: - *chidhaabhaasa vamsa*: /

But, what is the proof that the thoughts have *chidhaabhaasaa*? Ans: If the thought does not have reflected Consciousness, since, the thought by itself is *jadam*, it will remain *jadam*. It can never be called 'knowledge' / 'cognition' / 'experience'.

- *Avagathe*: - *saakshi chaithanyasya*
- *Bhidhaa* - modification
- *Na (asthi)* - is not there.
- तद्वत्- (un)like (the thoughts)

'Like' here should be interpreted as 'unlike'. "Unlike the thoughts, *chaithanyam* does not have modifications" is the message.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 87 :

स्वसंबद्दार्थ एव ।

The mind is bound up with its change:

Verse 87 – Chapter II:

सावशेषपरिच्छेदिन्यत एव न कृत्स्नबित् ।

नो चेत्परिणमेद्बुद्धिः सर्वज्ञा स्वात्मवद्भवेत् ॥ ८७ ॥

The mind discerns objects by fragments and leaves residues. It is not all-cognizing. If the mind were not subject to modification, it would be omniscient like the Self.

All these verses are profound, beautiful and significant verses, the contents of which are unique, rarely found in other *Vedhaantic* texts.

Sureswaraacharya points out: "*Buddhi* gains knowledge by generating thoughts. *Buddhi* becomes a 'knower' and gains knowledge by generating thoughts. And, every specific knowledge requires a specific thought. For instance, when you see the face of a person, you will get only a general knowledge of the face; if you (say, an ophthalmologist) want to know how the left eye of the person is, you will have to forget all other parts of the face and focus only on the left eye and an 'eye thought' should be generated. The eye also has several parts – the eye lids, the 'black' of the eye, the lower eye and so on. So, again, if you, as an ophthalmologist, have to get the knowledge of the eyelids, you have to focus specifically on the eyelids to get a specific knowledge of the eyelids. Thus a tedious process of entertaining very, very specific, fine thoughts of the object about which 'knowledge' has to be obtained, has to be gone through. (Incidentally, this is what the modern medical science does). This will only go to show that human intellect can never be omniscient – it is only *alpagnya*." |

Sureswaraacharya says "the very fact that *buddhi* is *alpagnya*., shows it is *parinaami*; (since, it has to gain 'knowledge' of any particular object, only by entertaining a specific thought, which thought is a modification). The *Aacharya* further says: The very fact that the *aathmaa* is *sarvagnya*: (omniscient) proves, that it is *aparinaami* - free of modifications.

91. Chapter II, Verse 87 to 89 (22-03-2008)

Chapter II: Verse 87 –

सावशेषपरिच्छेदिन्यत एव न कृत्स्नवित् ।

नो चेत्परिणमेद्बुद्धिः सर्वज्ञा स्वात्मवद्भवेत् ॥ ८७ ॥

The mind discerns objects by fragments, and leaves residues. It is all-cognizing. If the mind were not subject to modification, it would be omniscient like the Self.

Here, Sureswaraachaarya gives an unique argument to differentiate *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* – *ahamkaaraa*, otherwise known as *buddhi*, the 'knower'. And, he wants to point out that *saakshi* is the *changeless* 'knower' principle and *buddhi* is the *changing* 'knower' principle. He has been giving several arguments in support of this. Here, he gives a different argument: "The scriptures point out that the *saakshi*, the *aathmaa*, is none other than *Paramaathmaa*, the *sarvagnya*: | Therefore, it follows, that, *saakshi* is described in the scriptures as *sarvagnya*: or omniscient, whereas, the *buddhi* or *ahamkaaraa*, though also a 'knower', we know, by our experience, is **not** *sarvagnya*: | *Buddhi* is *asarvagnya* : and *saakshi* is *sarvagnya*:| And, from this, it is very clear, that one is changeless 'knower' and the other is changing 'knower'". This is the conclusion (drawn by the *Achaaryaa*.)

The method of thinking must be clear. Whatever or whoever 'knows' things through a process, can never be omniscient, because, 'knowing' is a process for that 'knower', which means every particular 'knowledge', for him, requires a tedious, slow process of focusing. Right from every minute micro-organism to all the macro-galaxies in the universe, wherever 'knower' is a 'knower' through a process, he cannot be an 'all-knower'. Sureswaraachaarya uses the *vice-versa* argument. And, therefore, whoever is 'all-knower', whether *aathmaa* or *paramaathmaa* or *Brahman* (however you call it), should not have to 'know' things through a process. For the 'all-knower', 'knowing' cannot be a process. And, that's why, *Bhagavaan* is said to be *nithya-sarvagnya*: | If *Bhagavaan* is going to *become sarvagnya*: through a process, (1) He will not be *sarvagnya*: before that process and (2) if He was not *sarvagnya*: before, He is not going to *become sarvagnya*: through a process also. Therefore, all the systems of philosophy, all religions who accept an 'omniscient' God, also maintain that God is *always* omniscient. *Sarvagnyathvam* and *nithya sarvagnyathvam* go together. And, since, *aathmaa* (or *Paramaathmaa*) is *sarvagnya*: and since *paramaathmaa* is also ever (all the time) *sarvagnya*: , it is clear, that *Paramaathmaa* 'knows' things, without requiring a process of knowing. To recap: *Paramaathmaa* is *sarvagnya*:; *Paramaathmaa* is *nithya sarvagnya*:; if *Paramaathmaa* is *nithya sarvagnya*:, *Paramaathmaa* should not require a process to know; that means, *Paramaathmaa* is 'all-knower', without undergoing a change involving the process of knowing; therefore, *Paramaathmaa* is a changeless 'knower' and therefore, (Sureswaraachaarya says) whoever is 'all-knower' has to be a changeless 'knower'. *Buddhi* is

not an 'all-knower'; not omniscient; therefore, it is not a changeless 'knower'; therefore, it must be a changing 'knower'; therefore, the changing 'knower' *buddhi* is different from the changeless, omniscient 'knower' *aathmaa*. *Aathmaa* is changeless; *buddhi* is changing and therefore, *aathmaa* is different from *buddhi*. This (in effect) is the argument.

Page 587.

- बुद्धिः सावशेषपरिच्छेदिनी (भवति) – *Buddhi* is a limited & changing 'knower'.

Parichechedhinee means 'knower'; *Parichchedha*: - a technical word used in *tharka saasthraa*, means "Jnaanam / objectification"

The word also has the meaning of 'limitation', as in *desa parichchedha*:, *kaala parichchedha*: etc.

Why knowledge is also called *parichchedha*: is explained, in detail, as follows (though the details are not very relevant here): "When I look in front of me, the consciousness coming out of my sense organs does not have any specific knowledge; the consciousness is diffused and unfocussed; it is general. Suppose, among the students, I want to focus on one student, I concentrate my consciousness upon that particular student ; the diffused, general consciousness, which was aware of the entire hall, becomes a converged specific consciousness 'knowing' that particular student. The diffused/ pervading consciousness becomes circumscribed, specific consciousness; that's why, the more I focus upon a particular student, I am not aware of even the hall. It follows, that, in 'knowing', diffused consciousness becomes circumscribed / converged consciousness. This circumscribing process is called *parichchedha*: | I am giving a shape to diffused, general, shapeless consciousness, which, in *tharka saasthraa*, is called *nirvikalpaka jnaanam* – (i.e. at the moment the sense organs are just got ready for receiving information) ; when, subsequently, I focus on an object, it becomes *savikalpaka prathyaksham*. Thus, in *tharka saasthraa*, *prathyaksham* itself is categorized as two – diffused one is called *nirvikalpaka prathyaksham* and the focused one as *savikalpaka prathyaksham*. The general consciousness becomes specified consciousness; the 'specification' happens by *parichchedha*:. Because of this, 'knowing process' is called 'consciousness specification' - *parichchedha*: |"

Parichchedha: means 'knowledge'; *parichchedhinee* means 'knower'.

Saavasesha means 'limited'; "*buddhi*: is *asarvagnya*:" (is the essence).

- अतः एव न कुत्स्नवित् - Therefore only (i.e. *buddhi* being a changing 'knower'), *buddhi* is not an omniscient one.

This statement by the *Achaaryaa*, 'buddhi is not omniscient' is an *anvayaa* statement. In the second half of the verse, the *vyathirkhaa* statement follows.

Suppose the *buddhi* is not a changing 'knower'.

- (बुद्धिः) न परिणमेत् चेत् - If *buddhi* is not a changing 'knower' (i.e. if *buddhi* did not require a process of 'knowing'),

What would have been the advantage? The *Achaaryaa* says:

- सा बुद्धिः (:सर्वज्ञा भवेत् - That *buddhi* which is a changeless 'knower', **as assumed**) would have become omniscient
- स्वात्मवत् – like the *aathmaa* / *Paramaathma* / *Brahman* / *Isvara*.

This is a hypothetical situation. The fact is: *buddhi* is **not** omniscient; therefore, *buddhi* is not a changeless 'knower'; therefore, *buddhi* is a changing 'knower'; therefore, *buddhi* is different from the changeless *saakshi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 88:

अतः अवगतेः एकत्वात् ।

Therefore, as the Self is one –

And, therefore what is the conclusion? *Buddhi* is a changing 'knower'; therefore *buddhi* is not omniscient; and therefore, *buddhi* will be different from person to person. One may be an expert in the subject of Physics - a Physics 'knower'; but, totally ignorant of economics – an economics 'non-knower' (while, in the case of another, the reverse may be true). And, therefore, the *buddhi* 'knowers' are different from individual to individual; whereas, since *saakshi* is changeless, omniscient 'knower', that *saakshi* has to be only one behind all the *buddhis*.

- अतः - Therefore,
- अवगतेः - of the *Saakshi chaithanyam*, (which is omniscient & all-pervading),
- एकत्वात् - being of the nature of One only

When it is said "you, the *saakshi*, are omniscient one", the tendency of the listener is to reply "How do you say, I am omniscient? I do not know many things", the reason behind such a reaction being the fact that the listener has unknowingly 'slipped' to *buddhi*. It is not the stand of *Vedhaantha* that *buddhi* is omniscient; it asserts, that, the *saakshi* is the One that is omniscient, the 'One' behind all *buddhis*, the illuminator of all types of knowledge – the knowledge of the subject of Physics of the scholar in Physics, the knowledge of the

subject of Chemistry of the scholar in Chemistry and so on. That *saakshi* is all-illuminator, therefore omniscient - "*kshethragnyam cha api maam viddhi sarva kshekthreshu Bhaaritha – Bhagavadh Geetha - Verse 2 – Ch. XIII*". Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* commences the next verse with the *sambhandha gadhyam*: "*avagathe: ekathvaath - Since saakshi is One*", giving the conclusion based on this fact, in the verse that follows.

Verse 88 – Chapter II :

चण्डालबुद्धेः यद्द्रष्टु तदेव ब्रह्मबुद्धिद्रुक्।

एकम् तदुभयोः ज्योतिः भास्यभेदादनेकवत् ॥ ८८ ॥

That which is the witness of the mind of a *Chandaalaa*, is the same as the witness of the mind of *Brahma*. The light of consciousness is the same in both ; but, it appears as many, owing to the difference of what is illuminated.

Therefore, the omniscient, all-*buddhi* illuminating *saakshi* is only One.

- यत् - The *aathma chaithanyam*,
- द्रष्टु - (which is) the illuminator (the changeless illuminator),
- चण्डालबुद्धेः - of the *buddhi* of a *chandaalaa*,

A *chandaalaa* is one who does not follow or accept the scriptural *aachaara*. Any person, (even if he is born as a Brahmin,) who does not accept or follow the scriptural *aachaara anushtaana* is called a *chandaalaa*.

- तदेव - that same *aathma chathanyam* (is),
- ब्रह्मबुद्धिद्रुक् - the illuminator of the *buddhi* of *Brahmaji*, the *chathurmuka*

Brahma, the Creator (not *nirguna Brahman*) also.

Brahma buddhi can be taken as referring to the *samashti buddhi* of the *Hiranyagarbhaa*, while, *chandaala buddhi* can be taken to refer to the *vyashti buddhi*. The meaning of the sentence would be: "The Consciousness behind the micro-*buddhi* and the macro-*buddhi* – that *Saakshi* is One and the Same".

Alternately, the word *Brahma* can be taken to mean a *Brahmin*. '*Brahma*' has different meanings – *Nirguna Brahman*, *Brahmaaji* (the Creator), a *Brahmin*, *Veda* (as in *Brahmopadesa*), *Omkaaraa* etc. In this context, the word can be taken to mean a *Brahmin*, in which case, the verse would mean "the *Saakshi* behind a *chandaala buddhi* and the *saakshi* behind a *Brahmana buddhi* are one and the same".

Why should the *Achaaryaa* repeat this idea, as he has already been saying this before? Ans: While for an informed *Vedhaanthin*, *aathmaa* is One and does not differ from *jeeva* to *jeeva*, all other *darsanams*, while they accept the concept of *aathmaa*, vehemently argue, that, *aathmaa* is different from *jeeva* to *jeeva*. The *Sankhya* philosopher, the great *Kapila Muni*, after a thorough analysis of the *saasthraas*, concludes, contrary to the *Vedhaanthir's* conviction, that *aathmaa* varies from individual and individual – there are as many *aathmaas* as there are *buddhis*. Similarly, *Yoga* philosopher, *Pathanjali*, who has talked about the *Ashtaanga Yoga* and has practiced *Nirvikalpaka Samaadhi* (which is believed to reveal *Advaitham*), concludes that every *jeeva* has a separate *aathmaa*. The founder of the *Nyaayaa* philosophy, *Gouthama Muni*, also maintains that everyone has a separate *aathmaa*. The *Vaiseshika* founder, *Kanaada Muni*, also maintains that the *Saakshi aathmaa* is different for different persons. The *Poorva Meemaamsaka* philosopher, *Jaimini*, also holds the same view. *Sri Ramanujacharya*, the *Visishtaadvaitha* philosopher, while granting that One *Paramaathmaa* pervades all *jeevaathmaas*, still maintains that the *jeevaathmaas* are different from one another. This vehement opposition from all other *darsanams* to *aathma ekathvam*, makes Sureswaraachaarya repeat his view more than once and assert "Do not think that the *aathmaa* of a *chandaalaa* and the *aathmaa* of a *Brahmanaa* are different and also that there is a separate *Paramaathmaa*. It is not so. *Jeevaathmaa is Paramaathmaa* and that *aathmaa (Jeevaathmaa/ Paramaathmaa)* pervades all over".

But, the 'all-pervasiveness' of Consciousness is not a matter for experience; what is needed is a 'cognitive negation of limitation' i.e. intellectually negating the misconception of limitations. "Take the stand 'I, the *Sakshi*, am in all the bodies'. Do not try to 'experience'; drop the notion that 'I am limited'".

- एकम् - There is only one 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*,
- ज्योतिः - which is self-evident Consciousness / the light of Consciousness,
- तदुभयोः - which is in both of them (*vyashti* and *samashti* or *chandaalaa* and *Brahmanaa*)

There is only one *aathmaa* in the religiously pure (the devout) or the religiously impure (the non-believer). But, what happens?

- अनेकवत् भाति – But, appears as many,
- भास्य भेदात् – because of the plurality of the manifesting medium called *buddhi*.

Bhaasyam, in this context, means '*buddhi*'. *Bhaasya bedhaath – upaadhi bedhaath/ buddhi bedhaath*. "*Buddhi bedhaath chithanya bedha:*".

A mundane example for this phenomenon, is the light-house, where, a **single, non-moving** light (*advaita, achala jyothi:*), appears as three or four lights, because of the cylindrical device, provided with three or four slits, rotating round the stationery light. The

plurality belongs to the device and not to the light. But, because of the numerous slits and the rotation of the device (the *upaadhi*), the single, stationery light appears to be many and moving.

(Stanza 4 of *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* goes: "Naanaachchidra ghatodhara sthitha mahaa deepa prabhaa bhaasvaram jnaanam yasya thu chakshuraadhi karanadvaaraa bahi: spandhathe" – "He, whose intelligence 'flashes' outside through the eyes and sense-organs, just like the bright light of a great lamp placed in a jar having many holes...")

Everybody is similar to the rotating device around the light and all the sense organs are like the slits in the device; there *appears* to be plurality of Consciousness. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says: "Bhaasya bhedhaath anekavath (*chalavath bhaathi*)". Our aim is to move to the "binary format" (of *Athmaa* and *Anaathmaa*) and at the time of practice of the binary format, we have to claim "I am that changeless, unaffected *saakshi*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 89 and Verse 89 :

कस्मात् ।

अवस्थादेशकालादिभेद : नास्त्यनयोर्यत : ।

तस्मात् जगद्दियां वृत्तं ज्योतिरेकं सदेक्षते ॥ ८९ ॥

Why is this so?

The Consciousness shining in the two, does not have difference of state, space, time etc. Therefore, the same light sees always all the activities of the minds of the world.

The *Achaaryaa* continues with the subject of the 'all-pervasive' nature of Consciousness.

All-pervasiveness of Consciousness cannot be experienced, because, the moment you attempt to experience, i.e. the moment you attempt to become an 'experiencer', a *pramaathaa*, one of the *thriputi*, you bring in division; you are localized; once you are localized, how can you 'experience' all-pervasiveness? "All-pervasiveness" denotes "divisionlessness", while the process of "experiencing" demands "division" There is thus a contradiction in terms to talk about "experiencing all-pervasiveness"; and, therefore "experiencing all-pervasiveness" is logically untenable.

Then the question arises: "If all-pervasiveness of Consciousness cannot be experienced, what is the proof for the 'all-pervasiveness' of Consciousness?"

Two answers are given to the questioner.

The first answer is in 'negative' form – "**You**, the questioner, do not have proof to establish the limitation of Consciousness. **You** have no *pramaanam* to show the dimensions of

Consciousness". Any dimension can be only of *sthoolam* – the gross matter, while no *pramaanam* dimensions or limits the Consciousness.

If the questioner argues "beyond the body, I do not experience Consciousness; therefore, Consciousness is not there beyond", the answer will be "lack of experience **cannot** be proof of lack of existence. Your statement merely confirms **only** your lack of experience and **not** the lack of existence of Consciousness. You have not produced, nor can you produce any conclusive proof for the dimensions or limitations of the Consciousness. That being so, i.e. since 'limitation' is not proved by you or any other *pramaanam*, it **is** proved that Consciousness is limitless. If at all, at any time, you 'objectify' Consciousness and establish its attributes – colour, dimensions etc., I shall, at that time, accept that Consciousness is 'limited' by the attributes indicated by you. But, this is purely hypothetical, since, at no time, can you 'objectify' Consciousness to establish its dimensions".

The second answer: "The 'positive' proof for the all-pervading nature of Consciousness is *Saasthra pramaanam*."

This, of course, is on the assumption that the questioner is an *Asthika*: , i.e. one who believes in *Saasthraas*, such as a *Saankyaa*, *Vaiseshikaa* or a *Poorva Meemaamsakaa*. To an *Asthikaa*, but, who is not a *Vedhaanthin*, the *Vedhaanthin* can point out, that, according to *Saasthraas*, "aathmaa is sarvagatha.", as in verse 24, Ch. II of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, "nithya: sarvagatha: sthaanu: achaloyam sanaathana:"

If, on the other hand, a *naasthikaa* demands positive proof for the all-pervasiveness of Consciousness, such proof cannot be given. In dealing with a *Nasthikaa*, the *Vedhaanthin* has to take recourse to the first answer only i.e. demanding proof **from** the *nasthikaa* for the 'limitations' of Consciousness and assert "till such proof is given (if at all) by you, I will rely on the *Saasthraas'* declarations about the 'limitlessness' or 'all-pervasiveness' of Consciousness". If the *nassthikaa* can choose to believe in 'limitations' to Consciousness, without any *pramaanam*, the *Vedhaanthin* is certainly entitled to believe in the all-pervasive nature of Consciousness, based on *Saasthra pramaanam*, which is ample evidence and authority for the *asthikas*.

The conclusion: "aham brahma asmi".

- **अनयोः** - For the chaithanyam in a chandaalaa and for the chainthanyam in a Brahmana,
- **अवस्थादेशकालादिभेदः नास्ति** - there are no differentiating attributes or features.

Between the Consciousness in a *chandaalaa* and the Consciousness in a *Brahmana*, one cannot find or experience any differentiating attribute. Whatever differentiating attributes

are talked about, they do not belong to *chaithanyam*; but, to some material aspect or other – in the intellect, in the mind or in physical appearance. When one uses the words *dhu:khee aathmaa* or *sukhee aathmaa*, the emotions are conditions of the minds only and not of the *chaithanyam*, which will be clear from the fact that one does not feel *dhu:kham* or *sukham*, when in sleep i.e. when the mind is at rest.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* declares “*bedha: naasthi*”. What are the various *bedhaas*?

Avasthaa bedha: (naasthi) - There is no differentiation in *avasthaa* or condition with regard to *chaithanyam*; the differentiation is again only in the minds. One individual may be in the triangular format of *jeeva- jagath- Isvara*, while another may be in the *athma- anaathmaa* binary format, both being the conditions of the minds only. Talking of ‘higher’ state of Consciousness of a *jnaani* and ‘lower’ state of Consciousness of an *ajnaani*, is fallacious. The *samsaara avasthaa* or *mukthi avasthaa* does **not** belong to *chaithanyam* – if they had belonged to *chaithanyam*, every one, without exception, will be either ever ‘liberated’ or ever ‘bound’; the *avasthaa bedhaa* belongs to the minds only. “*Na dharmo na chaartha na kamo na mokshopi (mahyam naasthi)*” – as in the *Nirvaana Shatkam* (verse 3) of *Adi Sankara*.

It follows that the belief that, “in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, the *saadhakaa* is in *Advaita avastha*, when he can realize the *advaita aathmaa*, while, in *jaagrath avasthaa* he is in *dvaitha avasthaa*, with *paroksha jnaanam*” is also fallacious. “I am *Advaitam* in **all avasthaas**” is the fact.

Similarly, *desa bedha:* is also only for the gross and subtle body-mind complex and never for *chaithanyam*. The ‘location’ of the body-mind complex is ‘mistaken’ as that of *chaithanyam*. The maximum concession that can be made in this context, is, that, the reflected Consciousness – *aabhaasa/prathi bhimba chaithanyam* can have different locations, an example being the possibility of reflections of the sun having different locations, while the sun is only one - *eka:* / The *prathi bhimba chaithanyam* is located in the brain and when the brain dies, what dies or goes away is the *prathi bhimbha chaithanyam* only- “*Na prethya samjnaasthi ithi are maithreyi ithi hovaacha yaagnyavalkya:*” (*Brahadaranyaka Upanishad: II.iv.12*).

Chidhaabaasa chaithanyam has a location in the individual body-mind complex and will cease to exist when the brain dies; but, the original *bimbha chaithanyam*, continues to survive even after the fall of the body and the death of the brain; it is only not available or accessible for any transaction. This non-availability or non-accessibility of the original Consciousness, is not because it had ceased to exist; but, because of the destruction of the medium of transaction or manifestation, namely, the body-mind complex.

Again, similarly, *kaala bedha:*, 'differentiation in time' is also not there for *chaithanyam*. As verse 20 – Ch. II of the *Bhagavadh Githa* goes "*Na jaayathe mriyathe vaa kathaachith naayam boothvaa bhavithaa vaa na bhooya: ajo nithya: saasvathoyam puraana: na hanyathe hanyamaane sareere* – "This Self is neither born at any time nor does it die. It will neither come to existence nor will it disappear again. It is birthless, eternal, and free from decay as well as growth. It is not destroyed when the body is destroyed".

(In this context, it is worth contemplating, that, for a true *Vedhaanthin*, the common, anxious prayer "Let me not have a re-birth" is out of place and meaningless , since, such a prayer would only show that he had not correctly understood the message of *Vedhaanthaa*, which is that, he is **not** his *sookshma sareeram*, that, he need not entertain a relationship with his *sookshma sareeram* and that he need not have any special concern for his *sookshma sareeram* , but, that, he is always the *nithya muktha aathmaa*.)

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- एकम् ज्योतिः - (I am) one, non-dual Consciousness, the Saakshi,
- सदा ईक्षते - (which) always witnesses / illumines
- वृत्तं – the behaviour / conditions of
- जगद्धियां - all the intellects / all the sookshma sareerams in the entire world/Creation

92. Chapter II, Verse 89 and 90 (29-03-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa continues with the topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka:*, otherwise known as *saakshi-antha:karana viveka:*, otherwise known as *saakshi-sookshma sareera viveka:*

The *Achaaryaa* started this topic in verse 22 and the topic is still in progress (now in the 89th verse). There is significance behind the *Achaaryaa's* dwelling on the subject, for so long.

By such dwelling at length on *saakshi-ahamkaaraa viveka:*, all the *Achaaryas* try to convey a very important message. Adi Sankarachaaryaa also does this in his *Upadesa Saahasree* - especially in the 18th chapter, where he deals with the subject in a very detailed manner, with the intention of conveying an indirect, hidden message, which is an extremely important message for a seeker. If the student grasps / discerns this hidden message, it can be a break-through / turning point in his *saadhanaa* / spiritual journey. This is the reason, why the teachers dwell on this topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka:* for a long time - so that, serious and sincere students can grasp this hidden message.

But, if this message is so extremely important and can cause a break-through / a turning point to the seeker, why should the teachers communicate it as a hidden message? Why cannot they openly convey the message? There is a valid reason for this also : the *achaaryaa* are worried that junior / immature students or those who make only a superficial study of the *Vedhaanthic* teachings , may misunderstand the message if it is given explicitly; it is intentionally 'hidden' by the *Achaaryas*, leaving it to the mature student to 'discern' the message from the their teachings.

What is that message? This is explained in the following few paragraphs.

Every human being generally evaluates/ assesses himself / herself, only from the standpoint of *ahamkaaraa* or *anaathmaa*. To repeat in a different form: Self evaluation / self assessment from the standpoint of *ahamkaaraa* or *anaathmaa* is natural for every human being. In worldly contexts, every one evaluates oneself only from the standpoint of one's physical/ emotional/ intellectual conditions / characters/ behaviors etc.; in short, *anaathmaa* is the basis of self-assessment. This basis continues even after the individual comes to *Veda Poorva Baaghaa*; during that stage also, the individual makes a self-evaluation/ self assessment, only from the standpoint of *anaathmaa*; every ritual prescribed by the *Veda Poorva Baaghaa* is based on the individual's *varna, aasramaa, gothraa, soothraa, Veda* etc. Thus, in the *Veda poorva bhaaghaa* also one assesses oneself, based on one's body-mind complex, the *ahamkaaraa*, the *anaathmaa*.

To the seeker who is a novice in *Vedhaanthic* studies and practice, i.e., the beginner who has just commenced the practice of *Karma Yoga* for attainment of *mokshaa*, *Vedhaanthaa* gives a definition of *mokshaa*, in several portions in the *Bhagavadh Geethaa* and the *Upanishads*. This definition of a *muktha*: is: "*Veetha raagha bhaya krodha:*" or "*harsha amarsha bhaya udhvegai: muktha:*" – "*mokshaa* is a state of freedom from attachment, anxiety and anger".

But, this definition of *mokshaa* is also, only from the standpoint of the mind, the *ahamkaaraa*, the *anaathmaa* only. Really speaking, this definition of *mokshaa* is only a 'provisional' definition; not a 'real' definition.

The 'real' definition of *mokshaa* concerns the *svaroopam* of *aathmaa* - not the condition of the mind, which is *anaathmaa*.

But, even though, thus, *mokshaa* is about the *svaroopam* of *aathmaa* and not about a condition of the mind, *Vedhaanthaa*, in the initial stages, compromises with regard to the 'real' definition and gives a 'provisional' definition of *mokshaa* as "*veetha raagha bhaya krodhathvam*" – as "freedom from attachment, anxiety and anger".

Not only do the *saasthraas* give this 'provisional', compromised definition of *mokshaa* from *anaathmaa* standpoint, they also prescribe the conditions for attainment of that *mokshaa* – that, *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is the qualification required for *mokshaa*. By presenting *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as essential qualification, *saasthraas* are obviously saying that *mokshaa* is possibly only for the qualified students; i.e. these qualifications become the conditions for *mokshaa*.

But, this, again is only a compromise - a 'provisional' condition. Why (is it to be considered as a compromise or a 'provisional' statement)? Because, the real *vedhaanthic* teaching is that, *mokshaa* is your very nature. Whatever is your nature (*svaroopam*) cannot depend on any condition. Therefore, the truth is "*mokshaa* cannot have any condition at all; even *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* can never be defined as a condition for *mokshaa*".

But, *Vedhaanthaa*, for a beginner / for a novice, presents this 'provisional' condition – *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*. The beginner gathers these two messages - the 'provisional' definition of *mokshaa* and the 'provisional' conditions for *mokshaa*. They get well entrenched in his thinking: that the definition of *mokshaa* is "freedom from attachment, anxiety and anger", and the conditions for *mokshaa* is "*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*". The consequence: The seeker, who assesses himself from the standpoint of *anaathmaa* all the time, has a tendency to periodically evaluate himself with these two understandings, to

know whether he is a *muktha*: | And, very often, arrives at the wrong conclusions: "I do not have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*; therefore, I do not have *veetha raggha bhaya krodhathvam*; therefore, I do not have *mokshaa*; therefore, I have to increase the intensity of my *saadhanaa*".

The *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka* has the hidden purposes: "questioning the very definition of *mokshaa* and also questioning the *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as a condition of *mokshaa*". If I really go through and assimilate *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka* and, as a result, I distance myself from *anaathmaa / ahamkaaraa / sareerathrayam*, I understand that "*veetha raagha bhaya krodhathvam*" is not the definition of *mokshaa* (that freedom from attachment, anxiety and anger is not *mokshaa*) but, the real definition is that "I am free from the mind itself – I am the *saakshi thathvam*, in which the whole world, including the mind, is falsely superimposed".

The mind and its condition have no bearing on my very nature; and, when I am free from the mind, where is the question of the presence of attachment, anxiety and anger?; and, when there is no possibility of the presence of the three, where is the question of freedom from the three? "*Prasakthasya eva prathishedha*:" is an accepted rule. Only when there is a possibility of the "presence of", the possibility of "freedom from" arises.

Therefore, *mokshaa* is the realization that "I am the *saakshi chaithanyam*, free from *sareerathrayam* and also from their attributes. There is no question of freeing myself from *raaghaa, bhayam* and *krodhaa*". This revision of the definition of *mokshaa*, is, thus, the first message, received from *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*. Only when the seeker is in *Karma Yoga*, i.e. till the time he comes to *thvam-padha-vicharaa*, he can consider the definition of *mokshaa* as "*veetha-raagha-baya-krodhaathvam*". Once the seeker comes to *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*; he has to negate this definition of *mokshaa* and re-define *mokshaa* as "I am free from *sareera thrayam*". This is called *apavaadhaa*. In contrast, "*Veetha raagha bhaya krodhaathvam*" definition is acceptable, during (what is known as) *adhyaaropa* condition; but, once, the seeker comes to *thvam padha vicharaa*, that definition has to be negated. This is the "shifting" from triangular format to binary format.

This 'revision' of the definition of *mokshaa* is the first hidden message; it is not explicitly explained by any *Achaaryaa*, since a seeker in initial stages /a beginner or one makes a superficial study of the subject, may misunderstand this definition of *moksha*.

When the definition of *mokshaa* is thus changed, the method of self assessment should also be changed. "Am I free from attachment, anxiety and anger?" is not the question, one should ask oneself. Instead, one should have the conviction, "When I am ever free from

mind itself, where is the necessity or question from freeing myself from attachment, anxiety and anger?"

Once I understand that *mokshaa* is "freedom from mind and that I am ever free from mind and its conditions" *mukthi* becomes my very nature as a *saakshi*. And, once I learn to claim *mukthi* as my nature, I do not look upon *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as a condition for *mokshaa*. Looking upon them as condition for *mokshaa*, is again a misunderstanding of the real teaching of *Vedhaanthaa*, because, once I know that *mokshaa* is my very nature, where is the question of any 'condition'?. Nature is that, which is 'unconditional'. Fire is not hot under a given 'condition'. Heat is the 'unconditional' nature of fire. In a similar manner *mokshaa* or *mukthi* is the very nature of the 'self' and therefore, the seeker should get out of the idea / the mind set "I am lacking in *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*; therefore, I am lacking *mokshaa* ; therefore, I have to do more *saadhanaa* for *mokshaa*". Instead, he should understand "*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not a *saadhanam* for *mokshaa*; 'I' am the *nithya muktha saakshi* ; I should never assess myself, based on the conditions of the mind, because, 'I', the *saakshi*, have nothing to do with the entire *anaathmaa*, the entire *sareerathrayam* and the conditions of the mind".

This is the second secret / hidden message behind the teaching of *saakshi- ahamkaara – vivekaa*.

To repeat all the above, in a nutshell: The definition of *mokshaa* as "freedom from attachment, anxiety and anger" is only a 'provisional' definition and similarly the condition that "*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is an essential qualification for *mokshaa*" is also only a 'provisional' condition. The ideas of both these 'provisional' definition and 'provisional' condition can/ should be entertained by the seeker, during the initial stages of his spiritual pursuit – during the *Karma Yoga* practice. But, once the seeker advances to the stage of *saakshi-ahamkaara- viveka*, as even as the seeker does the study, he should get out of this mindset entertaining the 'provisional' definition of *mokshaa* and the 'provisional' condition for *mokshaa*. Instead, he should realize that he is *nithya muktha saakshi*; and *mukthi* being his *svaroopam*, it does not need any qualification or pre-condition such as *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*. This process is called *apavaadhaa*; all these should be 'discerned' by the student during his study of *saakshi-amamkaara-viveka*.

This gives rise to the next question: Does this mean that. after study and assimilation of *saakshi-ahamkaara- viveka*, the seeker should not concentrate on *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* or need not concentrate on *veetha-raagha-bhaya-krodhaa* ?

The *saasthraas* and *Achaaryaas* reply: "If you are a responsible *jnaani*, you continue to work on *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and *veetha raagha bhaya krodhathvam*, not as

saadhanaas for *mokshaa*, (because, for a *jnaani*, *mokshaa* is *svaroopam* and unconditional). But, you continue to work (on these) for the sake of *loka sangraham*."

"*Loka sangraham sampasyan karthum arhasi*" – "considering the harmony of the society, you should act" – (Krishna exhorts Arjuna - Bhagavadh Githa – Ch. II – Verse 20). A responsible *jnaani* is very particular about *loka sangraha*: | Therefore, for him, *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and *veetha raagha bhaya krodhathvam* are not *moksha saadhanaani*; but are *loka sangraha saadhanaani*!"

Not only are they *loka sangraha saadhanaani*; but, as Sage Narada points out in *Narada Bhakthi Soothraani*, the *jnaani* has got another responsibility – "*Nischayadhaardyaath oordhvam saasthrarakshanam*" (*soothram* 12) – implying "a *jnaani* has to protect the *saasthraa* also".

A *jnaani* is intensely aware, that, whether he likes or not, he is an 'advertisement' for the *saasthram*. (In fact, in the case of any seeker also, whether he likes it or not, the moment he comes to *Vedhaantha*, his behaviour is used by others, to judge the glory of the *saasthraas* and the glory of his guru. The seeker's behaviour is an 'advertisement' to the society) Every *jnaani* can be a positive 'advertisement' or negative 'advertisement' for *saasthraas*. A *jnaani* is intensely aware of this - that the world judges *saasthraas*, based **not** on the *jnaanam* of the *jnaani*; but, based on his behaviour – on the behaviour of *anaathmaa*. He has to be, therefore, extremely careful about his behaviour, for the purposes of protection of *saasthraas* (*saasthra rakshanaartham*) and the harmony of the society (*loka sangrahaartham*). *Saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and *veetha raagha bhaya krodhathvam*, therefore, become important for a *jnaani* also, though not as *moksha saadhanaani*.

The *jnaani* has, therefore, to pay attention to both, though, after *saakshi-ahamkaara-viveka*, he is perfectly aware that he is a *nithya-muktha-saakshi*, free of the mind also and that he does not require *saadhana-chathushtaya-sampatthi* as a *saadhanaa* for *mukthi*.

Saadhana-chathushtaya-sampatthi and *veetha-raagha-bhaya-krodhathvam* belong to *anaathmaa*; *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*; *anaathmaa* is *adhyastham*. They do not even have real existence. Then, where is the question of connecting *mokshaa* to them?

Theses are the secret / hidden messages; and every seeker should revise the definition of *mokshaa* and the 'conditions' for *mokshaa*, after this *viveka* (*saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*).

Every teacher dwells at length, on this topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara viveka*, expecting the perceptive student to drop the 'provisional' definition (of *mokshaa*) and the 'provisional'

conditions (for *mokshaa*), and also to realize that, these two are relevant only in triangular format and in binary format, are no more relevant.

The question, "when am I likely to get liberated?" is, therefore, meaningless. This question also would automatically lose its relevance, after assimilation of *saakshi-ahamkaara-viveka*.

Sureswaraachaarya (impliedly) asks (in this verse 89) "Why are you looking for definitions of *mokshaa*? Why are you looking for 'conditions' for *mokshaa*? "

(*Saakshi*) *sadhaa eekshathe* – you are the *saakshi* who is the **witness** of *raaghaa*, *bhayam* and *krodhaa* - you are **not the possessor** of *raaghaa*, *bhayam* and *krodhaa*. Understand and claim this *saakshi* as your *svaroopam*.

The current verses are to be studied and understood, with these hidden messages in mind.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 90 :

सर्वदेहेषु आत्मैकत्वे प्रतिबुद्ध परमार्थतत्त्वस्यापि अप्रतिबुद्ध देहसंबन्धात् अशेषदुःख संबन्धः इति चेत् तन्न ।

Here it is objected: If there is a single Self in all bodies, he who is enlightened about ultimate Reality, must realize his identity with the Self in other bodies, in which this enlightenment has not taken place. Hence he must suffer all the sufferings in the world. The reply is this:

Many students keep missing these hidden messages (elaborated above). This *sambhandha gadhyam* is about a student who misses the hidden messages and raises a *poorvapakshaa*.

What is the message given by this teaching of *aathma-ahamkaara-vivekaa* ?

"I am the *saakshi* of the mind; therefore, I am different from the mind; therefore, I do not have *raaghaa*, *bhayam*, *krodhaa* etc., in any of the three periods of time; and, therefore, I need not work for freedom from them. I am ever-free *saakshi*; not only that, I am not even limited to this body. I am the *saakshi* behind every mind; I am all-pervading *saakshi*, different from the localized mind".

The student (the *poorva pakshin*) interprets this wrongly. He argues: "Until now, I thought, I am the *samsaari aathmaa* suffering from the *raaghaa*, *bhaya*, *krodha* etc. belonging to this (my) mind. But, now you are telling me, that, I am the **all-pervading** *aathmaa*; therefore, what conclusion can I come to ? That, I have got the sorrows of not only my mind, but, because I am the *aathmaa* behind **all** the minds, I have got the sorrows of all the minds. Previously as a limited *aathmaa*, I had a limited *samsaaraa*; now, I have got the *samsaaraa* of all the minds – *mahaa samsaaraa*, because *saasthraas* say 'you should see yourself in all

the beings' - '*vidhya vinaya sampanne sarva bhootheshu aathmaanam pasyathi*'; since, I have to see myself in all the people, I have to assume the *samsaaraa* of all the people; therefore, now, I am worried about the entire humanity".

In fact, some people even proudly claim "I do not want to work for my *mokshaa* alone. It is selfishness. Let me work for the *mokshaa* of the downtrodden". Such people also claim "we are 'superior' to the *Vedhaanthin*, since the *Vedhaanthin* works only for his personal *mokshaa*, whereas we are so generous, that, we are working for the *mokshaa* of entire humanity". Thus, people have a misconception, that, "expansion" of *aathmaa*, is "taking the *samsaaraa* of all the people and feeling 'I am a *mahaa samsaari*'".

Because of this misconception, the *poorva pakshin* says:

- सर्वदेहेषु आत्म एकत्वे - "If there is only one *aathmaa* which is behind all the bodies,
- प्रतिबुद्ध परमार्थतत्त्वस्य अपि - (then) even for a *jnaani*, who has understood the *Aathmaa*,

Prathibuddha paramaarthathathva: - a jnaani ; prathibuddham paramaarthathathvam ena sa: |

In verse 89, the *Achaaryaa* had said: 'I, the *aathmaa*, is behind **all** the minds'. The *poorva pakshin*, who has understood *mokshaa* as 'freedom from *raaghaa*, *bhayam* and *krodhaa*', therefore, reacts: "Based on your statement, a *jnaani*, now has to remove the *raagha*, *bhaya* and *krodhaa* not only from **his** mind, but, from **all** the other minds also".

अप्रतिबुद्ध देहसंबन्धात् - because he (the *jnaani*) has taken association with all *ajnaanis*' *dehaas*,

The intention of the *Vedhaanthic* teaching is that the *jnaani* has to disassociate himself from his own mind also; but, in the name of '*aham sarvagatha aathmaad*', he gets associated with all the minds. What is the basis for this wrong association? "I am the *aathmaa* behind all the minds; therefore, *sarva mana: sambhandha: aham*"

Aprathi buddha deha – all the other (*ajnaanis*) minds also; *sambhandhaath* – because of association (with)

This association comes after the *Vedhaanthic* study; instead of seeing *eka aathmaa*, the student claims *sarva aathmaa*, extending his problems further. 'Expanding' the ego has resulted in bigger *samsaaraa*; earlier, the student was selfish, worried about only his *samsaaraa*; now, he has become a selfless person, identifying with the whole world, therefore, worrying about the whole world. Thus *Vedhaanthaa* has lead to more worries; 'worry about the self' is replaced by 'worries about the whole world'.

All these are the doubts of the *poorva pakshi*.

'*Aprathi buddha*' means an *ajnaani*; and *deha*, in this context, specifically means the *sookshma deha* / the mind and its worries. *Aprathi buddha deha* means 'all the other minds'.

"Wiping out the tears of all the people in this world" is the agenda of the *jnaani* (interprets the *poorva pakshi*). Therefore, what will be the consequence of *Vedhaantha*, according to the *poorva pakshin*?

- अशेष दुःख संबन्धः - association with all the sufferings in the world (results)".

By taking upon the 'universal self', the *jnaani* has taken upon himself 'universal worry' (again only in the perspective of the *poorva pakshin*).

- इति चेत् - If this is the argument of the *poorva pakshin*,
- तद् न - this is not the aim of *Vedhaantha*.

Up to "*ithi cheth*" is the *poorva pakshin*. "*Thanna*" is where the *Achaaryaa's* reply starts.

'Universal identification' is not the aim of *Vedhaantha*. The aim, which is different, is covered by the *sloka*, that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 90 –

बोधात्प्रागपि दुःखित्वं नान्यदेहोत्थमस्ति न :।

बोधादूर्ध्वं कुतस्तत्स्याध्यत्र स्वगतमप्यसत् ॥ ९० ॥

Even before our attaining enlightenment, the sufferings occurring in other bodies do not affect us. How can, what occurs in other bodies, affect us after enlightenment, in which state, the sufferings occurring even in our bodies cease to be for us?

This is a very beautiful, significant verse.

The gist of the verse:

Through *jeevathma-paramaathma eikyam*, the aim of *Vedhaantha* is, not to make the seeker identify with the total mind. If with one individual mind, the seeker has got minor worries, by identifying with universal/ total mind, he will have 'total'/ major worries, which, obviously cannot be termed *mokshaa*, but, will only be bigger *samsaaraa*.

Then, what is the aim of *Vedhaanthaa*? Through *jeevaathma-paramaathma eiykyam*, *Vedhaanthaa* wants to negate **both** the individual mind and the total mind from the seeker, through *bhaagha thyaaga lakshanaa*.

Normally, an individual, an *ajnaani samsaari*, is worried about the members of his family, when they go through their *praarabhdtaa*, because of his love / attachment and compassion for them. He find himself unable to get over his worries. When such is the case, if he develops love for and attachment (*abhimaanaa*) with the whole world, his worries will only multiply infinitely.

From this perspective, *Isvara* also must be the most disturbed, if He has got *abhimaanaa* with the macro *anaathmaa*. But, *Isvara* is 'liberated'. Why?; because of only one reason : He knows that the whole universe / macro *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*. If *Isvara* takes the universe as *sathyam*, the worry / sufferings of all the people must also be *sathyam* and the compassionate *Isvara* must be worried all the time, about the sufferings of His children, all over the world, especially since it is not possible to create a world totally free of suffering.

The conclusion: 'Liberation' for *jeeva* or *Isvara*, is only through the knowledge "I am neither the micro-mind nor the macro-mind".

Isvara is free, not because He has identified with the whole world; but, because He has dis-identified with the whole world. The aim of *Vedhaanthaa* is – not identification with the *vyashti* mind or identification with the *samashti* mind - but, to imbibe in the seeker, the conviction "I am free from both. I am neither *jeeva*; nor *Isvara*. *Jeevathvam* is *mithyaa*; *Isvarathvam* is also *mithyaa*. I am the *aathmaa* which is free from both *vyashti* and *samashti*". This is the message behind *mahaa vaakyam*.

Isvara's freedom is from the knowledge that everything, including His *Isvara* status, is *mithyaa*. *Mokshaa* is knowing "I am *asanga aathmaa*; neither *jeeva*: nor *Isvara*."

When am I free? Not after *aiykyam*; but, **all** the time.

- बोधात् प्राक् अपि - Even before knowledge,
- अन्यदेहोत्थं दुःखित्वं - the sorrow belonging to other minds(Dhu:kithvam means sorrow)
- न अस्ति - is not there,
- नः - for us (the Vedhaanthic students).

I do not have the sorrows of other minds, even before self-knowledge? When such is the case (that is, when I am not having sorrow of the other minds, **before** self-knowledge), how can you say, that, **after** self-knowledge, I will have sorrows of all the minds?

This argument is based on what is known as *kaimuthika nyaayam*.

An *ajnaani* never takes others' sorrows as his sorrow, even as an *ajnaani*.

This being the case (Sureswaraachaaryaa points out),

- **बोधादूर्ध्व** - After self-knowledge,
- **कुतः तत् स्यात्** - how can a *jnaani* can take the sorrows of the total mind, in the name of *Isvara eikyam*?

The fact is: "After *jnaanam*, I do not take sorrows of other minds as mine; on the other hand, I reject even sorrows of my mind; I do not take even sorrows of my mind as 'my' sorrow. When, at times, my mind goes through states of sorrow, my *jnaanam* reminds 'me' that 'I' am '*asanga saakshi*'; that, I have no connection with the mind nor the sorrow of the mind; that both of them are *mithyaa* and I can never be touched by any one of them".

"*Amanasthvaath na me dhu:kha raagha dvesha bhayaadhaya:*"- "since 'I' do not have a mind, I am free from attachment, aversion and anxiety also" declares *Athma Bodha* (verse 33) of *Adi Sankaraachaarya*.

"I do not have mind; therefore, I am ever free from sorrow" is the message.

93. Chapter II, Verse 90 to 92 (05-04-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is answering a *poorva pakshaa* raised by the *saamkhyaa* philosopher. This is important, because, *saamkhyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa* have got very close affinity. Even the word *saamkhyaa* is used for *Vedhaanthaa* and therefore the *saamkyaa* objections have to be answered by the *Vedhaanthin*. That's why, in the *Brahma Soothras* - Chapter I, in the first *paadhaa*, most of the *adhikaranams* are refutations of *saamkhyaa* philosophy only.

When we, the *Vedhaanthins*, are engaged on the topic of *aathma-anaathma viveka*, the *saamkhyaa* philosopher is very happy, because both of us (the *saamkyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa* philosophers) agree with regard to *aathma-anaathma viveka*. *Anaathmaa* includes the mind also and when the *Vedhaanthin* dwells on the *aathmaa*-mind discrimination / the *saakshi*-mind discrimination, the *saamkyaa* philosopher approves and appreciates the *Vedhaanthin*. But, towards the end of the discriminative process, when the *Vedhaanthin* claims, that, this *aathmaa*, the 'I', who am different from the mind, happens to be only One (*ekam*), which is all-pervading and which is behind all the minds (*kshethragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarvekshethrushu Bhaaratha - Srimad Bhagavadh Githa - Chapter XIII - Verse 2*) i.e., when the *Vedhaanthin* talks of *aathma ekathvam*, the *saamkyaa* philosopher is shocked.

He objects vociferously: "Until now you were talking sanity and sense; suddenly how can you make this unacceptable claim that *aathmaa* is One behind all the *antha:karanams*?" He insists that such a view is untenable, because, according to his reasoning: "if *aathmaa* is one behind all the minds, it will mean that I am behind all the minds and if I am behind all the minds, then I will be associated with all the minds, and if I am associated with all the minds, then I will be associated with the *dhu:kham* / pain of all the minds. That means I will have *sarva dhu:kithvam*. Before *aathma ekathva jnaanam* I had only *eka mano dhu:kha sambhandhaa* ; now, after *aathma ekathva jnaanam*, *sarva mano dhu:ka sambhandhaa* will result. This will make me more miserable."

The *Vedhaanthin* answers: "*aathma ekaathvam* is not *my* imagination; *aathma ekathvam* is consistently taught by all the Upanishads, as **the** *thaathparyam*. '*Eko deva: sarva bhootheshu bhooma:*' and '*Saakshee chethaa kevalo nirgunascha*' etc. are examples of such *Upanishadic manthraas*. That 'there is only one (*kevala:*) *saakshee*', is loudly proclaimed by all the *Upanishads*. In the *Isaavaasya Upanishad*, where it is said: '*anejad ekam manaso javeeya: nainaddevaa aapnuvan poorvamarshath*' (*manthraa* 4), by the term '**ekam**', '*aathma ekathvam*' is taught. Again in the same *Isaavaasya Upanishad*, it is said: '*sarva bhootheshu cha aathmaanam thatho na vijugupsathe*' (*manthraa* 6) - '*jnaani* understands *aathmaa* as the One behind *all* the bodies and *all* the minds'. This *aathma ekathvam* is taught not only in the *sruthis*; it is taught in the *smrithis* also; for instance, in the *Bhagavadh*

Githa (which is the essence of the *Upanishads*), Lord Krishna says '(yogayukthaathmaa) sarva boothaastham aathmaanam sarva bhoothaani aathmani (cha ikshathe)' – '(the jnaani perceives) the Self in all beings and all beings in the Self' (Ch. VI – Verse 29). Thus, *aathma ekathvam* is *the Upanishadic teaching*."

In response, the *saamkhyaa* philosopher protests: "No, *aathma ekathvam* cannot be the teaching of the *Upanishads*. Even if any *Upanishad* makes a statement to this effect, it should not be accepted as the real *Upanishadic teaching* ; but, should be interpreted differently; because, if the *Upanishadic teaching* is 'I am the *aathmaa* behind all the minds', the consequence will be, as I explained, I will have *sarva dhu:kham* or *maha dhu:kham*. Obviously, that cannot be the aim of the *Upanishad*. Therefore, you have to interpret the teaching properly".

The *Vedhaanthin* answers: "Our interpretation is only proper. I will explain. You said 'when *aathmaa* is *eka:*, it will have *sarva dhu:kha sambhandaa* (in support of which you had given some arguments)'. You also pointed out: '*sarva dhu:khithvam* cannot be the aim of the *Upanishads*. *Sarva dhu:kha sambhandhaa* cannot be the teaching of the *Upanishad*, because that is *prathyaksha virodham*. *Sarva dhu:kha sambhandhaa* cannot be taught as a *prayojanam* of the *Upanishads*, because nobody seeks the *prayojanam* of *sarva dhu:kha sambhandhaa*'. While I agree with your view, that, *sarva dhu:khithvam* cannot be the *prayojanam* of the *Upanishads*. I am firm in my view, that *aathma ekathvam* is **the** teaching of *the Upanishad*, "But, why should *aathma ekathvam* be understood as the *Upanishadic teaching*? Because, the *Upanishad* is **consistently** teaching *aathma ekathvam* as its central theme. Therefore, while we should accept *aathma ekathvam*, at the same time, there should not be *sarva dhu:kha sambhandhaa* also. How do you manage this? How should the interpretation be made? It should be made in such a way, that *aathma ekathvam* must be understood as the message / teaching of the *Upanishads*, at the same time, taking care to see that *sarva dhu:kha sambhandaa* does not become a consequence.

"There is only one way by which this can be managed ; which is, understanding the fact, that, 'even though *aathmaa* is *eka:* and even though *aathmaa* is behind all the minds, *aathmaa* is *asangha:*; and, therefore, *aathmaa* does not have *sambhandhaa* with any of the minds. And, since this *eka aathmaa* does not have *sambhandhaa* with any mind, *aathmaa* cannot have *sambhandhaa* with *sarva mano dhu:kam* also and therefore there is no scope for the objection that *aathmaa* will have *sarva dhu:kham*.

"Not only this; we get some other *prayojanam* also, because of the *asanghaa* nature of *aathmaa*. What is the other *prayojanam*? Since *aathmaa* is understood to be *asangha:*, it does not have *sambhandhaa* with *my mind* also ; and, therefore, not only does *aathmaa* not have **sarva dhu:kham** , it does not have even **eka mano dhu:kham** . Even my mind's

sorrow is not *my* sorrow. I do not have the sorrow of any of the minds in the world and I do not have the sorrow of my mind also. Even when my mind goes through sorrow, as a *Vedhaanthin*, I will declare, that, I am only the *saakshi* of the mind; I am *asangha*; ; I have no *manas sambhandha*; ; therefore I have no *sambhandhaa* with sorrow; *na mey dvesha raaghau na mey lobha mogau madho naive mey naive maascharya bhaava*: (Verse 3 – *Nirvaana Shatkam* of *Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa*).

“When do I make this declaration? Even when my *mind* has *raaghadvveshaa*, since I should be firmly convinced that *I* have no *sambhandhaa* with my mind; *I* have no *sambhandhaa* with the *raagha-dveshaa* also; and, therefore, should declare ‘*chidhaannadarooopa: sivo ham sivo ham*’ |

“Thus, *ekamano dhu:kha sambhandha: api naasthi* | This is *Upanishadic* teaching; when, thus, the *Upanishad* wants to remove the sorrow of even one’s own mind, how can you say, that the *Upanishad* wants to give one, *all* the sorrows of *all* the minds? Such an interpretation is only the result of not properly understanding the significance of *aathma ekathva jnaanam*”.

Reverting to the text (*sloka* 90):

- बोधात् प्राक् अपि - Even before self-knowledge,
- नः - for us (the *aathmaa*)
- अन्यदेहोत्थं दुःखित्वं न अस्ति - there can be no sorrows, belonging to the entire humanity / there can be no sorrow resulting from sufferings of others.
- बोधादूर्ध्वं कुतः तत् स्यात् - (That being the case) how can that *sarva dhu:ka* come to me after knowledge ?

When the *aathmaa* cannot be affected by the sufferings of others, even before self-knowledge, how can *sarva dhu:kham* come, after the study of the *Upanishads*?

The aim of the *Upanishad* cannot be ‘transferring all others’ sorrows upon me’.

Then, what is the result of the knowledge? Certainly not ‘taking’ others’ *dhu:kham*; but, rejecting even my own *dhu:kham*. The so-called ‘my’ *dhu:kham* is, really speaking, not ‘my’ *dhu:kham*; it is only my *mithyaa* mind, that suffers some *mithyaa dhu:kham*, because of some *mithyaa* problems; but, ‘I’ should not and shall not claim the problems of my mind, as ‘my’ problems.

This can verily be called the ‘practice of the binary format’. The aim is not to ‘remove’ the sorrow from one’s mind; but, the aim is ‘to abstain from claiming’ the sorrow which is in one’s mind, as one’s sorrow. This is a *saadhanaa* (to be practiced).

- असत् - (is) mithyaa,
- यत्र - where (i.e. aathmani / to 'me' the aathmaa.)
- स्वगतं अपि - Even the sorrow belonging to my mind

'I' have no *sambhandhaa* with the sorrow belonging to my mind.

And, after thus 'disclaim'ing the sorrow of one's mind as 'one's' sorrow, by deliberate practice of the binary format, thereafter, one can try to improve / refine / cleanse the mind objectively. "Detach the mind, detach from the mind, see the mind as *mithyaa* or *anaathmaa* and then try to improve the mind. But, even while trying to improve the mind, do not connect it to your liberation. Your 'freedom' has no connection with the 'level' of your mind" is the ultimate *Vedhaanthic* teaching.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 91:

न चेयं स्वमनीषिकेति ग्राह्यम् । कुतः । श्रुत्यवष्टम्भात् ।

This is not a thesis fabricated by ourselves. It is based on the authority of the *sruthi*.

"This is the final teaching of Vedhaantha; this is not my philosophy" Sureswaraacharya tells the *saamkyaa* philosopher, since, the *saamkyaa* philosopher is an *aasthikaa*, who accepts *Veda pramaanam*.

In the beginning stages of *Vedhaanthic* study, a provisional definition of *mokshaa* is given, as "*mokshaa* is 'the mind being free from sorrow'". This ('mind being free from sorrow is *mokshaa*') is the definition given in the initial stages, because, a beginner of the *Vedhaanthic* studies, does not know *aathmaa* and assumes 'I am the mind'. Therefore a provisional definition 'mind being free from emotional disturbances is *mokshaa*' and a further provisional definition 'mind not traveling after death is *mokshaa*' are initially given, to help the student gain *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*; and thereafter to move on to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. Once this progress to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is made, the above provisional definitions of *mokshaa* are to be given up. 'The freedom of the mind from emotions' is not the goal of *Vedhaantha*, since, the mind will always suffer some emotion or other. You can 'improve' the mind; but, it can never be made totally free from *jvara*: | In *Panchadasi* (Chapter VII) *Swami Vidyaaranyaa* says that the mind has certain *jvaraas*, which you cannot remove – especially *vaasanaa*-based *jvaraas*. Then what is *mokshaa*? "I am not the mind; therefore, 'I am free from any form of emotional disturbance" is the real teaching of the *Upanishad*.

“I’ need not worry about ‘traveling after death’ or about ‘not traveling after death’, because, ‘I’ am not the mind, ‘I’ am the ever non-traveling *aathmaa* and in ‘me’, the non-traveling *aathmaa*, millions of minds are traveling; and, whether one particular mind travels or not, why should ‘I’ be concerned; if ‘I’ get concerned, it only means that I had not studied *Vedhaanthaa* properly”.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says: “Note this real teaching of *Vedhaanthaa*”.

- इयं - (That) “this statement
- न स्वमनीषिका - is not my own thesis”

Maneeshika means *jnaanam*.

- इति ग्राह्यम् - should be understood.

“This is not my *jnaanam* / my understanding / my view / my philosophy” states the *Acharya*.

- कुतः - Why (do I say this)?
- श्रुति अवष्टम्भात् - Since this teaching is based on / supported by *sruthi*.

Avashtambhanam - base / support / substantiation / reinforcement / corroboration.

The *sruthi* clearly teaches: “You are not the mind. Therefore, never judge yourself based on your mind. If you are going to judge yourself based on mind, you will never claim ‘I am liberated’. You will have the eternal complaint “I am not a *jeevan mukthaa*. Something must be lacking in me – probably *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*.”

When *jeevan mukthi* is itself in doubt, the fear ‘whether *videha mukthi* will ever come or not’ will be an eternal puzzle (worrying the *saadhakaa*). Therefore, it should be firmly noted: “‘I’ am free, in spite of the conditions of the mind, because ‘I’ am neither the mind nor is the mind belonging to me”.

Therefore Sureswaraacharya exhorts: “Practice detaching from the mind”, implying, “drop self-judgment based on your mental ups and downs, caused by the fluctuations of *satthwa gunaa*, *rajo gunaa* and *thamo gunaa*. The mind will be eternally fluctuating even for a *mahaa jnaani*; even for a *mahaa jnani*, mind is not going to be constant; even the *jnaani* cannot stop mental fluctuations; but, the difference (between a *jnaani* and an *ajnaani*) is that the *jnaani* has stopped bothering about mental fluctuations. As Lord Krishna said in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (verse 22- Ch. XIV) ‘*prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha moham eve cha paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaankshathf* – ‘(The *jnaani*) does not

hate brightness, activity and delusion (results of *satthwa gunaa*, *rajo gunaa* and *thamo gunaa* respectively) as they arise; nor does he desire for them, as they withdraw”.

Verse 91 – Chapter II :

शब्दाध्याकारनिर्भासा हानोपादानधर्मिणी ।

भास्येत्याह श्रुतिद्वष्टिरात्मनोऽपरिणामिनः ॥ ९१ ॥

***Sruthi* affirms that there is a seeing illumined by the unchanging Self, which sheds light on external objects like sound and colour and engages in appropriating and avoiding objects.**

Sureswaraacharya says: “The consistent *Upanishadic* teaching is that you are the observer of the mind. The mind is neither ‘you’ nor is it ‘yours’ ”

Because, if the *Vedhaanthin* states “my mind is not ‘me’”, then a counter-argument can be raised: “I know that ‘I’ am not the mind ; but, since the mind belongs to ‘me’, I am worried” (similar to worrying about one’s children). Thus, the worry can be either *ahamkaaraa* based or *mamakaaraa* based. But, *Sruthi* clearly says “mind does not deserve *ahamkaaraa* also; mind does not deserve *mamakaaraa* also”.

Sruthi says:

- द्रष्टिः - “Every experience in the mind,
- शब्दाधि आकार निर्भासा - which resembles the external five-fold sense objects, known as sabdha, sparsa, roopa, rasa and gandha,

Nirbhaasaa – resembling / *aabhaasa: / samaana: |*

An experience always resembles the external object experienced, because the thought is in alignment with the external object. For instance, if one sees a pot, there is a pot-*aakaara-vrutthi*; therefore, the pot experience resembles the pot outside. Pot experience is ‘inner’ pot; the pot outside is ‘outer’ pot. One is ‘thought’ pot; the other is ‘material’ pot.

In the same manner, every experience resembles the corresponding external object of the world. And, these experiences will produce varieties of emotions, which are also ‘experiences’. Further, when I see an object, if I get a desire for the object, that desire is also another form of experience, which will be called *raagha vrutthi:*; (so also *dvesha vrutthi:*)

Thus varieties of experiences are in the mind, resembling the external objects.

And, what is the nature of these experiences?

- **हान उपादान धर्मिणी** - and subject to arrival & departure /subject to 'taking' & dropping / subject to reception & rejection,

Upaadhaanam – taking / receiving; *haanam* - dropping / abandoning / rejection.

You 'take' an experience and 'drop' an experience ; for instance, when you switch on the television, you 'take' the experiences in the mind's frame and when you switch the television off, you 'drop' the experiences.

Both the words '*haana*' and '*upaadhaana*' are adjectives to *dhrushti*: (in the second line of the verse). '*Sabhdhaadhi aakaara nirbhaasaa dhrushti:*' and '*haana upaadhaana dharminee dhrushti:*' (are the two terms descriptive of *dhrushti*: /)

- **भास्या** - is an object in the (train of the) mind"

By directing the mind, the external world's image is formed on the mind (similar to getting visuals on the television screen, by operating the television). The mind, like an advanced camera turned towards different objects, casts images on the mental screen; and, who am 'I'? 'I' am the 'illuminator' of these experiences on the mental frame.

And, when there is a 'sorrow' image in the mental frame, there *is* sorrow; but, the 'sorrow' is *only* in the mind frame, while 'I' am only the 'illuminator' or 'observer'. Therefore, there is no reason, as to why one should say 'I' am sorrowful'. Instead the reaction should be: "I am never sorrowful, though my mind may be full of sorrow" (again similar to watching a tragic play on the television screen – though I watch the 'tragedy', I am not involved in the tragedy – I am only the 'observer' of the tragedy).

Sruthi exhorts: "Disclaim that 'sorrow' (of your mind)". The aim of *Vedhaantha* is not 'elimination' of sorrow (or other emotions); but, the teaching "'you' do not have sorrow (or other emotions)" is the central theme of *Vedhaantha*.

But, unfortunately, this central theme is quite often missed; even after a prolonged study of *Vedhaantha*, tending to look upon oneself as the mind, which mind certainly is not free of emotions or worries, one fails to realize the fact, that, one is free from emotions or worries, even though one's *mind* may suffer from the emotions. What is required is a 'shift' in the perspective. A *Vedhaanthin* can boldly claim that he is free from emotions all the time and that he is ever blissful. *Sruthi* declares: "*Aanando brahmethi vyajaanaath*" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhrgu Valli – Manthraa 6*) "*aananda aathmaa*" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Brahma Valli – Manthraa 5*).

"Claim that 'I' am *bhimbha aanandha*: | *Prathibhimbha aanandaa* in the mind may be there or, on most occasions, may not be there. The arrival and departure of *prathibhimbha aanandhaa* have nothing to do with the fact that 'I' am *aanandha*:" is the teaching that the *Vedhaanthic guru* struggles to impart to the student, even from the initial stages ; the primer in the *Vedhaanthic study*, "*Thathva Bodhaa*" defines *aathmaa* as "*sthoola sookshma kaarana sareeraath vyathiriktha*:", pointing out "'I' have no *sambhandhaa* with the emotions in 'my' mind, which mind is a component of 'my' *sookshma sareeram*".

But, of course, it *is* difficult (but not impossible) to change to this perspective.

Sureswaraachaarya says: "*Dhrushti: bhaasyaa*" – "The experiences are objects of your knowledge".

- इति श्रुतिः आह - thus states the sruthi (thus the sruthi is asking you to detach from the mind).

And, who are you? *Sruthi* states:

- आत्मनः अपरिणामिनः - This mind (with emotional disturbances) is an object of 'aathmaa' **who** does not have any emotional variations / disturbances / modifications.

The term '*aathmana: aparinaamina:*' is to be connected to the word '*bhaasyaa*'.

As already indicated earlier, this message "*sookshma sareeraath vyathiriktha*:", very often, is (unfortunately) not received properly by a seeker. In the *Bhagavadh Githa*, when Lord Krishna talks of a *sthitha prangyaa* (in Ch. II), a *para bhaktha* (in Ch. XII) and a *guna atheethaa* (in Ch. XIV), He gives a description of the poised mind of the *sthitha prangyaa*, a *para bhakthaa* and a *guna atheethaa*, which leads the student to the conclusion that 'the mind being free from sorrow' is *mokshaa*. But, it should be remembered that the 'poise of the mind' is only a provisional description of *mokshaa*; and, in fact, the Lord, in these portions, only describes the mind of a *jnaani*, and is not giving a description of *mokshaa*. The real description of *mokshaa* is the realization "'I' am not the mind".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 92:

का तु असौ श्रुतिः।

Which is this *sruthi* passage?

In the previous verse, the *Achaaryaa* had said: "*sruthi* says you are not the mind; that is the central teaching to be noted. Only when you detach from the mind, you can claim 'I am *nithya muktha*.'; otherwise, the claim is never possible. This is the teaching of the *sruthi*".

Then the *poorva pakshin* asks: "You say that this is the teaching of the *sruthi*. Where is it taught?"

- का तु असौ श्रुतिः - What is that *sruthi vaakyam* which says that 'I' am not the mind?

Sruthi., in this context, denotes *sruthi vaakyam*.

Any number of *sruthi vaakyams* to this effect (that 'I' am not the mind) can be quoted, which *vaakyams*, unfortunately, the *poorva pakshin* seems to have missed, while, a diligent *Advaitha Vedhaanthic* student will never miss the import of these *sruthi vaakyams*; in fact, even in meditation, he would endeavour to imbibe the message of these *sruthi vaakyams* – which message can be briefly referred to, as the 'binary format', i.e. consisting of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* only.

The well known *sruthi vakyam*, on this topic, is in the *Mundakopanishad* (II.i.2) – "*Divyo hi amoortha: purusha: sabhaahyaabhyantharo hi aja: apraano hi amanaa: subhra: hi aksharaath paratha: para.*" – "*Brahman* is indeed self-effulgent, formless, within and without, birthless, without *Praanaa*, **without mind**, pure and beyond *Maayaa*, which is beyond the world". In this *manthraa*, the word *amanaa*: means "Mind is not 'me'; nor is it 'mine'".

Sureswaraachaarya quotes two *Brahadhaarnayaka Manthraas*, III. iv.2 - *Ushastha: Brahmanam* and II.iv.14 - *Kapola Brahmanam*.

Manthraa B.U.III.iv.2, runs: "*Na dhrashte: dhrashtaaram pasye:, na sruthe: srothaaram srunyaath, na mathe: manthaaram manveethaa:, na vignaathe: vignyaathaaram vijaaneeyaa.*" – "You cannot see that which is the witness of vision; you cannot hear that which is the hearer of hearing; you cannot think that which is the thinker of thought; you cannot know that which is the knower of knowledge".

Chapter II: Verse 92 –

द्रष्टे :द्रष्टारमात्मानं न पश्येद्र्श्यमानया ।

विजातारमरे केन विजानीयाद्वियां पतिम् ॥ ९२ ॥

'You cannot see the Seer of the seeing with the help of the mind which itself belongs to the realm of the seen' (B.U. III. iv. 2). 'Through what means can you know the knower, who is the Lord of all minds? (B.U. II. iv. 14).

- आत्मानं न पश्ये: - You will never see the *aathmaa*,

Of course, this is not very relevant to the present subject; but, it is part of the *Upanishadic manthraa* quoted by the *Achaaryaa*.

"You will never see the *aathmaa*, because *aathmaa* is not the 'seen', but, it is 'you', the 'seer'. It is never seen."

What type of *aathmaa*? This is relevant to us.

- द्रष्टे :द्रष्टारं - which is the Witness of all the mental experiences,

Dhraste: - means 'of every experience'; *dhrashtaaram* - Witness.

"You will never see the 'seer' you, the *aathmaa*, which is the Witness of all the mental experiences and therefore different from the mind and its experiences".

- द्रश्यमानया - through another mental experience

"You will not see the 'seer' *aathmaa*, which is the 'seer' of mental experiences, through another mental experience. Through mental experience (the use of the word 'mental' as adjective to 'experiences' is redundant, since all experiences are only mental – but, the word 'mental' is used here, for confirmation / emphasis) you can see the external world ; but, through another mental experience, you cannot see the *aathmaa*, which (itself) is the Witness of the mental experience".

- *Dhrusyamaanayaa* means: 'through a particular mental experience'.

Therefore, *aathma jnaanam* is not a particular experience through which you know the *aathmaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa emphasizes: "The objectified mental experience cannot objectify the *aathmaa*".

The *anvayam* of this (part of) the verse: "(*Thvam*) *dhrashte*: *dhrashtaaram aathmaanam dhrusyamaanayaa (dhrushtyaa) na pasye*:" – "You will not see the *aathmaa*, through an experience, which experience itself is an object of *aathma*".

For these verses in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa has written very, very elaborate commentaries. His commentary on the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* is considered to be his *magnum opus*, most profound, sometimes considered even superior to his *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam*.

This (III. iv. 2) is one *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad vaakyam* quoted here.

Another *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad vaakyam* quoted by the *Aachaaryaa* is:

- **विजातारं केन विजानीयात्** - How will anyone know the 'knower'?

Vignyaathaara: - the 'knower'; *vijaaneeya* - to know.

This is not a question; but, intended to emphasize that 'no one can know the 'knower'. Why not? Because, once you know the 'knower', it will no more be the 'knower' but the 'known'. 'Knower' will ever be a 'knower' only and never be the 'known'.

And therefore, never attempt to 'know' the *aathmaa* or experience the *athmaa*, in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* etc. The attempts will be miserable failures.

There is no question of 'experiencing' *aathmaa*; only claiming "I was, I am and I ever will be *sacchidhaanada aathmaa*".

That 'claiming' is a thought and that 'claiming thought' does not objectify *aathmaa* but is meant to remove ignorance. Claiming has to take place in the form of a thought "I am ever the 'knower' and never the 'known'". This claiming is a thought in the mind and this claiming thought is called *aathma jnaanam*.

But, (a doubt may arise) when this 'claiming' thought does not objectify *aathmaa*, how can it be called *jnaanam*? Ans: It is called *jnaanam*, because the thought (or knowledge) is the remover of ignorance. The thought *is* required, to remove ignorance, since, otherwise (without the thought), the seeker will continue other efforts like meditation, in the search for *aathma jnaanam* and will be eternally waiting for *aathma jnaanam*. Whereas, the 'waiting' should and will end with this 'thought'.

To repeat: The thought (that 'I' am ever the 'knower'; but never the 'known'), is ignorance-remover thought and not *aathmaa*-objectifier thought. And, being ignorance-remover, *Vedhaanthee* calls it *aathma jnaanam*. This is what is stated in technical language, as: "There is *vrutthi vyaapthi* to remove ignorance; there is no *pala vyaapthi* to objectify *aathmaa*".

"*Vignaathaaram are vijaaneeyath*" – "Who will 'know' the 'knower'?", *Yagnyavalkya* addresses (*are* is the word indicating address) *Maithreyi*, in *Maithreyi Brahmanam* of the *Brahadhaarnyaka Upanishad* (*B.U. II. Iv. 14*).

What is that 'knower' *aathmaa*?

- **धियां पतिम्** - which 'knower' *aathma* is the Lord of all the minds (and, therefore, which is different from all the minds)

94. Chapter II, Verse 92 to 95 (12-04-2008)

Sureswaraachaarya points out that the nature of *aathmaa*, the *saakshi chaithanyam*, can be derived not only with the help of reasoning, but, it is supported by *sruthi pramaanam* also.

The first stage of reasoning is, that, 'I', the observer, is different from whatever I am observing, and since the body, the mind and the world are 'observed' objects, 'I', the observer, the *saakshi*, is different from all of them. The second important stage of reasoning is, that, all the observed attributes can belong to only 'observed' objects and therefore, cannot belong to 'me', the 'observer' subject and therefore, 'I' am free from all types of attributes, including all types of measurements or dimensions; and, since, 'I', the *saakshi*, is free from all types of measurements and shapes, 'I' have to be one all-pervading *saakshi*.

Thus, that 'I' am different from the body-mind complex is one knowledge and that 'I' am one non-dual, all-pervading *saakshi* is the second knowledge. Both these conclusions can be arrived at, through reasoning, otherwise called *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka*.

This is finally reinforced by *sruthi pramaanam* also. Sureswaraachaarya (in verse 92) quoted two *Brahadhaaranyaka Vaakyani* - (1) *na dhrashter dhrashtaaram pasye:* and (2) *vignyaathaaram are kena vijaaneeyath*. The first *vaakyam* is from *Ushastha Braahmanam* (of *Brahadhaaranyakaa*) and the other is from *Maithreyi Braahmanam* (of *Brahadhaaranyakaa*), both of which clearly establish "'I' am the non-dual *chaithanyam*".

Thus, even though the *sruthi pramaanam*, the 'eye' of *saasthraa*, is revealing this truth very clearly, majority of the people do not use this *saasthra chakshu:*; and since they refuse to use the *saasthra chakshu:* (the 'eye') they can be verily considered to be 'blind' people.

And, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says "majority of people are born 'blind' (ignorant) and they continue to be blind (because they do not use the *saasthra chakshu:*); and therefore, they do not have a clear knowledge, but only a misconception about themselves.

To convey this – the misconception of the spiritually blind humanity - Sureswaraachaarya quotes the well known example of the 'elephant and seven blind people'; how each one of the seven blind people, physically feels one part or other of an elephant and arrives at a wrong conclusion on the physical nature of the elephant. This example often quoted in the *saasthraas*, is called *jaathi andha gaja dhrushtaantha:* | '*Jaathi andha:*' means 'born blind' or 'congenitally blind'. The use of the adjective *jaathi* is significant, since, an individual born with normal sight, but, in later years, becomes blind due to some reason or other, would

have seen and known the elephant, when his vision was good. Only a 'born blind' individual will have the problem of properly understanding the physical nature of an elephant.

Saakshi chaithanyam can be likened to the elephant in the example and the humanity at large (who do not have/ use the *saasthra chakshu:*), likened to the 'born blind'. Such people have mistaken views regarding *aathmaa*; not only lay people, but, even philosophers - like *Bauddaas, Jainaas, Saamkyaas, Vaiseshikaas, Naiyaayikaas, Yogaas* etc. - have misconceptions about the nature of *chaithanyam / aathmaa*. In *Vedhaantha Saraa*, a whole chapter is exclusively dedicated to the refutations of the misconceptions of the other philosophies – such as *dehaathma vaadhaa, praanaathma vaadhaa, indriyaathma vaadhaa, mana aathmaa vaadhaa, buddhi aathmaa vaadhaa, jada aathma vaadhaa, jada-chethana misraathmaa vaadhaa* etc. *Jada aathma vaadhaa* is that of the *nyaaya-vaiseshikaa* philosophers, while *jada-chethana misraathma vaadhaa* is that of the *poorva meemaasakaa / Bhaata meemaasaka* philosophers. Sureswaraachaarya says: "These philosophers refuse to use the *saasthra pramaanam* and to understand that, 'I' am the non-dual *saakshi chaithanyam*". This is the content of the 93rd verse, that follows.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 93:

यस्मात्सर्वप्रमाणोपपन्नोऽयमर्थस्तस्मादतोऽन्यथावादिनो जात्यन्धा इवानुकम्पनीया इत्याह।

As this position is substantiated by all modes of proof, the thinkers, who hold otherwise, are to be pitied like the born-blind.

In this introduction to verse 93, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- **यस्मात् - Since,**
- **अयं अर्थः -** this particular teaching (that, 'I' am the non-dual saakshi, unaffected by *dhrusya prapancha* and *saakshya prapancha*)

What is the difference between *dhrusya prapancha* and *saakshya prapancha*? The external *anaathmaa* is called *dhrusya prapancha* and the closer *anaathmaa* in the form of body-mind complex is *saakshya prapancha*. Both *dhrusya prapancha anaathmaa* and *saakshya prapancha anaathmaa*, do not affect 'me', the non-dual *saakshi chaithanyam*.

- **सर्व प्रमाण उपपन्नः -** is endorsed / validated / substantiated by all the *pramanaas* (*sruthi, yukthi* and *anubhava*),

For *Sruthi pramaanaa*, the *Aachaaryaa* quoted two *Brahadhaarnyaka manthraas* in verse 92. There are numerous such *sruthi vaakyams*.

Yukthi, in the form of *anvaya-vyathireka* has been repeatedly discussed : "The body, mind and thoughts are subject to arrival and departure, whereas, 'I' am the non-arriving, non-departing *saakshi*." Thus, *anvaya-vyathireka yukthi* or *dhruk-dhrusya yukthi*, otherwise called *anuvrutta-vyaavruttha-viveka* supports this teaching.

'Experience' (*anubhava*) also supports this teaching, because , during *sushupthi*, 'I' happily survive, without either *dhrusya prapancha* or *saakshya prapancha*.

Thus, this teaching is endorsed by all the *pramaanaas*.

"Therefore, whoever holds any view other than this, should be pitied. We need not get angry with them; we need not hate them; they only deserve all our sympathy, like the 'born-blind' do" says the *Aachaaryaa*

- तस्मात् - therefore,
- अत अन्यथा वादिनः - all non-advaitic / non – Vedhaanthic philosophers

Atha: - who have a philosophy other than this (i.e. our *vaadha*: ' that 'I' am the ever-free *saakshi*); *Anyathaa vaadhina*: – *advaita vaadha bhinaa vaadhina*: |

Atha anyathaa vaadhina: - *advaita vaadhaath anyathaa vaadhina*: |

- अनुकम्पनीयाः - deserve our sympathy / *sochaneeyaa*;
- जात्यन्धा इव - similar to 'born-blind' people (deserving sympathy)"
- इति आह - thus declares the author (Sureswaraachaarya himself points out, introducing the following verse).

Chapter II: Verse 93 –

तदेतदद्वयं ब्रह्म निर्विकारं कुबुद्धिभिः।

जात्यन्धगजद्रष्टेव कोटिशः परिकल्प्यते ॥ ९३ ॥

This changeless and secondless *Brahman* is misconceived in crores of ways, like the elephant by the born-blind.

'I', the *aathmaa*, the *saakshi*, is comparable to the elephant (in the *dhrishtaantham*).

- तद् एतत् - This real 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*,
- निर्विकारं - not subject to *janma, jaraa, vyaadhi, mrithyu* etc. (i.e. not influenced by time / beyond time) and

- अद्वयं - non- dual (not a localized individual, and, therefore, not conditioned by space also / beyond space)
- ब्रह्म - (and, therefore only) the Infinite *Brahman*,

Even though this is the fact about 'myself':

- कोटिशःपरिकल्प्यते - is misconceived in crores of wrong forms,

Kotisa: - variously / in numerous ways; *parikalpyathe* - is imagined /misconceived.

- कुबुद्धिभिः - by people with confused intellect , who lack the *saasthra chakshu:* / who are spiritually blind / who are *ajanaana thimiraandhaa:*,

The use of the word '*kotisa:*', is significant. As long as I do not know, that, 'I' am the *asangha saakshi*, I tend to look upon 'myself' as *sangavaan*, i.e. as related to the world. The relationless 'I' is seen as a 'relative'; and the moment I look upon myself as a relative, I will have hundreds of designations, in relation with every person / object in the universe – father / husband and so on.

Verse 8 of *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothraa* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* runs : "*Viswam pasyathi kaarya kaaranathayaa svasvaami sambandhatha: sishyaachaaryathayaa thatthaiva pithruputhraadhyathmanaah bhedhatha: (maayaa paribhraahmitha: purusha:)*"- " (conditioned by *maayaa*, the individual) sees a world of multiplicity – of cause and effect, diversely related as possessor and possession, father and son, as teacher and taught etc."

"For instance, in relation to the house I own, I call myself as the 'owner' of the house. In the same manner, with regard to every entity, I invoke a corresponding relative 'I'; each relative 'I' gives me an adjective; and every relative 'I' is a type of *samsaar'*."

This is the reason why Goudapaadhaachaaryaa, in the 3rd chapter of *Maandookya Kaarika*, defines *mokshaa* as *asparsa yoga:* - the 'untouchable' (detached) stage, exhorting the seeker to become an 'untouchable' (i.e. unattached).

Unfortunately, we do not want to do that, because we feel that there is security in relationship, being '*abhaye bhayadarsina:*' (ones who perceive 'fear', where there is none).

Goudapaadhaachaaryaa laments in this portion (the 3rd chapter) of the *Maandookya Kaarika*: "where one should see bondage, there one sees security; and, where one has to see security, there one sees bondage. The perception is 'successfully' reversed, by this powerful 'ignorance', resulting from the absence of *saasthra chakshu:*" and exclaims "*Aho aascharyam!*"

Sureswaraacharya also remarks, in this verse (93) of the *Naishkarmya Siddhi*: "*Kotisa: parikalpyathe*" – "imagines / misconceives in various manners".

And, for this misconception, he gives the *jaathyandha gaja dhrishtaantha*: /

- **जात्यन्धगजद्रष्ट्या इव** - like the misperception of the elephant by the born-blind people.

In this context, the word '*dhrushti*' would mean 'wrong perception'; *gaja* – elephant; *jaathi andhaa*: - people born blind.

Therefore (because of this misperception), 'I', the *nirguna saakshi*, am now having several *viseshanams* (which, I proudly introduce to people). This is said in the following verses.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 94:

प्रमाणोपपन्नस्यार्थस्यासंभावनात्तदनुकम्पनीयत्वसिद्धिः। तदेतदाह ।

They are to be pitied because they do not see what is established by the sources of valid knowledge. This is said further:

Sureswaraacharya points out that such people deserve our sympathy.

The reason as to why they are to be pitied can be explained as below: Self-ignorance results in misconceptions about the 'self'. Ignorance and misconceptions about anything in the universe (other than the 'Self') may be condoned, since ignorance of and misconceptions about the other things may not be generally very serious ; but, one cannot afford 'ignorance' of the Self and the consequent misconceptions about one's Self , since the Self-ignorance and the consequent misconceptions are the causes of all misery.

In Swami Chinmayaanandha's words: "I AM THE HERO OF MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY; THE QUALITY OF MY LIFE DEPENDS UPON 'WHO I AM'; AND 'WHO I AM' DEPENDS UPON 'HOW I LOOK AT MYSELF'". And, therefore, one thing we cannot afford to live with, is 'self-ignorance, and consequent self-misconceptions'.

More unfortunately, such people, firm in their misconceptions, also resist the teachings of the *Advaita gurus*, who, therefore pity such misguided people (both philosophers and lay-people).

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- **प्रमाण उपपन्नस्य अर्थस्य असंभावनात्** - Since this teaching, which is reinforced by sources of valid knowledge, is considered as an 'impossibility' (by such people),

Pramaana upapannam - reinforced / supported by valid sources of knowledge; *Artham* - teaching.

The 'binary' format teaching is a 'strong rope', reinforced by *sruthi*, *yukthi* and *anubhavaa pramaanaas*, capable of saving the 'sinking' *samsaaris*; but, unfortunately, the format is not accepted by adherents of other philosophies.

Sambhaavanaa - possibility; *Asambhaavanaa* – impossibility.

Non-*advaitins* refuse to believe / trust this teaching; they argue: "How is it possible for me to be *swam*?; I will never claim *soham* ; I shall ever believe that I am *daasa*: (*dasoham*)".

- तद् अनुकम्पनीयत्वसिद्धिः - sympathy results / such people are to be pitied.

Anukampanam - Compassion, pity, sympathy.

The sympathetic *Advaita guru* tells such people : "You may continue with the *dasoham* philosophy/ in the triangular format; but, I shall also continue to stand by your side, repeating my teachings / throwing to you the strong 'rope' of the binary format outlook, to save you from the 'well' of 'ignorance', hoping that, some day or other, if not in this *janma*, at least in some other *janma*, you will resort to the '*soham*' rope, to save yourself".

तद् एतद् आह - This the 'author' is repeating (in the 94th verse).

Chapter II: Verse 94 –

यध्यद्विशेषणं द्रष्टुं नात्मनस्तदनन्वयात् ।

खस्य कुम्भादिवत्तस्मादात्मा स्यान्निर्विशेषणः ॥ ९४ ॥

Nothing that appears as qualitatively determining the Self, does really belong to the Self, as things like a pot appearing as qualifying space do not really belong to space. Therefore the Self is fundamentally unqualified.

Sureswaraacharya says "you can very clearly watch yourself; every time you introduce yourself as a *jeeva*, you have got *jeevathvam*, because of the various adjectives or attributes that you are adding". The adjective / attribute is called *viseshanam*.

And, when I add various attributes or *viseshanams* to 'I' the Consciousness , this 'I' with the *viseshanams*, is called *jeeva*: |

Chaithanyam + viseshanam = jeeva: |

Sureswaraachaarya further points out: "you can yourself observe clearly that each one of these attributes or *viseshanam* is constantly arriving and departing".

Every adjective is a *vyaavruttha viseshanam* not an *anuvruttha viseshanam*.

'*Vyavruttham*' means 'incidental attribute, subject to arrival and departure' and every *viseshanam* is to be understood as *vyavruttham*.

The very fact that they are 'arriving and departing', indicates that they are only incidental and borrowed and not intrinsic. When one claims "I am young" / "I am old" / "I am dying" etc., all these are 'adjectives' borrowed from the incidental body ; "*vaasaamsi jeernaani yathaa vihaaya*" as the Lord expresses in the *Bhagavadh Githa*. Only the incidental body-dress has these adjectives, "which adjectives, 'I' am (wrongly) claiming as 'mine'".

And, what is *anuvruttham*? '*Anuvruttha*' means 'persisting'.

"'I' am', 'I' am' 'I' am'" - this *saakshi chaithanyam* alone is *anuvruttham*. This *anuvruttha* "'I' am" alone is my intrinsic nature.

The word 'I' means '*chaithanyam (chith)*' and the word 'am' means '*sath*'. The *sath-chith* - 'I am' - alone is *anuvruttham*. "*Baalyaadhisvapi jaagradhaadhisu thathaa sarvaasu avasthaasu api vyaavrutthasu anuvarthamaanam aham ithi*" - "In all stages like boyhood etc., in all states like waking etc., similarly in all conditions also 'I' constantly manifests and persists" points out *Shri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* (verse 7).

"'I am a 'waker'" is an incidental attribute, because, the moment I become a 'dreamer', the 'wakerhood' is dropped and the 'dreamerhood' is put on. So also 'sleeperhood' is another adjective. These adjectives being incidental, they are not 'my' intrinsic nature.

Then who am 'I'?

The *Maandookya Upanishad (manthraa 7)* declares: "*Na antha: pragnyam na bahi: pragnyam na ubhayatha:pragnyam na pragnyaana ganam na pragnyam na apragnyam adhrishtam avyavahaaryam agraahyam alakshanam achinthyam avyapadesyam ekaathmaprathyayasaaram prapanchosramam saantham sivam advaitham chathurtham manyanthe sa aathmaa sa vignyeya:*" - "They consider the *Thureeya* to be (that which is) not that outward consciousness, not the inward consciousness, not the consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of consciousness, not the all-knowing consciousness, not unconscious, beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference,

beyond thoughts, beyond description, traceable through the unbroken self-awareness, free from the world, tranquil, auspicious and non-dual. **It is the Self.** It is to be known”.

“Is this (teaching) not evident to you, by your *avasthaathraya anubhavaa* itself? Does not the *avasthaathraya anubhavaa* clearly reveal this fact that every attribute is only incidental and not intrinsic?” asks the *Vedhantic guru*.

And, to convey this, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives the fantastic and popular example of ‘space’. ‘Space’ does not have any attribute of its own; but, nevertheless, is given a name, based on the ‘container’ of the ‘space’; for example, when a pot is created, on the arrival of the pot, the ‘space’ within the pot is given a temporary adjective and is referred to as *ghataakaasa*: | *Ghata*: can never bring about a limitation to ‘space’; still, we give the adjective ‘*ghataa*’ to the ‘space’. If this adjective is ‘intrinsic’ to space, the ‘space’ will be eternally *ghataakaasa*: | On the other hand, once the pot is destroyed, the very same ‘space’ that was in the *ghataa* becomes ‘space’ in the hall (where the pot existed and was later destroyed) and is called *ghoshtaakaasa*: | The very fact, that the adjectives *ghataa*, *pataa*, *ghoshta* etc., are subject to arrival and departure, reveals that ‘*aakaasa: nirviseshana.*’ |

In the same manner, ‘I’ am the *aakaasa-samaana-chaithanyam*, and my ‘body’ is a temporary ‘pot’. When the body is created, ‘I’ (like the *ghataakaasaa*) acquire an identity – a *Brahmanaa*, a *kshakthriyaa*, a *vaisyaa*, a *brahmachaari* etc. and go through the various stages in life - *kaumaaram*, *yuvanam*, *jaraa* - with the adjectives young, old etc. But, in reality, ‘I’ am *nirviseshana*: | Unfortunately, people (other than *advaita vedhaanthins*) do not accept / refuse to accept this evident fact. “Therefore, they deserve our sympathy” says the *Aachaaryaa*.

- **यद् यद् विशेषणं द्रष्टं** – Whatever adjective you add to yourself (whatever attributes are seen / experienced)

Physical attributes (tall, short, fat, thin etc.), *praanamayaa* attributes (thirsty, hungry etc.), *manomayaa* attributes (happy, unhappy, miserable, distressed etc.), *vignyaana mayaa* attributes (confused , clear etc.) and *aananda mayaa* attributes (sleepy etc.) are ‘intimate’ attributes; *karthaa*, *bokthaa*, *pramaathaa* etc. are another type of *viseshanams*; so also husband, wife, in-law etc. are yet another type of attributes.

- **न आत्मनः** - can never be an attribute / adjective of the true Self, the *Saakshi Chaithanyam*

What is the reason?

- **तद् अनन्वयात्** - because the adjective does not persist in me ‘continuously’.

The law is: "What is 'intrinsic' attribute is permanent attribute". An example is the 'heat' of the fire (*agne: oushnyavath*). Since 'heat' is the intrinsic attribute of fire, fire is always hot.

Conversely, whatever is a temporary attribute is not intrinsic, the example being the 'heat' of 'coffee', which becomes 'cold' with time.

'*Ananvayaa*' means 'does not travel with, all the time'.

Even *viswa*, *thajasa* and *pragnyaa* are not my 'intrinsic' attributes; only '*thureeyam*' is my intrinsic nature, because, the others are *ananvayaa* (not persisting). '*Anvaya:*' means 'continuing / persisting / accompanying'.

The 'space' example is given by the *Achaaryaa*.

- **खस्य कुम्भादिवत्** - similar to the 'pot' serving as an adjective of the 'space', within the pot (even though it can never be a 'real' adjective of space)

Kham – *aakaasam*; *kumbham* – pot.

(An incidental note: *Kham* also means *indriyam* or sense organ. In the words *sukham* and *dhu:kham*, *kham* refers to *indriyam*. *Sukham* means 'a stage, in which all sense organs are comfortable' – '*sushtu khaani yasmin thath sukham*' - and similarly, the word *dhu:kham* is arrived at, as '*dhushtaani khaani yasmin thath dhu:kham*').

"'Pot' cannot really serve as an adjective to 'space'" means "the dimensions / conditions of the pot cannot become the dimensions / conditions of the space". Still this sort of usage - applying such adjectives to 'space' - is common; we even use the expression "we have got 'limited' space"; the usage is a blunder or absurdity, since 'space', in reality, can never be limited. Even the galaxies are floating in one undivided / indivisible space. The walls of the pot or the walls of hall, can never really divide or separate 'space'. One may refer to the space outside the hall as 'outside space' and space inside the hall as 'inside space'; but, even where there is the wall, there is 'space' also. The wall cannot 'displace' or 'separate' the space. When thus the space is not divided, how can one talk of 'limited' space within the hall and 'limitless' space elsewhere? These are all only misconceptions.

Just as the pot cannot serve as a 'limiting' adjective of space,

- **आत्मा** - The 'Self'
- **निर्विशेषणः स्यात्** - is free from *viseshanams* or adjectives.

'I' can never be a *jeeva*.; in any of the three periods of time ; one should learn to forget the very adjective *jeevaa* to *athmaa*. As long as one looks upon oneself as a *jeevathmaa*, one cannot escape from the triangular format of *jeeva-jagadh-Isvara* 'well'.

Anvayam of the verse: *Khasya kumbhaadhivath, yadh yadh viseshanam dhrishtam (thadh) thadh, ananvayaath, aathmana: (viseshanam) na (bhavathi) | (Thasmaath) aathmaa nirviseshana: syaath |*

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 95:

अतश्चात्मनो भेदासंस्पर्शो भेदस्य मिथ्यास्वाभाव्यादत आह ।

Therefore, the Self is free from differentiation, for differentiation is of the nature of falsity.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Until now, I established that I am the *asanga saakshi chaithanyam* and the world is *saakshya prapancha*: and because I am *asangha*.; the *saakshya prapancha*: cannot assert itself and make me a *samsaari*. And, since I cannot be a *samsaari*, the question of getting *mokshaa*, becomes irrelevant. (In other words: "I am *asangha saakshi*; the *saakshya prapancha*: cannot give me an adjective / cannot make me a *jeeva* / cannot make me a *samsaari*. And, since I am not a *samsaari*, talking about *mokshaa* has no relevance). This is what I have been saying so far. I will now reinforce this teaching by giving another more powerful reason also".

अतः च - Because of the following additional reinforcing 'booster' argument.

What is that reason?

"Until now, I saw myself as *asangha*: / Now, I am seeing myself as *paaramaarthika sathya*.; who belong to a higher order of reality and the world, from my standpoint, is only *vyaavahaarika sathya*: | And, the world of a different (lower) order of reality cannot give an adjective to 'me', which is of the higher order of reality.

To give an example, the 'dream son' cannot give 'fatherhood' to the 'waker' (say a *brahmachaari / sanyaasi*). Nor can the wealth in a dream make the 'waker' really rich. The 'dream' attributes cannot be that of the 'waker'. *Vedhaantha* refers to this reason cited, using a technical term: '*bhinna satthaa thathvaath*'.

Because 'I' and the world belong to different orders of reality – *aham sathyam jagan mithyaa* - the 'world' cannot affect me.

95. Chapter II, Verse 95 and 96 (19-04-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is doing *aathma-anaathma viveka:*, otherwise called *purusha- prakrithi viveka:* | These two terms are used very much in the *Saankyaa* philosophy also, but with different connotations; therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to establish that the *purusha- prakrithi* of *Vedhanthaa* is totally different from the *purusha- prakrithi* of *Saankyaa*. Even though the words are the same, the concepts are not. The *Achaaryaa* wants to reveal two major differences.

The first difference is that the *Saankyaa* philosopher believes that there are many *purushaas* or *aathmaas* - that every living being has got an independent *aathmaa* and, therefore, *aathmaa* is 'plural'; *purusha- bahuthvam* or *aathma- bahuthvam* is, thus, one of his cardinal principles. Even though the *Saankyaa* philosopher also admits that *aathmaa* is all-pervading, he claims, that, the all-pervading *aathmaa* is many in number. And, since he believes in the plurality of *aathmaa*, he should talk about the differences between the different *aathmaas* ; as, otherwise, obviously, he cannot talk about plurality.

This difference between one *aathmaa* and another, which the *Saankyaa* philosopher talks about, will come under, what is known as, *sajaatheeya bedha:* | '*Sajaatheeya bedha:* 'can be defined as the 'difference between two things, belonging to the same species'; for example, the difference between one tree and another tree or between one body and another or between one fan and another fan etc., will all come under *sajaatheeya bedha:* | In short, differences existing between two members belonging to the same *jaathi* is *sajaatheeya bedha:* |

For the *Saankyaa* philosopher, '*aathma jaathl* is there, because he believes in the existence of several *aathmaas* and therefore, the differences between the different *aathmaas*, that he believes in, is *sajaatheeya bedha:* |

Sureswaraachaarya negated this *sajaatheeya bedha:* in verse 94, by pointing out that since *aathmaa* is free from all attributes and, since differences will have to be talked about in terms of 'attributes' only, one cannot talk about the differences between the attributeless *aathmaas*; i.e. he contended, that, between one *aathmaa* and another *aathmaa*, one cannot talk about differences, because differentiating attributes are not there at all.

The *Achaaryaa* emphasized (in verse 94) '*aathmaa nirviseshana: syaathl* - '*aathmaa* does not have any attributes'. He also gave an example: "just as the enclosures cannot become the attributes of the enclosed space, the enclosing bodies and minds cannot become the attributes of the enclosed *chaitanyam*". Even though we use the expressions *ghata aakaasaa, mata aakaasaa* etc., in which expressions, the *aakaasaa* seems to be qualified by

the enclosures *ghata, mata* etc., those attributes are only 'seeming' attributes of the space; but, in reality, the space does not have *ghata-mataadhi viseshanaani*.

To repeat : Just as the enclosures cannot become the attributes of the enclosed space, even though they *seem* to be qualifying the space, the Consciousness cannot be qualified by the enclosing *kosaas* – the enclosing *annamaya kosaa*, the enclosing *praanamaya kosaa*, the enclosing *manomaya kosaa* etc. Even though several enclosures are there for the *aathmaa*, in the form of *pancha kosaas (pancha kosa roopena)*, none of them can qualify the *aathmaa*, as 'fat' (*annamayakosa* attribute) *aathmaa*, 'hungry' (*praanamayakosa* attribute) *aathmaa*, 'disturbed' (*manomayakosa* attribute) *aathmaa* or 'confused' (*vijnaana mayakosa* attribute) *aathmaa* etc. Even though the *kosaas* 'seem' to qualify the '*kosee aathmaa*', really speaking, Consciousness is attributeless. Therefore, one cannot talk about differentiating attributes between two *aathmaas*; a further corollary of this, is, that, one cannot also count the *aathmaas*, as *aathmaa 1, aathmaa 2* etc., as there are no distinguishing attributes. Enclosures may be many; but, *aathmaa* is 'one'. As the Lord says, in the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*Kshethragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarva kshekthreshu Bhaaratha*", "*sarva boothastham aathmaanam, sarva bhoothaani cha aathman*" etc.

Thus, in verse 94, Sureswaraacharya dismissed *sajaatheeya bedhaa*; and also *aathma bahuthvam* – 'plurality of *aathmaa*', both convictions of the *Saankhya* philosopher.

And, now, in this particular *sloka* (verse 95), Sureswaraacharya is dismissing *vijaatheeya bedhaa* between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. *Sajaatheeya bedhaa* is 'difference between one *aathmaa* and another *aathmaa*'; now, the *Aacharya* is demolishing *aathma-anaathma-bedhaa*, which may be termed *vijaatheeya bedhaa*, which *bedhaa* also is believed in, by the *Saankhya* philosopher, because, he believes that there is a real *purushaa* and there is a real *prakrithi* – that, there is real Consciousness and there is real Matter. The difference (if any) between Consciousness and Matter will come under *Vijaatheeya bedhaa*, since Consciousness belongs to *chethana thathvam* and Matter belongs to *achena thathvam* – they do not belong to the same species.

Sureswaraacharya says that even *vijaatheeya bedhaa*, between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* – *dhruk* and *dhrusyam* - is not there.

- अतश्च - (sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 95) - Because of the following reason.

What is the reason?

- मिथ्यास्वाभाव्यात् - Because of the unreal nature (of the Universe) ,

Svaabhaavyam – svaroopam / nature; *mithyaa svaabhaavyam* – unreal nature.

In *Saankyaa* philosophy, the *dhruk* (the Observer) is real and the observed world (*dhruasyam*) is also real and therefore, the difference / distinction between them is also equally real – (*aathmani vijaatheeya bedha: asthi*) |

Sureswaraacharya says: "In *Vedhaanthaa*, 'Observer' is real; but, the 'observed' world is **not** 'real'. And, therefore, the difference is also not real."

The differentiating world being not real, *bedha:* is also not real.

The second difference between *Saankyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa*, is, thus, "*Vijaatheeya bedha: api naasthi*" |

In verse 94, *sajaatheeya bedha nishedhaa* was done and in the 95th verse, *vijaatheeya bedha nishedhaa* is being done.

- भेदस्य - (*mithyaa svaabhaavyaath*) - (Because of the 'unreal' nature) of the Universe and the *vijaatheeya bedhaa* (*Vijaatheeya bedasya mithyaa svaabhaavyaath*),
- आत्मनः भेद असंस्पर्शः - *aathmaa* is free from any differentiation (*sajaatheeya, vijaatheeya, svagatha bedha rahitha:*)

*Chaandoghya Upanishad's 'Sadeva soumya idham agra aaseeth **ekam eva adhvitheeyam**'* (VI.2. 1) may be recollected.

The reason is further elaborated upon in the Verse 95.

Chapter II: Verse 95 –

अवगत्यात्मनो यस्मादागमापायि कुम्भवत् ।

साहंकारमिदं विश्वं तस्मात्तत्स्यात्कचादिवत् ॥ ९५ ॥

This world along with the ego, arises and passes away, like a pot in space, within the Self of the nature of awareness. Hence it is not constitutive of the Self and is subject to negation being a false presentation.

What is the reason?

Vedhaanthaa does not accept the world as real, based on the following course of argument: the world is a product of *aathmaa*; i.e. the world is a *kaaryam*; *kaaryam* is nothing but *naama roopa*; any *kaaryam* / *naama roopa* does not have a substantiality of its own;

therefore, being a *kaaryam* and a mere *nama roopa*, the world cannot be counted as a separate entity.

The popular examples given by *Vedhaantic* teachers are (1) golden ornaments, which cannot be counted as separate from the gold and (2) wooden furniture, which cannot be counted as separate from wood. If a wooden desk and the wood of which it is made, are separate, when the desk is made from the wood, we should have two weights, – one, the weight of the wood and the other, the weight of the desk. But, we do not find two weights; we find that, there is no separate weight for the desk, other than the wood.

Swami Vidhyaaranyaa gives the same argument in his *Anuboothi Prakaasaa*: If a wooden chair is separate from the wood of which it is made, after the creation of the chair from the wood, the weight of the wood should increase, since, previously, wood alone was existing and after the creation of the chair, the wood is still existing and the chair has also come into existence; but, we do not observe any such additional weight. In fact, there is a reduction in weight, when wood is converted into chair (or when gold is converted into ornament), due to wastages (*sedaaram*) in shaping. This conclusively shows that the chair is not separate from the wood but is only *naama-roopakam*, and also that *Kaaryam* being *naama-roopathkamam*, is non-substantial.

In the same manner, the *naama-roopaka* world / *anaathmaa* cannot be counted as separate from *aathmaa*.

- **इदं विश्वं** - This entire universe (*anaathma prapanchaa*)
- **आगमापायि** - is subject to creation and destruction / arrival and departure,

aagamanam – arrival; *apaaya*: - departure.

From where (does the universe arrive)?

- **आत्मनः** - from the *aathmaa* ('I'),

What type of *aathmaa*?

- **अवगति** - which is *chethanam*,

Avagathi: - Awareness / knowledge / *chaithanyam*.

Avagathyaathmana: (*prakaasaath*) *idham viswam aagamaapayi (bhavathi)* /

And, what type of universe?

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to stress: "When the word 'universe' is used, do not look at the external world only; the word should include one's body-mind complex (*sthoola-sookshma-*

sareera- dhvayam) also. Only then, when the world is negated as *mithyaa*, one's own body-mind complex will also be negated as *mithyaa*".

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* adds an important adjective '*saahamkaaram*' to *viswam*.

- **स अहंकारं** - along with the ego (representing the body-mind complex, with the *chidhaabhaasaa*),

All these (the world, the body-mind complex, *chidhaabhaasaa* etc.) should be 'put' into one 'cosmic' basket called *mithyaa*.

Thereafter, i.e., after 'I' is separated from the *mithyaa* universe and the *mithyaa* body-mind complex, one can confidently claim "I have never had any problems in the past; I have no problems now; I will never have any problems in the future also". The 'problems' will also be only *mithyaa*, similar to the universe and the body-mind complex, while 'I' am only the 'illuminator' of all these – *mithyaa* jagath, *mithyaa* body-mind complex and *mithyaa* problems; but, without this conviction (that the world, body-mind complex etc. are all *mithyaa*) , one is even reluctant / hesitant to make the statement "I have no problem", since into the word 'I', has 'sneaked' the body-mind complex.

Idham saahamkaaram viswam aagamaapaayi (bhavathi) |

The *Achaaryaa* gives an example.

- **कुम्भवत्** - just as pots 'emerge' and 'dissolve' in the space, which space itself is not affected by the 'arrival' and 'destruction' of the pots and the seeming limitation caused by the pot.
- **तस्मात्** - Therefore,
- **तद् कचादिवत् स्यात्** - this entire universe is a false appearance like a *kacha*:|

The word '*Kacha*.' literally means a piece of hair; but, in this context, it represents "hair-like visions that appear, when there are certain types of eye-problems". It is common knowledge, that, elderly people 'see' dark spots, because of deterioration of eyesight, due to aging ; the 'dark spots' do not exist in reality, but are only 'false appearances'.

Some people see 'flashes' of light also. Similarly, certain defects in the ear result in 'hearing' non-existent false 'noises'; and, when mountaineers climb high peaks, and reach rarified atmospheres, they experience hallucinations.

A few scientists have contended that the claim of some pilgrims to *Kailash* and *Manasarovar*, that they 'sighted' *devathaas*, is only a result of hallucinations because of the rarified

atmosphere and less supply of oxygen to the brain. Without going into the merits and demerits of the pilgrims' claims and the scientists' contentions, what is relevant is, that, *Vedhaantha* says that the whole world comes under that category of 'hallucinations' caused by the fundamental disease called *ajnaana thimira andha:* /

'Kacha:', in this context, means 'mithyaa pratheethi:' | (*Pratheethi:* meaning 'conviction' / 'belief').

The whole universe is *mithyaa pratheethi:* - hallucination.

What a powerful statement by the *Achaaryaa* : "the world is only an 'appearance' caused by *avidhya*" !

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 96 :

सर्वस्यैव अनुमानव्यापारस्य फलमियदेव यद्विवेकग्रहणम् । तदुच्यते ।

This discrimination alone is the consummation of the whole operation of ratiocination. This is stated in the following:

Sureswaraacharyaa says: "Therefore, we do agree with the *saankyaa* philosopher that, the initial process of spiritual *saadhana* is *aathma-anaathma-viveka* or *dhruk-dhrusya- viveka*. In the initial stages, we also do not discuss whether the *dhrusyam* is *sathyam* or *mithyaa*. We postpone that topic for later analysis. Initially, we join the *saankyaa* philosopher and talk about *dhruk-dhrusya-viveka*. And, after this *viveka* is done, we go to the next stage, "I' am the *dhruk*; everything else is *dhrusyam* and this *dhrusyam* happens to be *mithyaa* also.' Thus, we come to the binary format – in which, the *sathyam* 'I' and the *mithyaa* universe – only these two are there. (In fact, going a step further, we cannot even count as 'two' also, because, the second one is *mithyaa*.)

Therefore, Sureswaraacharyaa says " *sathya-anritha-viveka* (real and unreal differentiation) alone is *Vedhaantha*".

- सर्वस्यैव अनुमानव्यापारस्य फलं – The result of all this process of enquiry

'*Anumaana vyaapara:*' means 'process of enquiry'. Here, '*anumaana*' means '*anvaya-vyathireka* logic' (which logic was discussed in an earlier session) – "Whatever is incidental, is not 'my' real nature; whatever is intrinsic alone is 'my' real nature. Going by this reasoning, the expression "I' am" is the only intrinsic nature, because, from birth to death "I' and 'am' " continue without break, 'I' meaning *chith* and 'am' meaning *sath*. That alone is *anvaya:*; whereas, 'I am a boy ; I am an youth; I am old; I am sick ; I am disturbed' etc. – such attributes are only *vyaavruttham*; even *avasthaa-thrayam* is *vyaavruttham*." This

argument is called *anumaana vyaapara*: - *anuvruttha-vyaavruttha-vichaara*: - enquiry about the 'intrinsic' and the 'incidental'. This enquiry is presented in the *Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram* in the beautiful verse: "*Baalyaadishvapi jaagradhaadhishu thathaa sarvaavasthaasvapi vyaavrutthaasu anuvarthamaanam aham ithi antha: spurantam sadhaa*" – "all experiences (stages in life, states like *jaagrath* etc.) are *vyaavruttham* (incidental); the only *anuvruttham* (intrinsic) is "I am"; that alone is un-negatable.

Therefore, "*yath abaahyam thath sathyam; yath anuvruttham thath sathyam; yath vyavruttham, baahyam thath mithyaa*". This is called *anumaana vyaapaara*: / Another name (for this) is *anvaya – vyathireka – vichaara*: / (Yet) another name is *anuvruttha-vyaavruttha-vichaara*: |

- **यद् एव** - is only this much :

What is the result?

- **यद् विवेकग्रहणम्** - which (result) is nothing but discriminative understanding

The distinct understanding is, that, "I am *sathyam* and whatever 'I' experience is *mithyaa*; therefore, 'I' can never be touched by whatever 'I' experience".

Then what is the purpose of being presented with these experiences? For 'entertainment' (so, would a *jnaani* consider them).

"By forgetting my nature, I convert life into a struggle and by remembering my nature, I convert life into a sport / entertainment" is a maxim (the fifth 'capsule', in Swamiji's 'Five Capsules of *Vedhanthad*' – a list of *Vedhaanthic* facts highlighted by Swamiji as a 'group').

तदुच्यते - That is being said here (in verse 96).

Chapter II: Verse 96 –

बुद्धेरनात्मधर्मत्वमनुमानात्प्रसिद्ध्यति ।

आत्मनोऽप्यद्वितीयत्वमात्मत्वादेव सिद्ध्यति ॥ ९६ ॥

Reasoning establishes that the mind is not the attribute of the Self. The oneness of the Self is established by the very fact of its being the Self.

As a result of this *anuvruttha-vyaavruttha-vichaara*:, we dismiss the entire world as *vyavruttham* / *dhrusyam* / *mithyaa* and in this, is included, the very *buddhi* or *sookshma sareeram* also, because, that is also *dhrusyam* and *vyavruttham*. During *sushupthi*, I do not experience *buddhi* and I do not use *buddhi* as an instrument; only in *jaagrath avasthaa*, I

experience *buddhi* and also use *buddhi* as an instrument for experiencing the world. An example (for *buddhi*) is a pair of spectacles, which the user 'experiences' and through the spectacles, he also 'experiences' other objects and people. The spectacles are 'seen' and 'used' when needed ; but, are subject to removal also. Extending this logic, *buddhi* is also *vyavruttham* / *dhrusyam* / *mithyaa*.

Therefore, the *Aacharyaa* says:

- **बुद्धे :अनात्म धर्मत्वम्** - The *anaathmaa* / *mithyaa* / *dhrusyam* status of the *buddhi*

Buddhi: (intellect) indicates the entire *sookshma sareeram*, which is an object and therefore *mithyaa*.

- **अनुमानात् प्रसिद्ध्यति** - is established / corroborated by enquiry (*anuvruttha- vyaavruttha- vichaara* / *anvaya-vyathireka-tharkaa*).

Prasidhyathi – is established / corroborated.

- **आत्मन :अद्वितीयत्वम् अपि सिद्ध्यति** - Non-duality of *aathmaa* is also established,

Once you have separated the *anaathmaa* and negated the *anaathmaa* as *mithyaa*, then *aathmaa* automatically becomes non-dual or *advitheeyam*.

Here, Sankaraacharya makes a technical point. He says: "The non-duality of *aathmaa* cannot be taken as an attribute of *aathmaa*" - just as *nirgunathvam* should not be taken as an attribute of *aathmaa*. This *Advaitic* belief – *aathma nirgunathvam* - is disputed by *Visishtaadvaitins*. When the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* states that *aathmaa* is *nirguna*: / *nirvikalapa*: etc., the *Visishtaadvaitin* argues "then, *aathmaa* has got the attributes of *nirgunathvam* / *nirvikalpathvam* etc." In the same manner, some people argue that the non-duality of *aathmaa* is an attribute of *aathmaa*. Sureswaraacharya says: "No, it is **not** an attribute of *aathmaa*, which I will prove by looking into *aathma*; because, if non-duality is an attribute of *aathmaa*, it has to be proved by a *pramaanam*. And, if the attribute has to be proved by a *pramaanam*, then the *aathmaa* itself should be available for the *pramaanam*; in that case, the *aathmaa* will become an object of the *pramaanam* (which it can never be). Therefore, *aathmaa's* nature is non-duality and upon the non-duality nature of the *aathmaa*, duality is super-imposed (because of *avidhyaa*). What we (the *Advaitins*) are doing, is, that, we are only negating the super-imposed duality through knowledge. Then, what is left behind is the non-dual *aathmaa*, which non-duality is not an attribute that comes and goes".

The non-duality of the *aathmaa*, the *Aacharyaa* says, is established because of its very nature:

- आत्मत्वादेव (सिद्ध्यति) - (is established) because of its very nature.

There is another way of looking at it also – a simpler way. *Aathmaa* always has to be non-dual; one need not establish the non-duality of *aathmaa*; because, suppose one says 'there is a second *aathmaa*', the *Advaitic Aacharya* will question 'how do you know?' The *poorva pakshin* has to give an explanation, that he had known the second *aathmaa* by such and such means (the 'means' need not bother the student). The *Advaitic Aacharya's* response to the *poorva pakshin's* explanation will be: "The moment you say that you 'know' the second *aathmaa*, the second *aathmaa* will become *anaathmaa* – since, the second *aathmaa* (according to you) is 'known' and what is 'known' can only be an object i.e., it is no more the 'subject'; being not the 'subject', it can never be called *aathmaa*". To repeat: "The moment you count a second *aathmaa*, that *aathmaa* becomes 'known'; once it is 'known', it is an 'object'; once it is an 'object', it is not a 'subject'; and once it is not a 'subject', it is no more *aathmaa*; it has become *anaathmaa*." Therefore, *Aathmaa* being the 'subject', it has to be non-dual only; the logic being 'because it is the subject'.

The use of the term *aathmathvaadeva* (in this verse) implies: The 'subject' because of its very 'subjecthood' has to be non-dual only; one can never count the second 'subject', because the moment one counts the second 'subject', it is no more a 'subject', but an 'object' (and therefore *anaathmaa*) ; therefore, *aathmaa* is always matchless. "I am non-dual" *ithi sidhyathi*.

96. Chapter II, Verse 96 and 97 (07-06-2008)

A methodology of teaching employed in *Vedhaantha* is called *adhyaaropa-apavaadha-nyyaaya*: | The word '*adhyaropa*' is translated as 'superimposition' and the word '*apavaadaa*' is translated as 'negation' or 'sublation'. Thus, the term '*adhyaaropa-apavaadha-nyyaaya*.' would mean the 'method of superimposition and negation'. We can also understand it as 'the method of introducing an idea in the beginning and later, withdrawal of the same very idea, in the latter part of the teaching'.

In fact, the whole *vedhaantic* teaching and *saadhana* involve this 'introduction of ideas and withdrawal of those very same ideas'. Both together will lead to the desired benefit and therefore, both of them are important and complementary. *Adhyaaropaa* is incomplete without *apavaadaa* and *apavaadhaa* is irrelevant without *adhyaaropaa*. And, since both of them are important and complimentary, this '*adhyaaropa-apavaadha-nyyaaya*.' is a deliberate method used. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa points out in his *Bhagavadh Githa Bhashyam* (Chapter XIII): "*Adhyaaropa-apavaadhaabhyaam nishprapancham prapanchyathe sishyaanaam sukha bodhaartham thathvagnyai: kalpitha: krama:*" |

If this fact, that, this methodology is deliberately employed by *Vedhaanthic* teachers, is not understood, the *Vedhaanthic* teachings may appear as a 'bundle of contradictions'. But, it is not so; and, this deliberate methodology is used, because of the uniqueness of the subject matter.

This idea of 'introduction and withdrawal' is sometimes done explicitly – the teacher himself openly / directly/ clearly saying "I have introduced this before and I am now deliberately negating it". An example is "talking about creation in the beginning and later saying 'there is no creation at all'".

But, sometimes, this 'introduction and withdrawal' is not explicitly done by the teacher; it is presented implicitly, in an indirect manner, due to various reasons. When, thus, this 'introduction and withdrawal' is done by the teacher, in an indirect manner, it should be the skill of the student, to understand what has been introduced and subsequently negated.

One example is that of the very *mokshaa* itself. In the beginning of the *Vedhaanthic* teaching, the teacher introduces *mokshaa* as a conditional event. Several conditions are prescribed for *mokshaa* to 'happen' or to 'take place'. The primary *Vedhaanthic* treatise *Thathva Bodha* starts with the declaration "*saadhana chathushtaya sampanna adhikaarinaam moksha saadhanaboortham thathva viveka prakaaram vakshyaama:*" – i.e., '*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*' is introduced as the 'qualification' – 'primary condition'

for the *Vedhaanthic* journey. Thereafter also, almost every *Vedhaanthic* text highlights *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and even declares "if *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not there, a student will not gain knowledge and *mokshaa*; if *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is there, then alone, a seeker will attain *mokshaa*."

For example, in *Viveka Choodaamani*, *anvaya-vyathireka* logic is used: "*saadhanaan yathra chathwari kathithaani maneeshibhi: yeshu sathveva sannishta yadhabhaave na siddhyath!*" – "Great sages have spoken of four qualifications in the presence of which, success in the realization of *Brahman* is achieved and in the absence of which the Goal is not gained" (Verse 18), clearly declaring "If *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is there, there is *mokshaa*; in its absence, there is no *mokshaa*".

Thus, the student, in the initial stages, receives the strong idea / impression that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a compulsory condition for liberation. This is an idea conveyed to the student by the *Vedhaanthic* scriptures and teachers, during what can be called the *adhyaropa-kaalaa* - the *adyaropa* phase of teaching - the first stage of teaching. But, later, when the teaching progresses, when a shift is made to the second stage, from *adhyaropa* to *apavaadaa* / the triangular format to binary format, *Vedhaantha* wants to refute the very same idea and reveal the fact that *mokshaa* is not a conditional event. Whatever has been taught to the seeker over a number of years, through several *Vedhaanthic* texts, is reversed by the *saasthraas* and the teachers; who, in the advanced stages of teaching, assert '*mokshaa* is not a conditional event; but is your very nature / *svaroopam*'. Whatever is *svaroopam*, is unconditional; for example, when it is said that 'heat' is the *svaroopam* of fire, the message that is conveyed, is, that, the 'heat' is *in* fire and the heat in the fire, is not based on any particular condition – *sarva deseshu, sarva kaaleshu, sarvaasu avasthaasu api agni: ushna: eva bhavathi*.

Thus, when the teacher says "*thath thvam asi*", the *apavaadaa* of the former idea (*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* condition) is done- what the teacher says is "*mokshaa* is your nature" i.e. "*mokshaa* is an unconditional fact", which means that you are a *nithya muktha svaroopam*, which further means that no condition is involved in claiming 'I am *muktha*.'

Then what about *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* condition? A student during the *apavaadaa* stage of teaching / the binary format stage, should understand that even *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not a condition that determines his liberation. If 'conditions' have to determine one's 'liberation', than 'liberation' cannot be one's *svaroopam*. But, on the other hand, *Vedhaantha* struggles to reveal that *mokshaa* is every one's *svaroopam*. And, therefore, every seeker should go through the second phase of teaching, termed *apavaadaa* stage, and when he shifts from 'triangular' format to 'binary' format, he

has to practice this *nidhidhyaasanam* "saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi is also not a condition for liberation; mokshaa is not a conditional event".

And, in *nidhidhyaasanam*, he has to further repeatedly assert to himself "I will never hesitate to claim my liberation, by saying that I lack *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*"; this aspect is being stressed, because, the problem, very often, of the student is, that, he eternally continues to believe and plead "I am not liberated since I am not yet *saadhana chathushtaya sampanna*:"|

This is an eternal 'excuse' for the postponement of liberation; every seeker should get out of this 'trap' one day or the other. '*Saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*' condition is a trap. It is, of course, initially required - it is useful at the *adhyaropaa* stage; but, after a reasonable period (which may vary from student to student) of *Vedhaanthic* learning, the seeker should not for ever continue in the *adhyaropaa* stage; but, move to the *apavaadhaa* stage. Therefore, the *nidhidhyaasnam* in the binary format is: "I am unconditionally liberated; *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is **not** at all a condition for liberation. I have to deliberately remove the misconception that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a condition for liberation".

This does not mean that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is useless. It has got utility in various other fields, including worldly transactions – in the *vyaavahaarika* plane also. The *Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaas* do not rule out or negate the utility of *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* totally; but, they do negate *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as a 'condition' for liberation, even though *saasthraas* themselves present *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as a condition, in the initial stages of *Vedhaanthic* teachings. The seeker should realize that this is true only at the *adhyaropaa* or triangular format stage; but, during the *apavaadhaa* / binary format stage, the seeker should regularly practice "I am free *aathmaa*, irrespective of the *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* conditions of the mind".

This is the reason that Sureswaraachaaryaa writes several (96) verses, struggling to separate 'me' from 'my mind and its conditions'. *Saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is only an attribute of the mind. What the *Aachaaryaa* wants the seeker to derive from his treatise *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, is the conviction: "I' am different from the mind; 'I' am not even connected to the mind; and the conditions of the mind can never determine 'my' freedom. *Asangoham ! Asangoham ! Nithya muktha svaroopoham!*".

Therefore, whenever the *saasthraas* dwell upon *Saakshi Chaithanyam* as *asangha aathmaa*, different from the mind, what the seeker should understand is that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* has nothing to do with the fact : "I' was free / 'I' am free / 'I' will ever be free'. This (understanding) is called *vipareetha bhaavanaa nivritthi*, the *viphareetha bhaavanaa*, in

this context, being the belief that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a condition for liberation. Of course, it is an unique *vipareetha bhaavanaa* created by *saasthraa* itself. Most other *vipareetha bhaavanaas* are developed by the individual ; but, this is an *adhyaaropa vipareetha bhaavanaa* promoted by *saasthraa* itself - similar to *Brahman's kaaranathvam*, which is also an idea, first presented by the *saasthraa*, which *saasthraa* itself , later, negates the very same idea that *Brahman* is a *kaaranam*. *Brahman's Kaaranathvam* is an 'introduced' *vipareetha bhavanaa*, subsequently negated. In the same manner, '*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* qualification' is a deliberate *vipareetha bhaavanaa* introduced during 'triangular' format stage; when the seeker moves to the 'binary' format, the seeker has to deliberately get out of this *vipareetha bhaavanaa* and claim to be a *muktha*; deficiencies in *saadhana chathushtaya samapatthi* cannot be an 'excuse' to believe or declare otherwise.

Sureswaraachaarya is struggling to establish this.

The terms '*Buddhe: anaathma dharmathvam*' and '*aathmana: api adhvitheeyathvam*' (in verse 96) convey the teaching: "I' am the non-dual *aathmaa* not connected to the mind and its qualifications; why should I connect those conditions with my liberation?" One can try to improve one's mind to a better condition, for the benefit of others or the world. That is a different issue. But, one should never connect that (the condition of one's mind) to one's 'liberation'.

That's why, in (*Swami Vidyaaranyaa's*) *Panchadasee*, it is said "for a *jnaani* (the practitioner of the 'binary' format) *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a 'hobby' that he enjoys; which he never connects to his 'liberation'".

In brief: *Adyaaropaa* is "*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a condition for liberation", while *apavaadhaa* is "*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is **not** a condition for liberation".

But, the *apavaadhaa* teaching is only for advanced and mature seekers / students, even to whom, it is not explicitly declared that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not a condition for liberation. The message is implicit from the teaching "*Mokshaa* is 'your' nature". By saying this, the teacher indirectly negates *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* as a 'condition' for liberation.

Hereafter, Sureswaraachaarya proceeds to negate another type of idea, that is introduced in the beginning stage of teaching and which will have to be negated in the later stages—another *adhyaaropa-apavaada-nyaaya*: /

What is that (idea)? The very definition of *mokshaa*. The definition of *mokshaa*, which is given in the beginning stages of *Vedhaanthic* teaching is a provisional definition – an

adhyaropa definition. In the later stages of learning, the student has to drop *that* concept of *mokshaa*.

And, what is that initial (provisional) definition of *mokshaa*? When the student is initially in the triangular format of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, how does *Vedhaanthaa* introduce *mokshaa*? It cannot talk based on binary format, i.e. on the basis that 'the student is *Brahmar*' (since the student is yet to be prepared for receiving this teaching). Therefore, *Vedhaanthaa* gives a modified, provisional definition. It introduces the world as a source of sorrow and suffering and introduces *Isvara* as a source of *aanandaa* and peace – that "I am a *jeeva*; there is a *jagath*, which is the source of sorrow; there is an *Isvara*, who is the source of *aananda*; I am, now, trapped in this world of suffering i.e. in *samsaara* ; my aim is to run away / escape from this world of *janma-mrithyu- jaraa vyaadhi-dhu:kha dosha anudarsanam* and 'rush to' *Bhagavaan* who will give me solace and comfort".

Thus, 'running away from the world and running towards God' / 'escaping from the world and reaching the Lord' is considered as *mokshaa*, in the initial stages of *Vedhaanthic* teaching.

In verse 15, Ch. VIII, *Shrimadh Bhagavadh Githa*, ("*Maam upedhya punarjanma dhu:khaalayam asaasvatham naapnuvanthy mahaathmaana: samsiddhim paramaam gathaa.*" – " Having reached Me, those great souls do not take rebirth, which is an ephemeral abode of misery. They have attained the highest goal"), Lord Krishna Himself declares "in *mokshaa*, you will come to Me; thereafter you will not go back to *dhu:khaalayam* – the world of suffering".

Thus, the initial definition of *mokshaa* is a 'great escape', in which approach, a number of *adhyaropa* misconceptions are involved: that (1) World is 'suffering' (2) I must run away from the world (3) *Isvara* is somewhere else, away from this world (4) I have to go to *Isvara's* abode – *Vaikunta* or *Kailasa* etc.

As the student advances in his study and his understanding of *Vedhaanthaa*, he should negate these misconceptions - the *adhyaropaa* wantonly introduced by *Vedhaantha*. The advanced seeker has to, deliberately get rid of these misconceptions, which process has two steps.

The first transformation is prescribed in the *Viswaroopa Darsana Yoga* of the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "Understanding that the world is not 'sorrow'; but is *Bhagavaan's viswaroopa*".

It follows from this prescription that 'escaping' from the world is akin to 'escaping' from the presence of the *Viswaroopa Isvara*. 'Studying this chapter of the *Githa* and as a

consequence, accepting the world as *Viswaroopa Isvara'* and, at the same time 'praying for *piravaa varam* (boon for avoidance of re-birth in this world)' is a contradiction.

The seeker, therefore, as a second transformation, should get out of the obsession of 'escaping from the world', realizing that the world is not 'sorrow' or 'harrowing', but is a holy *Viswaroopa* of the Lord.

In this later stage, the seeker should further change his attitude to 'looking at' the world, as *mithyaa naama roopaa*. The world is not a horrifying factor; but is a holy *viswaroopa* and *mithyaa naama roopaa*.

The necessity of 'running away' from the world, therefore, does not arise at all. The advanced seeker should deliberately get out of the ideas "I should not have *punar janma*; I should not come back to this world again etc.", by practicing the *nidhidhyaasanam* "I am not afraid of the world; I am not anxious to 'escape' from the world, since the world is not 'sorrow' – it is not *dhu:khaalayam*".

Not only is there, thus, any need for an advanced seeker to 'escape' from the world ; but also , if the seeker is assimilating the teaching '*aham brahma asmi*', he should know that he **cannot** also 'escape' from the world - the very idea of 'escape' springs from the misconception that one has of oneself, as a 'finite' mind or *chidhaabhaasaa*. Whereas, in the 'binary' format stage, the seeker knows that he is the all-pervading *adhishtaanam* of the world – "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh brahma advayam asmi aham*" – "everything is born of 'me', is established in 'me' and resolves in 'me' ; 'I' am that non-dual *Brahman*" as the *Kaivalya Upanishad* (verse 19) declares.

"*Mithyaa naama roopaa* is depending on 'Me' for its very existence; if 'I' go away, the very drama of the world cannot continue; the eternal show of *srishti - sthithi - laya* continues in 'Me'. 'I' am providing the 'screen' for the world-show to go on. Why should 'I' go away and, in fact, how can 'I' go away? Therefore, *mokshaa* is not 'escaping from the world'. I should meditate on the fact that the world is in 'me'; and, let it be in 'me' because *mithyaa-naama-roopa* cannot 'touch' 'me', the *asangha aathmaa*".

"Therefore, why should I pray "O! Lord! I should not come back. Do not give me any more *janmaas*."

But, it is also a fact, that, most devotional songs in almost all the Indian languages, in the name of *bakthi* and prayer, contain the strain: "I am suffering. O! Lord! I want to 'escape' from this world of suffering". This idea is so deeply entrenched, that, quite often, even an

advanced student of *Vedhaanthaa*, with long years of *Vedhaanthic* study behind him, and quite eager to practice the 'binary' format, tends to pray "O! Lord! This must be my last *janma*", which prayer only indicates that *apavaadhaa* has not taken place, the student preferring to permanently remain in the *adhyaropa* stage. The seeker *should* 'cap' the teaching with *apavaadhaa* and develop the attitude "I do not want to escape from the world; *mokshaa* is not an 'escape'". Even if there is an 'escape', it is an 'escape' from the misconception of 'escape'.

"I will never say 'I want freedom from *punarjanma*, because, 'I', *Brahman*, do not have any *janma*; 'I' am the *adhishtaanam* in which the *janma*, *vrutthi*, *parinathi* etc. of the universes go on." What a vision! The seeker should assimilate this vision; and if he has to assimilate this vision, he should negate the two ideas (1) '*saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is a condition for *mokshaa*' and (2) 'I want to escape from this world'.

To sum up: (1) the world is holy *Viswaroopa Isvara* and therefore, one should not have the **desire** to run away from the world, as it is akin to running away from *Isvara* (2) the world is only *mithyaa-naama-roopaa* and since *mithyaa-naama-roopa* cannot affect me in any manner, there is no **need** for me to run away from the world and (3) since 'I' am the *sarvagatha Brahman*, who, in fact, is the *adhishtaanam* for the world, there is no **possibility** also of escaping from the world.

The 'escapist' idea belongs to *saamkhya* philosophy and is only temporarily 'borrowed' by *Vedhaanthaa*.

Therefore, in the following section, Sureswaraacharya says: "It is the *saamkyaa* philosophy, which talks about *mokshaa* as 'escaping from *prakrithi*'."

For the *saamkyaa* philosopher, *purushaa* is 'real', *prakrithi* is also 'real', duality is 'real', *purusha's* association with *prakrithi* is 'real' and *mokshaa* is 'getting separated from *prakrithi*'. Towards this purpose, the *saamkyaa* philosopher wrongly quotes the *Upanishad vaakyam*: "*ajaamekaam lohithasuklakrishnaam bahveem prajaam janayantheegum saroopaam | ajo hi eko jushamaanonusethe jahaathyenaam bhukthabhoghaamajonya*:" (*Mahaa Naarayana Upanishad: Dahara Vidhyaa*), and says *prakrithi sambhandha* is *bhandhaa* (bondage) and 'getting away from *prakrithi*' is *mokshaa* (liberation).

This topic is analyzed in *Brahmasoothra* – in an *adhikaranam* called *chamakaadhikaranam* (Ch. I – 4th *Paadhaa*) - wherein *Vyasaacharya* refutes the idea of 'escape' from *prakrithi* and establishes "we need not 'escape' from *prakrithi*; we need not escape from the world, because world is *mithyaa* and 'I' am the *adhishtaanam*; let this continue; why should I worry about the presence or absence of the bodies, the minds and the world?"

Sureswaraacharya analyzes the same topic in the following portion.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 97:

यद्यपि अयं ग्रहीत्रुग्रहणग्राह्यग्रहीतितत्फलात्मकः :आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तः :संसारः :अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां अनात्मतया निर्माल्यवत् अपविद्ः ।

Though this world beginning with Brahma down to the lowest creature, consisting of the knower, the means of knowing, the object of knowledge, the knowing itself and the emergent knowledge, is determined to be other than the Self, by reasoning and is thus discarded like a garland no longer fresh....

Sureswaraacharya says: "the type of teaching that we have employed, is parallel to the *saamkyaa* methodology of teaching, which is in the form of *purusha-prakrithi-viveka*: - i.e., "I' am the *purusha*: - *aathmaa*; the body-mind-complex and the world are *anaathmaa* or *prakrithi*; they are mixed up together; through this *purusha-prakrithi - viveka*: (analysis), I am to understand that I am *purusha*: and everything else is *prakrithi*".

Up to this, there is no difference between *saamkyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa*. (In the 13th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa* also – verse 20 – is the declaration of the Lord: "*Prakruthim purusham chaiva viddhi anaadhi ubhau ap*" – "May you know both *Prakrithi* and *Purushaa* to be without a beginning.")

But, the problem with *saamkyaa* is, that, *saamkyaa* considers *purushaa* and *prakrithi* to be *equally* real and that, therefore, *mokshaa* requires 'escaping' from the body-mind-complex. That is why (i.e. based on this approach) people want to avoid *punar-janma*; if I say 'I want to avoid *punar-janma*', it is obvious that I believe 'by coming into the body, I am facing the world; by avoiding the body I will escape from the world'.

This idea of 'escape' comes from attributing 'reality' to the world. Sureswaraacharya points out: "On the other hand, *Vedhaanthaa* says 'Let the world continue; still I am free. Let the body continue; still I am free. Let another body come; still I am free. Let the mind continue; still I am free. Let *raagha dveshaa* continue; still I am free. The whole thing is a *mithyaa* drama. Why do you want to escape? Understand that everything is *mithyaa*. Other than this understanding, no other freedom is required "".

The desire to 'escape' from the world is similar to the fear and anxiety of a person, to run away from the 'rope-snake' (a snake wrongly perceived in a rope). The *Acharya* wants to point out the 'folly' in this approach: "why do you want to run away from the rope-snake?"

Unfortunately, in spite of repeated appeals of the *guru*, the seeker is unable to get out of his misconceptions. And, that is why, the *guru* is expected to be compassionate and understanding, as he has to keep repeating his teachings without getting tired or impatient. "Ahethuka dhayaasindhu: bhandhu: aanamathaam sathaam" – "An ocean of mercy that needs no cause for its expression and an intimate friend of those who have surrendered to him" is the description of such a *guru* given by *Shri Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* (in *Viveka Choodaamani* – verse 33).

Sureswaraachaaryaa, being such a compassionate teacher says:

- अयं संसारः - This *samsaaraa*,

Samsaaraa should be translated as 'this *so-called* (not true) suffering'.

- आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तः - beginning from *Brahma-lokaa* to a blade of grass,

Brahma - refers to *chathurmuka Brahma* and his *loka*; *Sthambha* - a blade of grass.

The term '*aabrahmastahmbha paryantha:*' would mean 'all the *lokaas* and all the *sareerams*', which consist of the well-known *thriputi* – *pramathha*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*.

The entire world can be reduced into either 'duality' or to a 'triad'. When the world is reduced to 'duality', it is to be understood as 'consisting of subject and object'. When the world is defined as *thriputi*, it should be taken as consisting of 'subject, object and the instrument, which links the two'.

- *Dvaitham* - Subject and object.
- *Thriputi* - Subject, object and instrument.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- ग्रहीत्रु - (consisting of) the *Pramaathaa* (the Subject),
- ग्रहणं - the *Pramaanam* (the instruments of knowledge, which include the sense- organs , mind etc and also *prathyakshaa*, *upamaanaa* etc.)
- ग्राह्यं – the *Prameyam* (the object of knowledge)

Sureswaraachaaryaa includes a fourth one also – *ग्रहीतितत्पलात्मकः* |

The `that' after *graheethi* and preceding *palaathmaka:* may, in fact, be deleted, to give a better reading *graheethipalaathmaka: |*

- **ग्रहीतिपलात्मकः** - (and) the consequence in the form of knowledge or experiences (in other words, *prama*),

Graheethi: - **knowledge / experiences born out of the above *thriputi:***
***Palaathmaka:* - Consequence**

All these four (*pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *anubhava:*) put together is called '*samsaara:*'|

This *samsaara:*

- **अपविद्धः** - has been negated (by me, in these previous 96 verses),

All the four - *Pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramithi:* - have been negated.

Pramaathaa is the *ahamkaara:* or *chidhabhaasa;* *pramaanam* means the mind, sense organs etc.; *prameyam* means 'the world'.

All were negated by,

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां - by applying the method of *anvaya* and *vyathirekkaa,* /method of *anuvruttham* and *vyaavruttham,*

Vyathirekkaa means 'that, which is temporary – subject to arrival and departure' and *anvaya* means 'that, which is not subject to arrival and departure'.

'I', the *saakshi,* am *anvaya:*, changelessly present, whereas *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* are subject to arrival and departure.

As the student may recollect, *Maandookya Upanishad* avers: In *jaagrath avasthaa*, the *pramaathaa* is *viswaa;* in *svapnaa avasthaa*, the *pramaathaa* is *thyjasaa;* and in *sushupthi avasthaa*, the *pramaathaa* is *praagnyaa.* *Viswaa*, *Thyjasaa* and *praagnyaa* 'come and go', as and when the *avasthaas* 'come and go'; whereas 'I' am the *thureeyam*, the non-arriving and non-departing 'Witness' of the three *avasthaas.*

Thus, *avasthaathraya saakshi* is *purusha:*, by *anvayaa;* *avasthaathrayam* is *prakrithi,* by *vyathirekkaa.* (This has already been established).

Like what? A beautiful example is given by the *Aachaaryaa*.

निर्माल्यवत् - similar to *nirmaalyam*,

'*Nirmaalyam*' is an expression used in the ritualistic field, especially in the context of temples. Flowers offered to the Lord during the course of a Puja are removed the next day. The faded flowers, thus removed, are called '*nirmaalyam*'. And, when the *nirmaalyam* is removed, a *darshan* of the idol without any *upaadhi* – *nirupaadhika Isvara darsanam* is had. That's why *nirmaalya darsnam* is considered to be sacred, since it is equivalent to 'seeing' the *nirguna Brahman*.

In the same manner, 'I' am '*Isvara*' and the *avasthaa thrayam*, *sareera thryam*, *guna thrayam* etc. are the fading *prakrithi* – *anaathmaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa removes the *prakrithi*, *nirmaalyavath*. How?

अनात्मतया - as *anaathmaa*.

Now what is left behind?

'I', the *purushaa*, is left behind.

97. Chapter II, Verse 97 (14-06-2008)

In this important portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that the *aathma-anaathma-viveka-vichaaraa* of *Vedhaanthaa*, is very similar to that of the *Saamkayaa* philosophy; but, with a difference; the difference is that *Saamkyaa* philosophy stops with *aathma-anaathma-viveka:*, whereas, in *Vedhaanthaa*, the journey has to continue further.

In *Vedhaanthaa*, *aathma-anaathma-viveka-vichaaram* is only the first stage of learning, known as *adhyaaropa-prakaranam*. The journey has to continue further and the journey is complete only with *apavaadha prakaranam*. Only after *apavaadhaa*, *anaathma mithyaathvam* is established.

In *Saamkyaa* philosophy, *aathmaa* is real; *anaathmaa* is also equally real. Whereas, in *Vedhaanthaa*, after *apavaadha prakaranam*, we say: "I, the *aathmaa*, am *sathyam* and the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*, consisting of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramaa* – the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *mithyaa*".

Thus, *aathma-anaathma-viveka:* should be converted into *sathya-mithyaa-viveka:* | '*Aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*' must be the conclusion. Only then, the seeker is really shifting from the triangular format to the binary format.

Once the seeker comes to '*aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*' binary format, then alone is he ready, to revise the definition of *mokshaa* itself.

Until the seeker comes to the binary format, the definition of *mokshaa*, which the seeker is given, is only a temporary and provisional definition. In triangular format, the seeker understands *mokshaa*, as "This world is full of suffering; I should escape from this persecuting world, at the earliest, death providing the escape route; but, I should escape from the world in such a manner as to never come back again into this world."

"Permanent escape from the persecuting world, never to come back again" is the definition of *mokshaa*, which the seeker follows in the triangular format, in the name of *videha mukthi*. But, that is only a temporary / provisional definition.

After coming to the binary format, the seeker has to revise the definition. What is that real and primary definition of *mokshaa*? Sankaraachaaryaa gives the definition in his introduction to the *Maandookya Upanishad Bhaashyam*, as "*svaroopaa avasthaanam moksha:*" | '*Svaroopaa avasthaanam*' means 'constantly being aware of my *sathya-aathma-svaroopam* and also being aware of the *mithyaa-jagath-svaroopam*' | This self-awareness / self-abidance, called

svaroopa avasthaanam, must be the definition of *mokshaa*, which the seeker should use after moving into the binary format.

In this definition, the seeker never thinks of 'escaping from the world', because, he is aware that **he** is the *mithyaa-jagath-adhishtaanam*. Being the very *adhishtaanam* of the entire *mithyaa-anaathma-prapanchaa*, how can he escape from the world? In fact, 'I' am the one, who is 'lend'ing existence to the entire universe - (*viswam dharpana dhruvyamaana nagaree thulyam – Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram*).

'I' am 'lend'ing to the universe its very 'is'ness. If 'I' try to escape, the very universe cannot exist. The eternal world show has to continue; and, if the eternal world show should continue, 'I' must be there to 'bless' the world with '*saththaa spoorthy: pradhaanam*'. ('*Satthaa*' means 'existence'; '*spoorthy:*' means 'manifestation / display'; '*pradhaanam*' means 'granting / bestowing').

Therefore, 'I' cannot escape from the world.

Nor do 'I' need to escape from the world, because, whatever that happens in the *mithyaa* world, cannot touch the *adhishtaanam-sathya-aathmaa* - (*nahi adhyasthasya gunena dhoshena vaa anumaathrena api sambhadhyathe*)|

Thus, the *svaroopa-avasthaana-mokshaa* comes only after *anaathma- mithyaathva-nischaya:* |

It is true that this *svaroopa-avasthaanam* (awareness or knowledge) will not and cannot stop the biological or physical suffering. But, equally true is that, the biological pains also cannot stop 'my' wisdom, that, 'I' am the ever-free *sathya-saakshi-aathmaa*, which is illumining the world drama, which drama includes these experiences (biological pains) also. No experience can challenge valid knowledge, just as the experience of sunrise can never stop the valid knowledge that 'sun never rises'.

Any amount of biological pain cannot stop the knowledge that 'I' am the *paaramaarthika-sathya-aathmaa* illumining the drama of the *vyaavahaarika prapanchaa*, which includes both pleasures and pain. I should never judge the world, based on the biological pains nor on the biological pleasures. Pleasures and pains are integral parts of the *mithya-anaathma-prapanchaa*, which 'I' am blessing all the time. This wisdom is called *svaroopa avasthaanam*; this alone is the real *mokshaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "adhyaropa prakaranam, which is aathma-anaathma-viveka:, is over. Now apavaadha prakaranam, which is anaathma-mithyaathva-nischaya:, has to start."

With this purpose, the Achaaryaa gives this introduction (*sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 97), part of which, was studied in the earlier class. To continue:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 97:

तथापि तु नैवासौ स्वतस्सिद्धात्मव्यतिरिक्तानात्मप्रकृतिपदार्थव्यपाश्रयः सांख्यानामिव ।

still, it is not something that rests in a self-existent non-self as affirmed by the Saamkhyaa philosophers.

Sureswaraachaarya shows the difference between *Saamkhyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa*. The *Saamkhyaa* philosopher also says that the entire *anaathma prapancha / ghata prapanchaa*, consists of the four components - *pramathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramaa*. He groups these four components as *prakruthi thathvam*; he also says that this *prakruthi thathvam*, which is *anaathmaa*, is different from the *purusha thathvam*, the *aathmaa*.

Up to this, the *Saamkyaa* standpoint is very, very similar to *Vedhaanthaa*.

Thereafter only, the difference arises. The *Saamkyaa* philosopher holds: "This *prakruthi* is as much real and as independently existent as *purusha*: |". So, (according to the *Saamkhyaa* philosopher): "*Purushaa* and *prakruthi* are both equally real; their *sambhandha* is also equally real; therefore, the *sambhandha*-born pleasures and pains are also equally real; and, therefore, *mokshaa* involves 'escaping' from *prakruthi*".

In fact, all systems of philosophy, other than *Advaita*, look down upon the world; all of them define the world as 'suffering'; and, therefore, 'escape from the world' is the cardinal principle in all of them. They demonize the world as 'full of suffering'.

Advaita Vedhaanthaa alone says: "Drop the idea of 'demonizing the world' and the idea of 'escaping from the world'. World is wonderful, with its infinite varieties; and life is full of all kinds of events. Let them continue as 'drama'. Imagine, for a moment, that, *Brahman* alone is there, without the *prakruthi* or the world; in such an event, the mere *Brahman*, by itself, cannot even say '*aham Brahma asmi*'; *Brahman* may be *aananda svaroopaa*: and *chith svaroopaa*: / But, even to claim '*aham Brahma asmi*', we require this wonderful world. Therefore, never demonize the world; realize that the world is wonderful, with infinite varieties and experiences, which, of course include *janma*, *mrithyu*, *jaraa*, *vyaadhi*, and *dhu:kham* also. But, all of them are required for the world-drama. *Mokshaa* is not 'avoiding' the world; but, is 'accommodating' the world. 'Avoidance' is provisional definition (of

mokshaa), while, 'accommodation' is the real definition. Let the 'drama' of the world continue; there is no need to 'escape' from it. The idea of 'escape' results only when the world is seen as absolute reality. Once it is viewed as drama / as *mithyaa*, the idea of 'escaping' will be dropped".

In *Saamkhyaa*, the world is not looked upon as *mithyaa* i.e. as 'drama', which attitude naturally results in the experience of real *dhu:kham*, when circumstances are not favourable; whereas, *Vedhaanthaa*, by looking upon the world as *mithyaa* or 'drama', makes world and life , with all their different situations and experiences - even difficult and miserable – enjoyable. The aging process may gradually convert the physical body from an instrument of enjoyment to a liability, causing pain; but, an informed *Vedhaanthin* will not complain against this, understanding that 'matter' has to undergo changes and will undergo changes. A positive approach to life is understanding that, the 'changes' in 'matter' are inevitable and, in fact, they alone make life interesting. A non-changing matter cannot give us the 'variety show'; the non-changing *Brahman* also cannot give us the 'variety show'. A healthy attitude is to 'enjoy' life with all its ups and downs, as an 'entertainment'; this attitude will result only from *jagath-mithyaathva-nischaya*: |

Sureswaraacharya points out that the *Saamkyas* have missed this fact. He says:

- **सांख्यानां** - For the saamkyaa philosophers,
- **असौ** - "The world of four components

The four components, as indicated earlier, are *pramaathaa*, *pramaanaa*, *prameyaa* and *pramaa*, which four components Sureswaraacharya names as *graheethaa*, *graahyam*, *graheethi*: and *palam*.

- **व्यपाश्रयः** - is resting on/ dependent on
- **प्रकृतिपदार्थ** - the kaarana prakruthi matter (as the basic substance),

What type of *prakrithi*?

- आत्म व्यतिरिक्त अनात्म (प्रकृति)- (the *prakrithi*) which is different from *aathmaa*,

"This world rests on *anaathma prakrithi*, which is different from *aathmaa*" is the gist.

And what type of *aathmaa*?

- **स्वतस्सिद्ध** - which (*aathmaa*) is the Self Evident (Consciousness principle)".

When the different systems of philosophy (under *sanaathana dharma*) are studied in comparison, a gradual progression can be observed. In the materialistic philosophies *Nyaaya* and *Vaiseshikaa* (as in modern science) 'Matter' is fundamental / basic and 'Consciousness' depends on 'Matter'. A gradual transition follows. The *Saamkyaa* philosophy is in the intermediary stage. It says: "Consciousness does not depend upon matter; Consciousness is independent; Matter is also independent". According to *saamkyaa*, therefore, Consciousness is released from Matter and is given an independent status ; thus, now, in the intermediary stage, there are two independent entities – 'Matter' and 'Consciousness' – while, previously (in *Nyaaya* and *Vaiseshika*) there was only one independent entity, 'Matter', with 'Consciousness' being dependent on 'Matter'. When we come to *Advaitaa* philosophy, there is again only one independent entity – but, with a very important difference. In *Nyaaya* and *Vaiseshikaa*, 'Matter' is independent and 'Consciousness' rises and resolves in 'Matter'; but, in *Advaitaa*, 'Consciousness' is independent and 'Matter' rises and falls in that 'Consciousness'. And, (incidentally) what is that Consciousness? "*Mayyeva sakalam jaatham; mayi sarvam prathistitham*" (*Kaivalya Upanisad – manthraa* 19).

Sureswaraachaarya started from 'Matter'; then he segregated *purushaa (aathmaa)* from *anaathmaa*; now, again he wants to go back to *Advaitam*. With that intention, the *Aachaaryaa* said "*Saamkyaa*s consider 'Matter' and 'Consciousness' as independent"; and, now, refutes that viewpoint. He asserts:

- न - It is not true in Vedhaanthee / this philosophy is not acceptable

If the world is not resting on *prakrithi*, what really does it rest on?

Sureswaraachaaryaa raises the question and answers it also:

(Sambhandha gadhyam) further to Verse 97:

किं तर्हि । स्वतस्सिद्धानुदितानस्तमितकूटस्थात्मप्रज्ञानमात्रशरीरप्रतिबिम्बिताविचारितसिद्धात्मानवबोधाश्रय एव तदुपादानत्वात्तस्येतीममर्थं निर्वक्तुकाम आह ।

What, then, is it? It rests as a product on the non-apprehension of the Self, which non-apprehension appears through failure of inquiry into the Self, that is constituted solely of absolute Consciousness, changeless, birthless, everlasting and self-established. This point is elucidated in the following:

If the question "If the entire universe, with four components, is not resting on real Matter, *prakrithi*, what is it?" is raised, Sureswaraachaaryaa answers "The entire world is *mithyaa*, which has got a lesser order of reality".

Then the next question (that may arise) is: "Why do you say that the entire world is *mithyaa* or is of a lesser order of reality, even when it is very clearly experienced by us? 'Matter' is very clearly experienced by us. On what basis do you say, that, the world is *mithyaa*?"

"Even the modern science is not able to negate the world, because, modern science holds that 'matter can neither be created nor destroyed. When matter is, thus, indestructible, on what basis, do you say that the world is *mithyaa*?" will be the question.

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not answer this question here (in this portion). But, the answer can be found in several other places (in our *saasthraas*), including the *Maandookya Kaarika*.

What is our (the *Advaitins*) answer?

We (the *Advaita vedhaanthins*) say: "The *Upanishads* – i.e. the *Veda pramaanam* - do not negate Consciousness, at any time, during the entire teaching procedure. On the other hand, when you look at the *saasthric* attitude to 'Matter', you find that the *saasthraas'* approach to 'Matter' is totally different. Even though the *Upanishads* accept 'Matter' initially, during the *adhyaaropa prakarana*, in the latter part of their teaching, they consistently and systematically 'negate' the entire universe. To repeat: Consciousness is never negated (by the *Upanishads*); but, 'Matter', though not negated in the beginning, is later negated in all the *Upanishads*.

"For instance, *Kathopanishad* very clearly asserts '*na iha naanaa asthi kinchana*'- (II. I. 11) meaning 'the world that you are perceiving - this plurality consisting of *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-pramaa* - is not there'.

"*Kaivalya Upanishad* is more emphatic – '*na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha*' (*manthraa* 22) – 'all the *pancha bhoothas* are non-existent' (It is to be noted that this averment is not 'the *pancha bhoothas* will be non-existent some time in the future i.e. in *pralayan*' – but 'the *pancha bhoothas* are non-existent even now')

"In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, four times, it is said "*sa esha nethi nethi ithi aathmaa*". In addition to that, there is indirect negation (of 'Matter'), by the statement 'the other (*aathmaa*) is non-dual'.

'Thus, the *Upanishads* negate 'Matter' directly and indirectly in several places.

"Therefore, there must be a difference between 'un-negated' Consciousness and 'negated' Matter.

"Then, what should be the status of the world? It can never enjoy the same status as Consciousness, because, one (Consciousness) is never negated and the other (the universe) is negated; how can they be treated equally? This difference is what is emphasized by the use of the word *mithyaa* for the *anaathma prapancham*. Alternately, it can be termed as *vyavahaarika sathyam* (empirical reality), while, *aathmaa* or Consciousness is 'absolute Reality'".

This is the *Advaithin's* reply.

To repeat the reasoning: "What is negated cannot come under 'existent' category or 'non-existent' category. What is 'existent' **cannot** be negated, because it is 'existent' and what is 'non-existent' **need** not be negated, because it is 'non-existent'. Therefore, whatever is negated will have to belong to a third category (other than 'existent' or 'non-existent')".

In *Sanskrit*, this category is called *sadhasath vilakshanam* or *sadhasadbhyaam anirvachaneeyam*; a mysterious, un-categorizable experience is the world, otherwise referred to as 'seemingly existent' or '*mithyaa*'.

Advaithic knowledge is complete only when it is understood that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* / world (including one's own body and mind) comes under that *mithyaa* category, while, 'I' am the *mithyaa jagadh adhishtaanam chaithanya thathvam*. And, therefore, '*aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*'.

There is one more important aspect. Sureswaraachaaryaa points this out: "Any *mithyaa vasthu* / seemingly existent object is always born out of ignorance only; in other words, any *adhyasaa* is born out of *ajnaanam*".

Two examples are popularly given: (1) the seemingly existent dream world is born out of the ignorance of the 'waker' (and, the moment the dreamer wakes up, the seemingly existent dream world gets falsified) and (2) the seemingly existent rope-snake is born out of rope ignorance (and is falsified on the 'awareness' of the rope).

Any *mithyaa adhyasaa* rests on the ignorance of the *adhistaanam*. This is not the teaching of only Sankaraachaaryaa (or Sureswaraachaaryaa). The *Upanishads* themselves say this: "For the *jnaani*, there is no duality at all".

"*Thathra ko moha: ka: soka:*" queries *Isaavaasya Upanishad* (verse 7) "there (after realization of *Athman*) where is the scope for delusion or grief?", while, *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (VII.24.1) declares: "*yathra naanya: pasyathi naanya: srunothi naanya:*

vijaanaathi thadh bhoomaa – “The Infinite is that where one does not see anything else, does not hear anything else and does not understand anything else”.

“The *dvaita prapanchaa* is not resting on ‘matter’; but, is resting on ignorance/ *ajnaanam*” is the averment of *Advaitaa*, though the statement appears mind-boggling.

“(Jagadh) *Prakruthi aasraya:*” is *Saamkhyaa* definition; “*ajaana aasraya:*” is the *Vedhaanthaa* approach to the world.

As *Maandookya Upanishad* and *Mandookya kaarika* declare “*visva (jaagrath), thyjasa(svapnaa), and praagnyaa (sushupthi)* are all based on ‘*agrahanam*’ . In the *thureeyam*, “*naantha: pragnyam nabahi:pragnyam ..saantham sivam 'prapanchopasamam'*” (*Mandookya Upanishad – manthraa 7*) – “*aathmaa* is **free from the world**”.

(Reverting to the text) Sureswaraachaarya raises the question:

- किं तर्हि - Then what is the world based on?

The *Aachaaryaa* answers, describing the world in one long compound word: “*svathassiddhaanudhithaanasthamithakootasthaaathmapragnyaanamaathrasareerap-rathibhimbhithaavicharithasiddhaathmaanavabodhaasraya:*”|

- आत्म अनवबोध आश्रयः - The whole universe is resting upon the ‘ignorance’ of the ‘self’;

Anavabodha – ajnaanam; aasraya: - dependent.

What is the ignorance? The fact that “I **alone** ‘am” is not known; because of this ignorance, ‘I’ lend ‘is’ness to the world, which world does not have an ‘is’ness of its own; this is similar to the ‘waker’ lending existence to the ‘dream world’, which does not have an existence of its own. ‘I’ am ‘lending’ existence to the world; but, not knowing that fact also, I think the world has an existence of its own. Therefore, I say the world ‘is’. This attributing ‘is’ness to the world, is also *ajaanam*.

Just as the dream world is born out of the ‘ignorance’ of the (*vyaavahaarika*) ‘waker’, the ‘is’ness of the world is born out of the ignorance of the other ‘waker’- the *paaramaarthika* ‘waker’/ the un-negated Consciousness.

- अविचारित सिद्ध - the world’s existence is available only as long as one does not make an enquiry (into the Self);

The well-known simile is the *rajju-sarpa*, in which the snake's existence continues only as long as the rope is seen for what it really is. The 'existence' of the world is dependent on 'non-enquiry'. In his treatise, *Panchadas* (in the 10th chapter), *Swami Vidhyaaranyaa* nicely points this out : "non-enquiry is the food for the world".

By 'non-enquiry', we are feeding duality and *samsaaraa*, and (ironically), having fed the *samsaaraa*, we want to escape from *samsaaraa* also. Why should I 'escape' the world, when I am 'feeding' the world for my own entertainment? 'I am supporting the world' is a fact. But the world is 'there' only because of my non-enquiry. This is conveyed by the adjective '*avichaaritha siddha*.' |

- प्रज्ञान मात्र शरीर प्रतिबिम्बित - the world appears in the *aathmaa*, which (*aathmaa*) is of the nature of pure Consciousness;

Prathibhimbhitha – prathibhaasamaana: / appearing.

"*Viswam dharpana dhruyamaana nagareethulyam nija anthargatham* (it is within me) *pasyan aathmani maayayaaa bahi: udhbootham iva* (but appears as if 'existing' outside me)" – "the Self alone plays as the universe of names and forms, like a city seen in a mirror, due to the *maayaa* power, as though produced outside" – *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Slokam* (verse 1)

"The world (appears as) existing outside 'me', though, it is (in reality) *prathibhimbhitham* (*prathibhaasamaanam*) in the *pragyaanamaathra sareeram*" (is the message conveyed by this description).

The word '*Sareeram*', in this context, means '*svaroopam / chaithanyam*'.

And, what is that *chaithanyam*?

Do not look for that '*chaithanyam*' outside. It is nothing but *Aathmaa*, the very Self, 'I', the Observer. Later, the *Aachaaryaa* will point out that the *chaithanyam* is ever the 'Observer' and never the 'Observed' – ever the 'experiencer' and never an 'object of experience'.

What type of Consciousness?

- कूटस्थ आत्मा - the changeless Consciousness,
- अनुदित - (which is) devoid of 'rising' / birth,
- अनस्तमित - (which is) devoid of 'setting' / death,

The term '*anudhitha-anasthamitha*' conveys the meaning 'without *janma* or *maranam*'. This would also mean that I should not ask for avoidance of *punar-janma*, since, in the binary format, 'I' do not have even one '*janma*' – where is the question of escaping from *janma* at all? All these facts should be there, in one's awareness, all the time.

- स्वतस्सिद्ध – and (which is) self-established / self-proven

Even though 'Consciousness' is not an object of 'experience', it is ever experienced, as 'I' the Subject, in and through all the arriving and departing objective experiences. Though it cannot be proved, it need not be proved also, because it is ever experienced by 'me'.

Sankaraachaaryaa avers in his *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* – verse 7 - "*baalyaadhisvapi jaagradhaadhisu thathaa sarvaasu avasthaasu api vyaavrutthasu anuvarthamaanam*" ("constantly and persistently manifests in all stages of age such as childhood, boyhood, youth and old age etc. and in all states - waking, dreaming and deep sleep").

In and through all the changing objective experiences, 'I', the Subject, continue. And, this ever-experienced 'I', am ever free also.

Then what about all the *samsaaraa*? The wise approach will be to stop calling it *samsaaraa* and view it as 'entertainment'. It is interesting to note, that, if one opts for *videha mukthi*, one cannot even claim "'I' am *aanandam-brahma*" - nor even 'I am a *videha muktha*: | You need *sareera-thrayam* to claim that you are a *muktha*: | You should learn to 'enjoy' your body-mind-complex, in which alone you can claim '*aham brahma asmi*', even in the face of biological pain or mental grief. "Let the bodies come and go; I am ever free" should be the conviction.

And, why is this world *mithyaa*?

- तद् उपादानत्वात् तस्य - because 'ignorance' is the cause of this world.

Thadh – ajnaanam; upaadhaanam – kaaranam ; thadh upaadhaanam – ajaana kaaranam . "ajaanam kaaranam yasya prapanchasya". Thasya – dvaitha prapanchasya.

Therefore "'I' am ever-free Brahman; because of ignorance, 'I' am seeing a duality, as though really existing." Appearance of duality is not the problem; but, attributing 'reality' to the duality is (the problem).

- निर्वक्तुकामः - To introduce

- इति इमं अर्थ - this (apavaadhaa part of) teaching,
- आह - the author declares (the following):

This teaching is unique to *Advaita*. *Saamkhyaa* philosophy does not subscribe to this teaching. In *saamkhyaa* philosophy, *prakruthi* is real and therefore, (in the *saamkhyaa* philosophy) to attain liberation, *purusha* has to detach from *prakruthi*.

Therefore, the common notion that one has to take to *sannyasa asrama* for attaining liberation may be right from the *Saamkhyaa* viewpoint. But, according to *Advaita*, the *saadhakaa* need not 'run away' from *prakruthi*. "Even while engaged in worldly and mundane activities 'I am free' is the *Advaita* conviction.

Chapter II: Verse 97 –

ऋते ज्ञानं न सन्त्यर्था अस्ति ज्ञानमृतेऽपि तान् ।

एवं धियो हिरुज्योतिर्विचिद्यादनुमानत : ॥ ९७ ॥

Independent of knowledge, there are no objects of knowledge, while independent of them, knowledge can exist. In this fashion should one discriminate the element of consciousness from the objective phenomena presenting themselves to the mind.

Here Sureswaraacharya points out, that, matter does not enjoy existence of its own and that, Consciousness alone lends existence to matter.

This is proved not only by *Upanishadic pramaanam*, but proved by our experience also, as explained below:

If you have to talk about the existence of anything in the Creation, it must be a known thing; whatever is not known or not knowable - i.e., a thing which can never be known by anybody at any time – you can never talk about its existence. Therefore, 'Existence' presupposes 'knownness' or 'knowability'. So, wherever existence is talked about, there is knowledge (of that object, whose existence is talked about). And, wherever there is knowledge, there must be awareness or consciousness. Existence presupposes knowledge and knowledge presupposes Consciousness; therefore, without consciousness, one can never talk about the existence of matter. Therefore, experientially also, consciousness alone 'lends' existence to matter.

On the other hand, Consciousness exists by itself; it is self-proven; that 'I' am existent, does not require proof. Even when 'I' want to prove myself, the desire to prove myself is proof enough that 'I' exist. As a person who attempts to prove myself, even before the attempt, I am proved. The 'prover' of everything need not be proved or proven.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "Consciousness is self-proven / self evident" This profound idea is expressed by the words '*svathassiddham*' or '*svayam siddha:*'|

Whatever is *svathassiddhaa* is *sathyam* and whatever is proved by something else or whatever is existent because of something else, is *parathassiddha:* | Matter is *parathassiddha:*; its existence is lent by Consciousness and it has to be *mithyaa*.

Yath svathassiddham thath sathyam ; yath parathassiddham thath mithyaa; aham sathyam jagan mithyaa ; chaithanyam sathyam jada prapancha: mithyaa | This awareness is called *svaroopavasthaanam*; this is *moksha:* |

98. Chapter II, Verse 97 and 98 (21-06-2008)

Until now, Sureswaraachaarya elaborately did *aathma-anaathma viveka*, *anaathmaa* being the entire *dhrusya-prapanchaa* – the experienced universe – which includes the external world, which includes our own body, as well as the mind. We called it *dhrusya prapanchaa*. A more precise term would be '*saakshya prapanchaa*'; because, when we say *dhrusya prapanchaa*, generally we understand the term to mean only the external world, excluding the body and mind, with 'I' being the subject; but, once the term *saakshya prapanchaa* is used, then the body and mind also will fall under *anaathmaa*; 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*, am the '*dhruka*'. This alone, we call, as '*aathma anaathma viveka*.' |

Having established this *aathma – anaathma* distinction, now Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering the important second stage, namely, the relationship between *aathma* and *anaathma*. He wants to establish that they do not have the same order of reality – one is *sathyam* and the other is *anrutham* or *mithyaa* - and that their relationship is called *adhyaasa sambhandhaa*. This *adhyaasa sambhandhaa* is not accepted by the *saamkhyaa* philosopher. The *saamkhyaa* philosopher also talks about *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*; *vedhanthaa* also talks about *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*; but, the difference is, in one philosophy (*Vedhaanthaa*), *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa adhyaasa*: and in the other (*Saamkhyaa* philosophy) *anaathmaa* is also *sathyam*.

When you confine the discussion to *aathma-anaathma vivekaa* alone, we may be said to be in the *saamkhyaa* 'binary' format; but, from this *saamkhyaa* 'binary' format, we have to move to the *Vedhaanthaa* 'binary' format, in which it is *sathya-aathmaa* with *mithyaa-anaathmaa*. Only when we come to *Vedhanthaa* 'binary' format, it becomes as good as 'unitary' format. Quite often, people raise the query: "In *Advaitaa*, how can we stop with the 'binary' format?; should we not move to the 'unitary' format?" This question or doubt arises, because, the word 'binary' implies *dvaitam*, whereas we are supposed to be *advaitins*. But, it should be understood and remembered that the *Vedhaanthaa* 'binary' format **is** 'unitary' format ; because, in *Vedhaanthaa* binary format, *aathmaa* is *sathyam* and *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa* and since *mithyaa anaathmaa* cannot be counted, it (*Vedhaanthaa* 'binary') is as good as *advaitam*.

Sureswaraachaarya's teaching is now moving from the *saamkhyaa* binary format to the *Vedhaanthaa* binary format, which, as explained, is 'unitary' or *advaitam*. This understanding (that *advaita* binary format is in reality 'unitary') is possible only when we establish that 'I' am the *adhishtaanam-sathyam* and the entire *dvaitam* is *mithyaa*.

The *dvaitham* consists of four factors. Of course, sometimes, we say that *dvaitham* consists of two – *pramaathaa* and *prameyam* ; and, sometimes we say that the world is three – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* ; the world may be said to consist of four factors also – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramaa*. The 'knower', the 'knowing instrument', the 'known' and the 'knowledge' – all these four come under *anaathmaa* and this entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is superimposed on 'me', the *aathmaa*.

This is the real *Vedhaanthaa* and only when the seeker assimilates this, he will get out of the conventional *mokshaa* concept, which conventional *mokshaa* concept is the belief "I have to escape from the world, through *videha mukthi*".

At the advanced stage, the seeker has to get out of this conventional belief and learn to look at himself as: "'I' am the *adhishtaana chaithanyam*, in which *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramaa* are all falsely superimposed". This would mean that the relationship between 'me' and the world is like the relationship between *rajju* and *sarpa*: (in the well-known *rajju-sarpa* example). 'I' am the 'rope'; the entire 'frightening' world is the *rajju-sarpa*, which, in reality, cannot 'touch'/ affect me; 'I' bless the world; 'I' cannot be frightened by the world.

Since Sureswaraachaarya wants to talk about *anyonya adhyaasaa*, *rajju sarpa* etc., we have to remember some of the fundamental facts with regard to *adhyaasaa* or superimposition, which Sankaraachaarya had discussed in his famous *adhyaasa bhaashyam*. Sureswaraachaaryaa takes these points for granted and does not elaborate on them here; and, therefore, it is up to the student, to clearly recollect them.

When do we experience a rope-snake? The condition is: when the rope is present in a semi-dark / semi-lit place; under which circumstance, I may get the experience of the rope without knowing that it is a rope. This is obviously a situation of partial knowledge with partial ignorance - partial knowledge that 'there is something' and partial ignorance of 'the specific nature of the thing that is present'. The 'rope-ness' is not known ; while 'thisness' (i.e. the awareness of the presence of something) is there. This partial knowledge - that 'there is something' - is called *saamaanya jnaanam* ; the partial ignorance – 'ignorance of the specific nature of the thing that is present - that it is a rope' - is termed *visesha ajnaanam*.

There is a consequence to this partial ignorance. As explained, the partial ignorance conceals the specific nature of 'rope-ness' ; when the specific nature is thus concealed, it can create a misconception, and, in turn, the misconception or error can lead to mistaking the rope for a snake or a crack on the floor or a stream of water or a flower garland etc. The mistaken notion is born out of rope-ignorance. Therefore, we say '*ajnaanam* is *kaaranam*;

the mistaken notion (*sarpa:*, in the example) is *kaaryam*. Between error and ignorance, the relationship is *kaarya-kaarana sambhandha*: |

Vedhaantha extends this example to *aathmaa*. It says "aathmaa is 'partially known' and this aathmaa is partially unknown also".

What is the partial – *saamaanya - jnaanam* about the *aathmaa*? "'I am" is known, because everyone is aware of oneself. This "'I am" – i.e. the self-conscious principle expressed as "'I am" - is the *saamaanya jnaanam*, which is not veiled by ignorance.

Then, what is veiled by 'ignorance'? "My' specific *visesha svaroopam*" is veiled by ignorance.

And, what is that *visesham* (my special nature)? From the *Upanishads*, we come to know that "'I, the aathmaa, am advaitham" – that "advaitam is my svaroopam". And, what type of *advaitam*? "*Sajaatheeya vijaatheeya svagatha bedha rahitham advaitam*" is my *svaroopam*. This is the clear message of the *Upanishads*.

Kathopanishad (II. 1 .11) says: "*Iha na naanaa asthi kinchana*" – "There is no plurality at all here"; *Kaivalyopanishad* avers: "*na bhhomiraapo na cha vahnirasth*" (*manthraa* 22) – "there is no earth, no water and no fire (implying 'nothing is there, other than aathmaa') ; and *Maandookya Upanishad* declares "*naantahpragnyam na bahipragnyam nobhayapragnyam na pragnyaanaganam na pragnyam na apragnyam| adrishtam avyavahaaryam agrahyam alakshanam achinthyam avyapadesyam ekaathmaprathyaasaaram **prapanchopasamam saantham sivam **advaitam** chathurtham manyanthe sa aathmaa sa vignyeya:***" (*manthraa* 7) – " They consider the *Thuriyaa* to be that which is not the outward consciousness, inward consciousness, not the consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of consciousness, not the all-knowing consciousness, not unconscious and that which is beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference, beyond thoughts, beyond description, traceable through the unbroken self-awareness, **free from the world**, tranquil, auspicious and **non-dual**"|

Advaitam is my *svaroopam* and ignorance has 'covered'/ veiled the *advaita svaroopam*, which *svaroopam* is my *visesham*. But, (as indicated earlier), The *saamaanya jnaanam* "'I am" is there; but, the *visesha jnaanam* "'I am *advaitam*" is not there.

When did this 'ignorance' start? This 'ignorance' is *anaadhi* (beginningless); in fact, 'time' itself started because of 'ignorance'; 'ignorance' did not start in 'time'; 'time' itself started in and because of 'ignorance'. Because of this *anaadhi ajnaanam*, there is misconception; and just as when 'ropeness' is 'covered', 'snakeness' appears, when *advaitam* is 'covered', the *advaita prapanchaa* appears. The entire *advaita prapanchaa* is a false appearance in 'me',

the Self, the Conscious principle, because of 'self-ignorance'. In the *Bhagavadh Githa*, Lord Krishna says "*ajnaanena aavrutham jnaanam* - (Ch. V – verse 15) – "because of self-ignorance *advaita jnaanam* is *aavrutham* (veiled)" and continues "*thena muhyanthi janthava:*" – "Because of this, the beings are deluded".

Therefore, the first lesson to be noted and which is unique to *Advaitam* is : "*prakruthi* is a false projection due to *purusha ajnaanam*". The *saamkhyaa* philosopher will never accept this ; for him, *prakruthi* is also as much real as *aathmaa*, whereas the *Advaitin* goes by the *Upanishadic* teaching, "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvam layam yaath*" (*Kaivalya Upanishad – manthraa 19*) – "everything is born of 'me', exists in 'me' and resolves in 'me'".

Therefore, what is the basis for *dvaitam*? Sureswaraachaaryaa said "*aathma anavagama: eva dvaita aasraya:*" - a powerful statement – "self-ignorance alone is the basis for *dvaitam*" – *dvaitam* meaning "*pramaathru – pramaana – prameya – pramaa – chathushtayam*".

The second point to be noted:

Vedhaantha says, that, the world comes under *sadh-asadh-vilakshana mithyaa* category, borrowing existence from 'me', the *aathmaa*.

To explain: In the example cited, the 'rope-snake', which is a product of rope-ignorance, belongs to an unique category (as discussed in the earlier class also).

The 'rope-snake' does not come under 'existent' category ; because, if the rope-snake comes under 'existent' category, it can at no time be negated ; on the other hand, on proper investigation with better lighting, the rope is seen for what it is, and the 'snake' is negated. Obviously, whatever that can be thus negated, cannot come under 'existent' category.

Nor does the 'rope-snake' come under totally 'non-existent' category, because it *is* 'experienced'; it *does* cause fear, it *does* cause the consequent physical symptoms such as perspiration, palpitations etc. and it *does* cause the anxiety to 'escape' from the perceived 'rope-snake'.

Therefore, (i.e. since it cannot be called either 'existent' or 'non-existent') the 'rope-snake' will have to be considered as belonging to a third category, neither 'existent' nor 'non-existent' - the '**seemingly** existent' category / *sadhaasadh vilakshana* category, which is termed *mithyaa*. This concept is unique to *Advaitam*, which the *Visishtadvaitins* do not accept. They say that everything should come under either 'existent' or 'non-existent'

category only. They reject the very possibility of the third category – *mithyaa / sadhasadh vilakshanaa*.

And, what is the uniqueness of the *sadh-asadh vilakshana mithyaa*? It exists only by 'borrowing' existence from an *adhishtaanam*. Going back to the *rajju-sarpa* example, the rope-snake does not have an existence of its own; it exists 'borrowing' existence from the rope. When you say 'is', the 'isness' belongs only to the rope, since, if you remove the rope, the snake cannot 'be'; in the other well-known example of the dreamer and the dream-world, if you remove the 'dreamer', the 'dream-world' cannot exist; the dream-world also comes under *sadh-asadh vilakshana mithyaa* category, borrowing existence from the dreamer-*adhishtaanam*.

Vedhaantha says, that, in the same manner as in the rope-snake and the dream-world examples, the world also comes under *sadh-asadh-vilakshana mithyaa* category, borrowing existence from 'me', the *aathmaa*.

Sankaraachaarya declares in his *Maneeshaa Panchakam* (verse 2): "*Brahmaivaahamidham jagascha sakalam chinmaathravisthaaritham sarvam cha ethadh avidhyaayaa thrigunayaa sesham mayaa kalpitham iththam yasya dhrudaa mathi: sukhathare nithye pare nirmale chaandalosthu sa thu dvijosthu gururithyeshaa maneeshaa mama*"—"I **am** Brahman (pure Consciousness). It is pure Consciousness that appears as the universe. All this universe is only conjured up by me, because of *Avidhya* (nescience), which is composed of the three *gunaas* (*sathwam*, *rajas* and *thamas*). One who has attained this definite realization about *Brahman*, which is bliss itself, eternal, supreme and pure, is my *guru*, whether he is an outcaste or a *Brahmana*".

Advaita Vedhaantha expects the adherent not to be a squeaky mouse, trying to run away from the world, but to roar and face the world like a lion.

Thus, "the world comes under *sadh-asadh-vilakshana mithyaa* category, borrowing existence from 'me', the *aathmaa*" is the second feature (of *Vedhaantha*). In other words: "I bless this world with its existence; 'I' do not seek blessings from the world".

The third, final and most important feature is the cultivation of the attitude that "I can allow the world process to continue, because, the *mithyaa* world cannot affect 'me', the *adhishtaanam*".

"I do not depend on the world; the world depends on 'me'; therefore, I would like to continue to bless the world, for its un-broken *srushti-sthithi-laya* march; I need not talk about *mokshaa* as 'escaping from the world'. *Roopamastheha thathobha labhyathe naantho*

na chaadhir na cha sampradhishtaa | Let the eternal process of *srishti-sthithi-laya* continue in 'me' " should be the firm conviction of an *Advaita vedhaanthin*.

If the world will affect 'me', 'I' may desire to escape from the world and to stop the process of creation. The *Vedhaanthin* does not want to go to a state in which the world will never 'come and go'; he does not want to stop the process; on the other hand, he says 'let the process eternally continue'. That is his vision. Why does he allow it to continue? Because he knows that the world being *mithyaa*, its continuation is not going to adversely affect him, just as a stage-play does not affect the viewer, who, on the other hand, gets 'entertained' by the stage-play.

"*Mokshaa* does not mean achieving *videha mukthi*, in which, world experience ends; let the world continue; let the cycle of birth and death continue for my *sookshma sareeram* ; or let my *sookshma sareeram* also be terminated. Either way, it does not bother me; 'botheration' will result only if 'reality' is attached to these. 'Let the *vyavahaaraas* continue; 'I' am not affected'" – this attitude is *mokshaa*.

Coming back to the text, the portion that follows, is *adhyaasa baagha*: /

Sureswaraacharya says (in verse 97):

- ऋते ज्ञानं अर्था न सन्ति - Without 'me' the Consciousness principle, objects do not exist.

Even experience of those objects is possible only because of 'me', the Consciousness principle. On the other hand:

- तान् ऋते अपि ज्ञानं अस्ति - But, independent of the objects (of knowledge), 'I', the Consciousness principle, can exist.

In the *rajju-sarpa* example, without the snake, rope 'is'; but, without the rope, the snake cannot exist. Another example: – without the screen, movie cannot exist; but, without the movie, the screen can exist. In the same manner, without 'me', the world cannot exist; but, without the world, 'I' can exist. In short, the relationship between 'me' and the world is *sathya- anrutha-sambhandha*: /

एवं - In this manner,

Sureswaraacharya also warns: "When you say 'the world is *mithyaa*, depending on 'me', the meaning of the word 'me' should be clearly understood, as *saakshi chaithanyam* and not as the body-mind complex; you should include the body-mind complex also in the world and

should say that the body and the mind are also *mithyaa*, depending on 'me', the *saakshi-chaithanyam*'.

This is extremely important, because, initially, the seeker understands *mokshaa* as *manas saanthi*, since he tends to look upon himself as the *mana*: | But, later, when he understands that he is not the mind, but, is the *aathmaa / saakshi chaithanyam*, whose *saanthi* is unconditional, the seeker need not and should not look for *manas saanthi*, but, instead, work on 'claim'ing *aathma saanthi* | An interesting fact is, that, when the seeker succeeds in 'claim'ing *aathmasaanthi*, *manassaanthi* is also achieved, as a bye-product. Of course, the 'claim'ing of *aathma saanthi*, is done with the help of the *mithyaa* mind; but, even though the seeker is focused on 'claim'ing *aathma saanthi*, without paying any attention to *manas saanthi*, *manas saanthi* also results, as a bye-product. Every *jnaani*, therefore, has achieved *manas saanthi* also – not as a goal, but as a bye-product.

- ज्योतिःविविच्यात् - may you separate the *aathma chaithanyam*,

jyothi: - 'I', the *aathma chaithanyam*; *vivichyaadh* – may one separate.

Separate from what?

- धियःहिरूक् - as something different from the mind,

Hiruk– (an indeclinable word) *vilakshanam* / different; *dhiya*: - from the mind.

The *aathma chaithanyam* is different from the mind; therefore, the seeker should not get attached to the mind nor start working for its *saanthi*; because, the more the seeker works for *manas saanthi*, the more he has to nourish *mano abhimaanaa*| However, by 'claim'ing *aathma saanthi*, (of course, with the help of the mind) the seeker, indirectly, achieves *manas saanthi*, without working directly for it. An analogy can be given: the ritual of *soorya namaskaaraa*, where the worshipper's focus is on achieving *chittha suddhi*; but, his physical body also becomes healthier because of the ritual. *Soorya namaskaara* is done for *chittha suddhi*, and physical health is a bye-product. Similarly, 'claim'ing *aathma saanthi*: is the seeker's direct *saadhanaa* and *manas saanthi*: is the bye-product. This is the practice of the 'binary' format.

- अनुमानतः - by using the *anvaya-vyathirekha* logic.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 98:

यस्मात्प्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहार आत्मानवबोधाश्रय एव तस्मात्सिद्धमात्मनोऽप्रमेयत्वम् । नैव हि कार्य स्वकारणमतिलङ्घ्यान्यत्राकारक आस्पदमुपनिबध्नाति । अत आह ।

As the empirical life involving means of knowledge and objects of knowledge is thus founded on the ignorance of the Self, it is evident that the Self is not an object of knowledge. The effect cannot go beyond its cause and rest on what is not a factor in its production. Hence the following:

Here, Sureswaraachaarya is talking about a corollary of this discussion. This is not the main discussion, (the main discussion being "*aathmaa sathyam; anaathmaa mithyaa ; anaathmaa 'is' because of aathmaa's ignorance*").

What is that corollary? Ans: "The Self is not an object of knowledge".

Because of *aathma ajaanam* or the concealment of the *advaita* nature of *aathmaa* alone, there is *dvaita anubhavaa* – duality existence. Therefore, the existence of *dvaitam* presupposes the concealment of *advaitam* – just as, in the *rajju-sarpa* example, the seeming existence of the snake presupposes the concealment of the rope.

What is *dvaitam*? Earlier, the *Aacharyaa* had defined *dvaitam* as *pramaathaa-pramaanam-prameyam-pramaa*. *Dvaitam* in the form of these four, is possible only because of the concealment of the *advaita aathmaa* and since *aathmaa* is concealed, *aathmaa* cannot be one of these four entities.

In other words, because these four entities appear only because of the concealment of the *aathmaa*, *aathmaa* cannot be any one of the four. An example for this assertion: Because of the concealment of the 'waker', different entities are experienced in the dream world; therefore, it is clear that the 'waker' cannot be one of the entities in the dream world. If the 'waker' is one of the entities in the dream, the very experience of the 'waker' will make the dream disappear.

To repeat: the appearance of *pramaathru-chathushtayam* presupposes the concealment of *aathmaa* and therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, "*aathmaa* cannot be *pramaathaa* or *pramaanam* or *prameyam* or *pramaa*".

Though *aathmaa* is different from all the four – *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-pramaa chathushtayam* - the *Aacharyaa* highlights only one of them here, namely, that, *aathmaa* is not a *prameyam*. He states: "*Aathmana: aprameyathvam siddham*" – "it is evident that the Self is not an object of knowledge". This '*siddham*' (or understanding) is possible based on all the detailed arguments given above; the *Aacharyaa* does not elaborate on these arguments; but, succinctly covers them by the sentence "*yasmaath pramaana prameya vyavahaara: aathma anavabodha aasraya: eva thasmaath*".

Since *aathmaa* is *aprimeya*, a seeker should not expect *aathmaa* to be revealed in any particular experience ; he should not try to experience *aathmaa* or endeavour to have the *aathmaa* revealed in a particular experience; because, if *aathmaa* is revealed in a particular experience , it will become *prameyam*. For instance, consider a 'visible' object; it is revealed in a particular experience; the steps to the 'revelment' are: the viewer's vision is directed towards the object, a particular *vrutthi* is formed, a particular knowledge takes place and the object is revealed. Thus, a particular object is revealed in a particular experience.

If *aathmaa* is one of the four entities – the *pramaathaa*, *pramaana*, *prameyam* or *pramaa* - it will also be revealed in a particular experience. But, *aathmaa* being *aprimeya*, it is never revealed in a particular experience; therefore, the act of 'working for a particular experience with regard to *aathmaa*' , is, itself, a misguided pursuit.

Therefore, i.e. "*aathamana: aprimeyathvaath* (since the Self is not an object of knowledge)", if a *Vedhaanthic* seeker says "I have completed all the prescribed *saadhanaas* – like *sravanam*, *mananam* etc. Currently, I am sitting in meditation, looking for a particular explosive / silent / mystic / extraordinary experience, in which *aathmaa* is revealed", it would only show that he has misconceived *aathmaa* as one of the *prameyams*. Sureswaraachaarya warns the seeker: "do not commit that blunder".

- प्रमाणप्रमेय व्यवहाराः - All the 'knowledge' activities / epistemological activities / *jnaana vyavahaara:*,

Jnaana vyavahaara: / *pramaana prameya vyavahaara:* would mean "all forms of efforts that are taken, for getting a particular knowledge / experience". All the efforts are based on *dvaitham*, which is born out of *aathma ajnaanam*. Therefore Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- आत्म अनवबोध आश्रयाः - (are) based on self-ignorance.

All 'knowledge' activities or efforts for specific experiences – all those struggles – are based on '*aathma anavabodhaa*' (ignorance of the Self). The very struggle presupposes the concealment of the *aathmaa*; therefore, *aathmaa* will not fall within that *vyavaharaa*.

- यस्मात् तस्मात् - Because of this reason,
- सिद्धं - (the following idea /conclusion is) clear/evident.

What is that conclusion?

- आत्मनः अप्रमेयत्वम् - That *aathmaa* can never be revealed through any particular experience, (ordinary or extraordinary / mystic or non-mystic).

If at all anybody gets any mystic experience and something got revealed in that mystic experience, we (the *Advaita Vedhaanthins*) do not negate that mystic experience nor that 'something' revealed; what we say is "it is a mystic *prameya*, revealed through a mystic experience; but that mystic *prameya* is not *aathmaa*".

This is clarified further. It is because:

- कार्य कारणं अतिलङ्घ्य (athilangya) न आस्पदम् उपनिबध्नाति |
- कार्य - Any product
- आस्पदम् न उपनिबध्नाति - does not find its support / basis,
- अतिलङ्घ्य - outside
- स्वकारणं - its cause.

No *kaaryam* will find its support outside its cause; ornaments do not find their support outside their cause, namely, gold ; waves do not find their support outside their cause, namely, water ; furniture would not find its support outside its cause, namely wood. Extending these examples: "errors are products of *ajnaanam* and do not find their support outside the cause, *ajnaanam*". So, all the *mithyaa padhaarthaas* find their bases upon *ajnaanam*; all the *adhyaasaas* / misconceptions (like the rope-snake) find their supports / basis on ignorance. This is proved by *anvaya-vyathireka* – in the *rajju-sarpa* example, *ajnaana sathve rajju-sarpa sathvam*; *ajnaana abhaave rajju-sarpa abhaava*.; proving that ignorance is the *aasrayaa* of error; *agrahanam* is the *aasrayaa* for *anyathaa-grahanam*. (All these have been covered earlier in *maandookya kaarikaa* / *maandookya Upanishad* classes).

Therefore, all these four (*pramaathru- pramaana- prameya-pramaa*) have their basis on *aathma ajnaanam*.

So, in this context, the above general statement is to be interpreted as below:

- कार्य - Pramaathraadhi chathushtayam
- आस्पदम् न उपनिबध्नाति - does not find its support
- अतिलङ्घ्य - outside
- स्वकारणं - its cause, viz, aathma ajaanam,

Kaaryam is to be translated as *prameyaadhi chathushtayam* and *kaaranam* as *aathma ajnaanam*. "*Prameyaadhi chathushtayam aathma ajnaanam athilanghya na varthathe*" is the message.

- अन्यत्र अकारके - (and) apart from the *kaaranam*.

This term is used to further emphasize the same message.

And from all these discussions, what is the conclusion? The conclusion is: "*aathmaa* is never revealed in any particular experience that we have in *mithyaa dvaitha vyavaahaaraa*".

- अतः आह - Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says this:

Chapter II: Verse 98 –

व्यवधीयन्ते एवामी बुद्धिदेहघटादयः ।

आत्मत्वादात्मनः केन व्यवधानं मनागपि ॥ ९८ ॥

The mind, body and the objects are all mediately presented. But, the Self, because it is the Self, is present without any mediation whatever.

The various objects in the world, which are known as *prameyams*, are to be revealed by a *pramaanam*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- बुद्धिः - The mind (which is used in the generic sense and includes *mana:*, *buddhi:*, *Chittham* and *ahamkaaram* – the entire *antha: karanaa* or *sookshma sareeram*),
- देहः - the *sthoola sareeram* -
- घटादयः - (and) all external objects (*gata:* means a pot and *gataadhaya:* means 'all external objects such as a pot etc.') -

All these are varieties of *prameyams*.

- अमी - these *prameyams*
- व्यवधीयन्ते - are separated away from *chaitanyam*, (distanced by the *pramaanam*, which is the connecting link).

All the *prameyams* are distanced by the *pramaanam*, which is the link. Until the *pramaanam* link comes the *prameyam* is away unseen / unexperienced; the moment the *pramaanam* link comes, the *prameyam* is revealed.

The word '*vyaveedhayanthé*' literally means 'remain away' (from our Consciousness, because of the connecting link - the *pramaanam* - missing). The 'distance' is also caused by several layers. Between the *sookshma sareeram* and 'me', there is one layer – *kaarana sareeram*; between 'me' and the *sthoola sareeram*, there are two layers – the *kaarana sareeram* and *sookshma sareeram*; between 'me' and the external world, there are three

layers, *kaarana sareeram*, *sookshma sareeram* and *sthoola sareeram*. All these are *prameyams*, which are to be revealed by the *chidhaabhaasaa*, which has to pervade them to make them 'revealed'. Thus, the objects in the world are to be revealed through a *pramaana* and through particular experiences. But, *aathmaa* is different (stated in the second line of the verse).

99. Chapter II, Verse 98 and 99 (28-06-2008)

After dealing with the topic of *aathma-anaathma viveka*, now, Sureswaraachaarya has entered into the topic of the relationship between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. And, in this respect, *Vedhaanthaa* is quite different from *Saamkhyaa* philosophy.

In the *saamkhyaa* philosophy, *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* have the same degree of reality, whereas, in *Vedhaanthaa*, we have a very different view, viz., "'I', the *aathmaa*, am of a higher order of reality and the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is of a lower order (of reality)"; also, according to *Vedhaanthaa*, "'I' am the *adhishtaanam* of *anaathmaa* and *anaathmaa* is *adhyastham* upon 'me'". Therefore *anaathma-aathmaa* relationship is *adhyaasa-adhishtaana sambhandhaa*; *adhyaasaa* means *mithyaa* and *adhishtaanam* means *sathyam*.

Sathya-mithyaa sambhandhaa is the relationship between *aathmaa* and *anaathma prapanchaa* and the awareness of this relationship is very much required to practice the binary format successfully. The binary format will never work, if we forget the difference in the degrees of reality. The maxim '*aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*' has to be clear.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa highlights this topic. First, he categorized the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* into four categories – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramaa*. If the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* consists of these four components, and *aathmaa* is the *adhishtaanam*, different from the *anaathmaa*, then, *aathmaa*, the *adhishtaanam*, must be *pramaathru vilakshanam*, *pramaana vilakshanam*, *prameya vilakshanam* and *pramaa vilakshanam* – different from *pramaathaa*, different from *pramaanam*, different from *prameyam* and different from *pramaa*. All of them are *adhyastham*, *aathmaa* being the *adhishtaanam*, different from them.

And, among these four components of the *anaathma prapanchaa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is focusing on one particular aspect – i.e. '*aathmaa* is *prameya vilakshanam*' – different from *prameya* - which can be termed as '*aprimeyathvam*'.

The *Achaaryaa* has taken up for discussion, this concept of '*aprimeyathvam* of *aathmaa*'. '*Aprimeyathvam* of *aathmaa*' can be translated in this manner: "*aathmaa* is not revealed or revealable through a particular experience". Anything revealed through a particular experience is called *prameyam*; for instance, *sabda* is revealed through a particular experience caused by the ears - similarly *sparsaa*, *roopaa* etc. Any *prameyam* is revealed or revealable through a particular experience at a particular time. And, if it is a mystical experience, that will also reveal only a *prameyam* – the only difference is that through **mystical** experience, is revealed a **mystical** *prameyam* – nevertheless, what is revealed is

only a *prameyam*. *Aathmaa* being *aprimeyam*, it is neither revealed through a particular ordinary experience nor through a particular extraordinary or mystical experience. This, in essence, is the meaning of the word *aprimeyam*.

Sureswaraachaarya wants to continue to discuss this topic further in a technical - interesting and subtle - language. This manner of discussion is unique to this text, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* – not presented by other *Vedhaanthic* texts. And, what is that unique presentation?

Sureswaraachaaryaa first wants to deal with the query 'what is a *prameyam*?'; so that, once he explains the word very clearly, he can say '*aathmaa* is different from that *prameyam*'. Therefore, to start with, his focus is on *prameyam*, later to move to the *aprimeyathvam* of *aathmaa*.

The *Aachaaryaa* says that 'any *prameyam* is *anaathmaa*' and that 'any *anaathmaa prameyam* is hidden / separated from Consciousness by one or more layers of obstacles'.

Now, the question is "What are the possible layers of obstacles for a *prameyam* to be hidden from Consciousness?"

The first and universal layer of obstacles, which is common to all the *anaathmaa* is called *ajnaanam*. *Ajnaanam* is the first, fundamental and universal obstacle which hides *prameyam* from Consciousness. When we say '*ajnaanam* is the first layer of obstacle', the word *ajnaanam* is used in a technical sense. *Ajnaanam*, in this context, means *jaadyam* = *jadathvam* = *achethanathvam* = insentientcy = materiality. The statement, '*ajnaanam* is the first layer of obstacle', therefore, means 'the very insentientcy / *jadathvam* / materiality of *anaathmaa* is the first obstacle'.

Why do we say that *jadathvam* is an obstacle? Because, if *anaathmaa* were *chethanam* by itself i.e., if *anaathmaa* had *chethanathvam* / *chaithanyam* as its intrinsic nature, then *anaathmaa* would not have been away from Consciousness, obviously because Consciousness would have been its very nature. But, since *anaathmaa* is material / insentient in nature, and *anaathmaa* does not have Consciousness as its intrinsic nature, the very *jadathvam* of *anaathmaa* keeps it 'away' / separated from Consciousness. Because of its insentientcy, it can never reveal its existence by itself. It is true of any material object in the Creation, that it can never reveal its existence by itself, because it is obstructed by the layer of *ajnaanam* / *jadathvam* and therefore it requires *chaithanya sambhandha*: - 'pervasion of Consciousness', otherwise called '*chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*.' | If *jadathvam* were not there, it would not have required *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*: | An analogy can be given : consider the desk (in front of *Swamiji*) ; it requires the pervasion of light, for revealing its existence ; if the desk were luminous by itself, it would not have required the

pervasion of light. In contrast, 'light' does not require a 'pervasion of light', because 'light' is luminous by itself. In a similar manner, every *jadavasthu* is 'distanced' by *jadathvam* and therefore, it requires *chaithanya vyaapthi* / *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* for its existence to be revealed. And, whatever requires *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*, is called '*prameyam*'.

The entire *anaathma prapanchaa* - every material entity – has got *jadathvam* as an obstacle, requiring *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*., making it a '*prameyam*'.

And, there can be and there are more obstacles also.

Sureswaraachaarya says, that, based on the layers of obstacles, *prameyams* – the *anaathmaa* material - can be sub-divided into three categories, which he names.

The first is *buddhi*: / the mind. Mind is material; it has one obstacle - the obstacle of *jadathvam* / *jaadyam*; therefore, it requires *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* for its existence to be revealed. We are able to experience our mind and thoughts, because, *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades the mind, making the 'insentient' mind 'sentient'. The mind is the first type of *prameyam*.

The next category of *anaathmaa* is *deha*: | *Deha*: also is inert; it has *ajnaana prathibhandhaa* / *jaadya prathibhandhaa*; to use Sureswaraachaaryaa's expression, it has *ajnaana vyavadhaanam* – (the verb '*vyavadheeyante*' in the verse is a very technical word). Therefore, the body also requires *chaithanya* pervasion / *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*, for its existence to be revealed. Only when pervaded by *chidhaabhaasaa*, body also becomes sentient and recognizable. Body is *prameyam* No. 2, requiring the obstacle-remover of *jadya vyavadhaana nivritthi*: | But, between the two *prameyams* – the mind and the body - there is a difference, which is: even though both borrow *chaithanyam* from the *aathmaa*, the body cannot borrow the *chaithanyam* directly from the *aathmaa*, whereas, the mind can borrow *chaithanyam* directly from the *aathmaa*. If body can directly borrow *chaithanyam* / *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* from *aathmaa*, what will be the consequence? Ans: If it were so, even after death i.e. even after the mind 'leaves' the body, the body will continue to exist and will be able to perform its functions. But, experience shows that it is not so. This proves that, between the body and the *aathmaa*, there is a second layer, the 'mind'. Through the mind alone, the body can borrow *chaithanyam* from the *aathmaa*. Thus, the body has two layers of obstacles. The mind has only one layer of obstacle - *jadathvam*; while, the body has the obstacle of *jadathvam* / *ajnaanam* and in addition, a second layer – the mind. Only when the *chaithanyam* crosses the obstacle of the mind / passes through the mind and comes to the body / sense organs etc., then alone the body will become sentient.

The third category of *anaathmaa* is the external world of objects. The objects of the world are also *prameyams* ; they also have *jadathvam*; they also require *chidhaabhasa vyaapthi* ; and, they also cannot borrow *chidhaabhasa* directly from *aathmaa*. Then, how does *chidhaabhasa* come to them? In the first stage, from *aathmaa*, *chidhaabhasa* should go to the mind; then, it should go to the body, because, only if it goes to the body, sense-organs can operate. Otherwise, i.e., if *chidhaabhasa* pervades only the mind / is confined to the mind, the recipient will be in *svapna prapanchaa*. Only when the *chaithanyam* enters the body also, all the *golakams* will become active; and, with the activation of the *golakams* alone, the *indriyams* will become operational; only when the body, the *golakams* and the *indriyams* become operational, the *chidhaabhasa* goes out (to the external objects) - "Naanaachchidhra ghatodharasthitha mahaadeepaprabhaa bhaasvaram jnaanam yasya thu chakshuraadhikaranadhvaara bahi: spandhathe" - "whose intelligence 'flashes' outside through the eyes and other sense-organs, just like the bright light of a great lamp placed in a jar having many holes" – as verse 4 of *Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram* goes. Thus, the *chaithanyam* has to cross the mind (obstacle 1), cross the body (2nd obstacle) and then cross the fundamental obstacle – *jadathvam*. Thus, the external world has three layers of obstacles - three *vyavadhaanam*s - *jadathvam*, *deha:* and *mana:* |

But, what is common to all the three categories of *anaathmaa*? All are *jadam*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that all of them are *prameyams*.

A corollary is also derived: When it is a *prameyam* with three layers of obstacles, it is called *prameya anaathmaa* ; when it is a *prameyam* with two obstacles, it is called *pramaan anaathmaa* and when it has got only one obstacle, it is called *pramaathru anaathmaa*. *Pramaathaa* is also *anaathmaa*; but, its speciality is that, it is a *prameyam* with only one layer of obstacle; *pramaanam* is also *anaathmaa*; but, it is a *prameyam* with two layers of obstacles. *Prameyam* is also *anaathmaa*, with three layers of obstacles. What is common is that they – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* - are all *anaathmaa* only, all requiring *chidhaabhasa vyaapthi*.

If the *chidhaabhasaa* does not pervade the mind, *pramaathaa* - the knower – disappears. If the *chidhaabhasaa* does not pervade the body, all the *pramaanams* – the sense organs - become non-operational. And, if the *chidhaabhasaa* does not pervade the external world, *prameyams* go away. That's why, in *sushupthi*, the *pramaathaa* is absent ; the *pramaanam* is absent ; the *prameyam* is absent.

To summarize: "*Prameyam* means that which requires *chidhaabhasa vyaapthi*; and when the *chidhaabhasa* pervades , it becomes a particular experience, through which the *prameyam* is revealed".

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that *aathmaa* does not come under *prameyam* category, because *aathmaa* does not require *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* for its existence to be revealed. And, it does not require *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* because it is free from all the layers of obstacles. Especially the fundamental obstacle called *jadathvam* – inertia – is not there, because *aathmaa* itself is of the nature of Consciousness and why should *chith* require *chidhaabhaasa* for revealing its existence? *Thasmaath aathmaa aprameya:*]

Reverting to the text, verse 97 – Chapter II:

- अमी - These -
- बुद्धिदेहघटादयः - *Buddhi* (the *pramaatha*), *deha:* (the *pramaanam*) and objects like the pot etc. – i.e. the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*
- व्यवधीयन्ते - are obstructed from Consciousness.

The obstruction is caused by one or two or three layers; for *buddhi*, by one layer called *jadathvam*, for the body, by two layers called *jadathvam* and *buddhi* and for the world, by three layers – *jadathvam*, body and *buddhi*. Whereas:

- आत्मत्वात् - 'I', the *aathmaa*, being of the very nature of *chaithanyam*,
- केन - with what layer of obstacle whatsoever,
- आत्मनःव्यवधानं स्यात्(- can it (*aathmaa*) be separated / hidden from Consciousness?

This is not a question. It conveys that there is no layer of obstacle for *aathmaa*, requiring *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*. Therefore, *aathmaa* is *aprimeya:* (by definition of *prameyam*).

(In almost all *sahasranaamaas*, one of the names for the deity is *aprimeya:* or *aprimeyaa* – difference being only in the gender, which difference is also only *upaadhi dhrushtyaa* and not *svaroopaa dhrushtyaa*.)

This conclusion - that *aathmaa* is *aprimeya:* - gives rise to a few questions, as corollaries, which are worthwhile studying in this context.

It was said that '*aathmaa* is not revealed through any particular experience'. In that case, how does one prove the very existence of *aathmaa*? (This important topic has been discussed earlier, in various other contexts also – but, has to be recollected in this context.) The answer is: "even though *aathmaa* is **not revealed** through a / any particular experience, *aathmaa* is always/ ever **experienced / evident** in and through all the particular experiences, because all particular experiences are possibly only in the medium of Consciousness".

To drive home this answer i.e. to make this fact clearer, the following example may be given: Perception of any object requires not only the (existence of the) object and not only the (perceiving) eyes; but the medium of light also. All particular perceptions can take place and are taking place only in the medium of light. And, if a question "in which particular perception, is the *light* revealed?" is raised, the answer can only be "in *every* particular perception, light is *evident*". When a person is perceived, the object by his side may not be perceived and when the object is perceived, the person may not be perceived; in other words, when you perceive the person, the object by his side is not revealed; when you perceive the object, the person is not revealed; whereas, 'light' is revealed in *every* perception, though, this 'availability of light in every perception' is largely ignored, because the focus of the perceiver, is on the person / the object perceived. The fact, that, "in and through every perception, 'light' is being experienced" is lost sight of, by the perceiver. The perceiver does not require a particular perception to experience the light.

In the same manner, as in the above example of 'light' and 'perceptions', *aathmaa* is not revealed or experienced in a particular event; but, is ever available, in and through *all* experiences.

Whatever is experienced in one particular event is *prameyam*. But, *aathmaa* is 'experienced' in and through experiences of all *prameyams*. *Prameyams* are varied; but, in and through all the varied experiences / *prameyams*, "*prathibhodhavidhitham matham*" – "(*Brahman*) is known / discovered (as the witness awareness) in every thought" (*Kenopanishad* - verse 4 – Ch. II)

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "Why should you struggle to experience *aathmaa*?" In fact, *aathmaa* is unavoidable, just as sunlight cannot be avoided, when objects are perceived in sunlight. *Aathmaa aprameyathve api svaprakaasa: bhavathi* | Sankaraachaarya also repeatedly says: "If there is one experience which you need not work for / which is given to you freely, it is *aathma anubhavaa*". That's why, *aathmaa* is called *svaprakaasa:* and *svathassiddha:* |

Lalitha Sahasranaama Sthothraa refers to *Devi* as "*Aprameya svaprakaasaa mano vaachaamagocharaa*" | These adjectives are applicable to *aathmaa* also. *Aaathmaa* is beyond *mana:* and *vaak.*

And after reading this adjective '*manovaachaamagocharam*' to *aathmaa*, people commit a very big blunder. They conclude: "Because *aathmaa* is not available for mind and sense organs, the seeker has to work for *aathma anubhavaa*, by *removing* the mind and sense organs. *Nirvikalpa samaadhi* has to be resorted to. The seeker has to remove all the sensory

experiences; the seeker has to remove all the thoughts; and after removal of all the thoughts, *aathma anubhavaa* will be attained”.

But, if, thus, *aathma anubhavaa* were to be ‘attained’ only later, it would mean that there is some obstruction ; and , if there were, thus, some obstruction, *aathmaa* would become a *prameyam*. But, *aathma anubhavaa* being ‘unobstructedly’ available – *nithya upalabhdhisvaroopoham aathmaa* - why should one work for *aathma anubhavaa*? No effort is required.

This (i.e., the question ‘why should one work for *aathma anubhavaa*?’), in turn, gives rise to another question: “in that case, why should, at all, one study *Vedhaantha*?” Sankaraachaarya eloquently answers this question in his *Upadesa Saahasri* - Ch. XVIII (verse 4) – “*siddhaath eva ahamithi yasmaath yushmaddharmo nishidhyathe rajjvaamvaahidhee: yukthayaa thathvamithyaadhisaasanai:*” – “Just as the idea of a snake is negated from a rope (in the rope-snake example), so, everything of the nature of the non-self is negated from the eternally existing Self, implied by the word ‘I’, on the evidence of the ***Sruthis*** ‘Thou art That’ etc., in which the implied meanings of the words have been ascertained by **reasoning and the scripture**”.

It should be clearly understood that *aprimeya aathmaa* is always experienced by one, as ‘*aham*’, ‘*aham*’, ‘*aham*’ – *ekaathma prathyaya saaram*’ – ‘*baalyaadhishvapi anuvarthamaanam*’ etc. This is not the problem.

Then, what exactly is the problem? It is that, “upon the ever-experienced *aathmaa*, ‘I’, I falsely attribute the properties of *anaathmaa*”.

To repeat: Lack of *aathma anubhavaa* is not the problem; the problem is, that, ‘upon the ever-experienced *aathmaa* ‘I’, I superimpose *anaathmaa*’s attributes’. The physical body’s attributes – such as gender etc. – are wrongly superimposed on *aathmaa*; and mental attributes are also superimposed. The seeker tends to complain “ I do not have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* . Therefore, how can I claim that I am liberated?”. Even as one makes this statement, one is perpetuating the blunder of transferring the attributes of the mind to *aathmaa*. Even if the converse claim viz., ‘I have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*’ is made (which claim is generally not likely), the same blunder is committed. Both the *bhaavaa* and *abhaavaa* of *adhikaarithvam* are attributes of *anaathmaa* only, which attributes one tends to superimpose on *aathmaa*, little realizing that this ‘blunder’ is an obstacle to one’s progress towards the binary format.

“Drop’ the attributes of *anaathmaa* (i.e. recognize and ‘realize’ that they are only attributes of *anaathmaa* and **not** that of *aathmaa*) and you are free right now”. ‘Improvement of

anaathmaa' can be undertaken as a hobby; but, not as a 'must' for 'liberation'. *Sareeradhvayam* can be improved or refined, for *loka sangraha* – for the benefit of the family and community.

The very complaint "I have not achieved *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and therefore, I am hesitant (to claim that I am liberated)" only shows that the seeker is wrongly identifying himself with his mind – that he is superimposing on his Self, his *sookshma sareera dharmaa:*|

"I am" is a correct statement; but, adding an / any adjective to this statement – including one's academic achievements and qualifications - is only a loud proclamation of one's ignorance and does not reveal the glory of the true 'I'. *Vedhaantha* gives the call: "*siddhaath eva ahamithi yasmaath yushmaddharma: nivarthathe*"- "everything of the nature of the non-self is to be negated from the eternally existing Self, implied by the word 'I'". '*Yushmaddharma:*', in this context, is '*anaathma dharmaa'* | *Vedhaantha* does not talk of *aathma anubhavaa;* but, is for 'cleaning' the *aathmaa* intellectually, 'recognizing' that every attribute belongs to the *anaathmaa* and claiming that "I am the *nirguna chaithanyam*".

The seeker should realize that the attributes of his *sareera thrayam* are to be utilized only for his 'entertainment' and that his self-worth does not depend on the qualities or conditions of his *sareerathrayam* / family / profession / business etc.

Study of *Vedhaantha* is intended for negating *anaathma dharmaa* i.e. "*Adhyaasa nivrithyartham Vedhaantha vichaara:*" | This is another corollary to be noted.

(Reverting to the verse) –

- मनाक् अपि – *alpam api* (the word '*manaak'* is 'indeclinable').

"Even the smallest layer of obstruction is not there for *aathmaa*, with regard to the Consciousness" is the message.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 99:

स्वयमनवगमात्मकत्वादनवगमात्कत्वं च मोहमात्रोपादानत्वात् ।

This is so because they are not of the nature of consciousness by themselves ; and they are not of that nature, because they are products of mere delusion:

In the previous *sloka*, it was said that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is a *prameyam*, because it has got the *jaadyam* obstacle.

Then, the question arises: "Why do they have the *jaadyam* obstacle?" In other words: "Why is 'matter' material? Why does it have *jadathvam*? Why does it have the *jaadyam* layer of obstacle, requiring the *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*, for 'revelment' of its existence?"

Sureswaraacharya answers: "because, the entire *prameya / jaadya prapanchaa* is born out of *ajnaanam*".

The very word *ajnaanam* means '*jnaana virodhi*' / opposed to *jnaanam* or *chaithanya svaroopam*; i.e. the word itself indicates the opposite of *jnaanam*, viz., *achethanathvam / jadathvam*. Similar to a non-luminous object being a non-revealing object, *ajnaanam* also is non-luminous / non-revealing / non-illuminating.

The *Aachaaryaa* says that *ajnaanam* is the cause or *kaaranam* of the *prameya prapanchaa*; and, the *kaaranam*, *Ajnaanam*, not being of the nature of *chaithanyam* i.e. being *jada-svaroopam*, its *kaaryam* or product, the entire *prameya-prapanchaa* is also *jada-svaroopam*. "*Kaarana ajnaanasya jadathvaath kaarya prameya prapanchasya api jadathvam*" |

To repeat: *Ajnaanam* is *jada-svaroopam*, because *jnaanam* or *chaithanyam* is not the nature of *ajnaanam*; the *prameya prapanchaa* is born out of *ajnaanam* i.e. it is a *kaaryam* (product) of *ajnaanam*. "*Kaaranasya jadathvaath kaaryasya api jadathvam*", because of the maxim, "*kaarya-kaaranayo: samaana svaroopathvam / svabhaavathvam*" | An analogy: If gold is the cause and ornaments are the effect, the ornaments will be of the nature of the gold only.

Sureswaraacharya says: "*Prameya prapanchaa* is born out of *ajnaanam*; *ajnaanam* is *jadam*; therefore, *prameya prapanchaa* is also *jadam*; therefore, it requires *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*" |

- स्वयं अनवगम आत्मकत्वात् - Because they (*buddhi, deha, ghataadhaya*: - the entire *prameya prapanchaa / the anaathma prapanchaa*) are of the nature of *ajnaanam / achethanathvam*

This portion of the sentence is to be connected to the earlier verse – as "*svayam anavagama aathmakathvaath vyavadheeyanthe*" – "The mind, body, world etc. are obstructed from Consciousness, because they are of the nature of *achethanathvam*".

Then the next question is "How do you say that the world is *ajnaana svaroopam*?"

The *Aachaaryaa* gives the answer:

- अनवगम आत्मकत्वं च - The *jada svaroopam* of the world (is),

- मोहमात्र उपादानत्वात् - because mere ignorance is the material cause (of the entire *prapanchaa*).

Moham - *ajnaanam* / ignorance; *moha maathram* – mere ignorance; *upaadhaanam* - material cause.

Mere ignorance is the cause of the entire *prapanchaa*. *Ajnaanam*, the *kaaranam*, is *jadam*. Therefore, the *kaaryam*, the entire *prapanchaa*, is also *jadam*. The *kaarya-kaarana vilakshana aathmaa* alone is *chethanam*. And, it has to 'lend' *chidhaabhaasa* to all *prameyams*.

Then the next question is "Why do you say that the world is born of ignorance?"

Ans: "If the world was not born of ignorance, it would have been real like *aathmaa*".

Further question: "So, what is wrong in accepting the world also real, like *aathmaa*".

Sureswaraachaarya would reply: "If *anaathmaa* also were as real as *aathmaa*, the *Upanishads* would have never negated the universe".

The very fact, that the *Upanishads*, very deliberately, consciously, systematically and in several contexts, negate the universe, establish that 'the world is not as real as *aathmaa*'. The negations are not casual; nor are they stray statements.

"*Thaathparyathayaa*" (as their essential content) the *Upanishads* have negated the world. To quote only two (among the numerous passages): (1) in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, in four places, the term "*neti*" is used; (2) in *Kaivalya Upanishad* the 'negation' is established by the statements "*na bhoomi: na aapa: na agni: na sareeram na punyam na paapam*" etc.

In stark contrast, the *Upanishads* **never** negate *aathmaa*. *Aathmaa* is never negated; while the world is repeatedly negated.

"*Yath bhaathitham thath mithyaa*" | And, therefore, "the world must be born of *ajnaanam* only; therefore, world is *ajnaana kaaryam*; *ajnaanam* is *jadam*; therefore, the world is *jadam*; therefore, it requires *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*. *Aathmaa* is different; it is *aprimeyam*."

100. Chapter II, Verse 99 to 101 (05-07-2008)

Chapter II: Verse 99 –

प्रमाणमन्तरेणैषां बुद्ध्यादीनामसिद्धता ।

अनुभूतिफलार्थित्वादात्मा ज :किमपेक्षते ॥ ९९ ॥

These phenomena like the mind are not there independent of knowledge probative of them, because they require to be illumined by experience. But, the Self is sentience itself. Hence, what else does it need for presenting itself?

In these profound verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is pointing out that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is a product of ignorance – *ajnaana kaaryam*. The *Achaaryaa* uses a different term – '*moha maathra upaadhaanam*', whose ultimate meaning is only '*ajnaana kaaryam*'.

Since the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is only a product of ignorance, it is only a 'misconception'; it cannot be taken as a fact.

What is the proof / support for Sureswaraachaarya to make this statement, with such courage and conviction? Just as Sugreeva (in the Ramayana) boldly challenged Vaali, because of the backing of Rama, the *Achaaryaa* boldly declares "the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is a product of ignorance and is, therefore, only a misconception - not a fact", backed and supported as he is, by the *Upanishad Pramaana Vaakyaani*. All the *Upanishads* consistently and systematically negate this entire universe, both directly and indirectly.

Direct negation is available in several *Upanishads*:

The declaration "*Neha naanaa asthi kinchana*" – "there is no plurality at all here" is found in the *Katopanishad* (II.1.11), and also in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.Iv.19).

Kaivalya Upanishad avers: "*Na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na cha anilo mesthi na cha ambaram*"- "there is no earth, nor water, nor fire, nor wind, nor space" (negating even the basic *pancha bhoothaas*). "*Nethi nethi ithi aathmaa*"– in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*. There are, thus, several *anaathma prapancha nishedha vaakyaani*, in the *Upanishads*.

Not only do the *Upanishads* negate the universe directly, they negate the universe indirectly also. How do they do that?; by pointing out, that *Brahman alone* is there: "*Brahmaiva idham amrutham purasthaath brahma paschaath brahma dakshinatha: cha uttharena*" – "All this in front is the immortal *Brahman* alone; *Brahman* alone is behind; *Brahman* alone is on the right as well as on the left" (*Mundakopanishad* II.ii.12) or "*aathmaiva idham purasthaath*

paschaath" etc. When the *Upanishad*, thus, says "*aathmaa* **alone** is there", it indirectly means that "really speaking, *anaathmaa* is **not** there".

With such direct and indirect 'negations' of the universe, as his supports, Sureswaraachaarya boldly declares that the universe is *ajnaana kaaryam*.

But, when we say that the universe is a 'product of ignorance', the following aspect must be carefully understood: Generally we understand the word 'ignorance' as a condition of the mind; therefore, when we say that world is a 'product of ignorance', many people conclude that the world is a 'product of the mind' – i.e., 'ignorance projection' is misunderstood as 'mental projection'. The well-known example of the 'rope-snake' further adds to the confusion, because, the misconceived 'rope-snake' admittedly is a mental projection. But, this is not what *Vedhaanthalaa* means to say ; when *Vedhaanthalaa* says that *anaathmaa* is a product of ignorance, it means that the mind **also** is a product of ignorance, because, (according to *Vedhaanthalaa*), mind itself comes under *anaathmaa*. The entire universe, **including the mind** is a product of ignorance. To clearly convey this, the adjective '*moolaa*' is used for *avidhyaa*; and by the use of the term *moolaa avidhyaa*, the ignorance that *Vedhaanthalaa* talks about, is the ignorance which projects the world **including** the mind; it is 'mind-projecting' ignorance. Therefore, this ignorance is called *moolaa avidhyaa* ; and since the world **and** the mind are products of *moolaa avidhya*, the whole world and the mind are non-factual; mind is a misconception; world is also a misconception. They are both *ajanaa kaaryam*. This is a profound concept, which has to be understood properly: "World is not mental projection; world and the mind, together, are products of *ajnaanam*". When *sruthi* negates the world, *sruthi* negates the mind also; in *Kaivalya Upanishad*, for instance, world along with the mind is negated.

Therefore, (the first fact that is established, is) "*anaathmaa* is *ajnaana kaaryam*".

Then, the next fact that is established is "*Ajnaanam* is *jadam*", on the reasoning that follows: *Ajnaanam* is different from *Brahman* or *aathmaa*. What is the reason? "*Brahman jnaanaswaroopathvaath*" – "because, *Brahman* is of the very nature of *jnaanam*." Since, thus, *ajnaanam* is different from *Brahman*, *Brahman* being *chethanam*, *ajnaanam* has to be *achethanam* or *jadasvaroopam*.

"*Ajnaanam* is *jadam*" is, therefore, the second lesson to be noted.

The third lesson or the corollary: *Anaathmaa* is a product of *ajnaanam* (1st lesson above); *ajnaanam* is *jadam* (2nd lesson above). Therefore, "the *anaathmaa* which is a product of *jada ajnaanam*, must also be *jadam*" is the 3rd lesson or corollary based on 1 & 2 above.

To repeat: *Jada ajnaana kaaryathvaath* – being a product of *ajnaanam*, which is *jadam* - the *anaathmaa* also must be *jadam*. And, since the entire *anaathmaa*, which includes the body-mind complex also is *jadam* – i.e. since the body, mind and the entire universe are all *jadam* - they will all come under *prameyam*. "*jadavthvaath prameythvam (anaathmana:)*". Whereas, *aathmaa* is *aprameyam*; in contrast to *anaathmaa*, which is *ajnaana kaaryam*; therefore *jadam*; and therefore, *prameyam*.

And, therefore, what? Since *anaathmaa* is *ajnaana kaaryam*, *jadam* and *prameyam*, *anaathmaa* requires *chaithanya sambhandhaa*, for its existence to be revealed. This is similar to a non-luminous object requiring 'connection' with light for its existence to be revealed.

The *chaithanya sambhandhaa* can be either direct or indirect. This is what the *Achaaryaa* indicated in the last verse.

The mind gets *chaithanya sambhandhaa* directly. 'I' am the *aathmaa* and I spread my 'luminosity' / *chaithanyam* – directly over the mind. 'I' spread a coating of *chidhaabhaasaa* directly on the mind and the mind becomes *pramaathaa*. Later, after penetrating the mind, through the mind, 'I' spread over the body and the sense organs. The sense organs are, thus, indirectly coated by *chidhaabhaasaa* and they become *pramaanams*. Thereafter, when the *pramaanams* perceive the sense objects, through the *pramaana* sense organs, the *prameya prapanchaa* gets the *chaithanya sambhandhaa*. Thus, the *pramaathaa* mind gets primary coating of *chaithanya sambhandhaa*, the *pramaana* sense objects get the secondary coating and the *prameya jagath* gets the tertiary coating of *chidhaabhaasaa*. The common factor between the three - the *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – is that, none of them (the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*) - is capable of getting revealed without the *chidhaabhaasaa* coating, which is a blessing of 'I', the *chaithanya aathmaa*.

"*Na thathra suryo bhaathi na chandratharakam nemea vidhyutho bhaanthi kuthoyamagni: thameva bhaantham anubhaathi sarvam thasya bhaasaa sarvamidham vibhaathi*" - "The sun does not illumine; the moon and stars do not; these flashes of lightning also do not; how can this fire illumine? Everything shines after that Self alone, which is self-effulgent. By its light, all this shines" declares the *Kathopanishad* (II. ii.15). 'Thasya' refers to the Self or *aathmaa*.

Because of 'my' light, *pramaathaa* mind, *pramaanaa* senses and *prameyam* universe – all of them reveal their existence. This is what Sureswaraacharyaa says (in this verse): "you are the *aathmaa*; and, because of you alone *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya anaathmaa* reveals its existence". This is the topic of verse 99.

- एषां बुद्ध्यादीनां - All these anaathmaa components / the pramaathaa mind, the pramaanaa sense organs and the prameya prapanchaa (external world)
- असिद्धता - cannot prove their existence
- प्रमाणं अन्तरेण – without the pramaana, (which alone generates the Chidhaabhaasaa).

The terms *vrutthi vyaapthi*, *pala vyaapthi* etc., should be recollected in this context. *Ghataakaara vrutthi* is generated by the sense organs. *Ghataa* thought pervades the *ghataa* object and along with the thought, the *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades and when the *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades, the pot becomes known.

Antharena - without.

“Without *pramaanam*, *chidhaabhaasaa* is not generated; and, without *chidhaabhaasaa* ‘coating’, the world (*anaathmaa*) is not revealed”, (to quote the example again) similar to “objects not getting revealed without light ‘coating’ them”.

When *chakshurindriyam* (the organ of vision) is used, the generated *chidhaabhaasaa* is ‘coated’ over ‘*roopa prapanchaa*’ / the world of colours and forms. Use of *srothrendriyam* (the organ of hearing) generates *chidhaabhaasaa*, which gives a ‘coating’ on *sabda prapanchaa*. In a similar manner, each sense organ generates the relevant *chidhaabhasaa* and that relevant *chidhaabhaasaa* gets ‘coated’ over the relevant *prapanchaa - roopa, sabda, gandha, rasa and sparsa prapanchaa* - and the *chidhaabhaasaa* coating reveals the world. This is what is conveyed by the *Aachaaryaa*, by the use of the term ‘*pramaanam antharena*’.

But, an important difference (already indicated) is to be noted. What is that?

The sense organs *pramaana* are required for the *chidhabhaasa* ‘coating’ upon the external world to reveal its existence and that’s why they – the *roopa, sabda, rasa, gandha, sparsa prapanchaas* - are all called *indriya prathyaksha siddham*. But, in the case of body and mind, sense organs are not required to generate or develop the ‘coating’ of *chidhaabhaasaa*. Even when the sense organs are not functioning, the body and mind get *chidhaabhaasa*, directly from the *saakshi*, even without the functioning of the sense organs. The intervention of the sense organs is required only with regard to the external world, whereas, the body and the mind get the *chidhaabhaasaa* directly from the *saakshi* and therefore, the body and mind are called *saakshi prathyaksha siddham*. All three – the mind, body and the external world – require *pramaanam* – but, the difference is that the external world is ***indriya prathyaksha pramaana siddham*** and the body and mind are ***saakshi prathyaksha pramaana siddham*** - meaning that *saakshi* directly gives *chidhaabhaasaa* ‘coating’ to the mind and the body.

Therefore, '*pramaanam antharena asiddhathaa*' means '*saakshi indriya prathyaksha pramaanam antharena*' - 'without either *indriya pramaanam* or *saakshi pramaanam*'- the existence (of *anaathmaa*) is not revealed.

And, why do they require *pramaanaa*? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- अनुभूतिफल अर्थित्वात् - Because they need the pervasion of *chidhaabhaasaa*.

'*Anubhoothy palam*' means '*chidhaabhaasa palam*' otherwise called *pala vyaapthi*: |

All *Anaathmaa* require the 'spreading' of 'consciousness' upon them, because they are '*prameyam*'; why are they '*prameyam*'?; because, they are '*jadam*'. Why are they '*jadam*'?; because, they are '*ajnaana kaaryam*'. Why are they '*ajnaana kaaryam*'?; because, they are '*sruthi bhaadhyam*' (meaning 'negated by *sruthi*').

Then what about the *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* does not have any one of these problems. *Aathmaa* is not '*ajnaana kaaryam*'; therefore, not '*jadam*'; therefore, not '*prameyam*'; therefore, does not require '*chidhaabhaasa*' pervasion; therefore, does not require *indriya prathyaksham*; therefore, *aathmaa* is self-revealed – not in any particular experience ; but, in and through all particular experiences, *aathmaa* is revealed as '*aham*', '*aham*', '*aham* ithi ; *baalyaadhisu api jaagraadaadhisu* – *aathmaa* is *svathas siddha*: |

The term '*anubhoothy pala arthithvaath*' (in the verse) is to be connected to the first line of the verse as '*eshaam buddyaadheenaam asiddhathaa pramaanam antharena anubhoothy pala arthithvaath*' – 'the existence of *buddhi* etc. cannot be revealed in the absence of *pramaanam*, since they (*buddhi* etc.) require the pervasion of *chidhaabhaasaa* upon them (for their revelation) '.

'*Aathmaa jna:*' and '*kim apekshathe*' are separate sentences.

- आत्मा ज्ञः - *Aathmaa* is *chaithanya svaroop*: |

Jna: is the opposite of '*jadam*'; opposite of *jadam* is '*chethanam*'.

The *chethana aathmaa*, the self – evident *aathmaa*, the 'Consciousness' *aathmaa*:

- किं अपेक्षते – What *pramaanam* does it need (for presenting itself)?

What *pramaanam* does the *chethana aathmaa* / self – evident *aathmaa* / the 'Consciousness' *aathmaa*, need to reveal itself? It does not require *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*

or *prameyam* to reveal it'; on the other hand, all the three are revealed by 'me', the *aathmaa* .

'I' am beyond the '*thriputi*'; 'I' am the illuminator of the '*thriputi*' | "*Naantha: prangnyam na bahi: prangnyam na prangyaana ganam chaithanyam thureeyam aham asmi*" – as *Maandookya Upanishad* (*manthraa 7*) declares.

'*Kim apekshathe*' is not a question; but, a declaration that '*aathmaa* does not require a special experience – but, is self-evident'. If, therefore, a seeker says "I want to experience that *aathmaa*, by sitting in meditation and going into *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*", it only shows that he has not understood this *Vedhaanthic* view.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 100:

- वक्ष्यमाणेत्तरेतराध्याससिद्ध्यर्थमुक्तव्यतिरेकानुवादः।

To support, in advance, the idea of mutual superimposition, to be propounded, the distinction stated already, is repeated:

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "To achieve our grand goal, we have to consolidate, what we have already seen".

What we have seen is: "*pramaathaa* – the name given to the mind - is *anaathmaa*, and it has borrowed *chidhaabhaasaa*; *pramaanam* – which means the sense organs - is also *anaathmaa*; and it also has borrowed Consciousness; *prameyam*, which is the external world, is also *anaathmaa* and the *prameyam* also borrows *chidhaabhaasa* for its existence to be revealed. The *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – all the three are *anaathmaa* and all borrow/ have to borrow *chidhaabhaasaa*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa expresses this in a different language. Instead of using the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi*, he gives two divisions – "(1) all thoughts / experiences and (2) all objects of the thoughts / experiences. Both are *anaathmaa*".

What does one experience in the *jaagrath avasthaa*? (Ans:) (1) the world outside and (2) the thoughts inside. One cannot experience the world without the corresponding thought and cannot have a thought without the corresponding object. Thus, the *thriputi* (*pramaathaa*, *pramaana* and *prameyam*) can be reduced to 'thoughts' and 'objects', both being *anaathmaa*, while the *aathmaa* / *saakshi*, by its very presence - *saannidhya maathrena* – lends Consciousness / *chidhaabhaasaa* to the thoughts and the objects.

Kanopanishad starts with the queries "Keneshitham thathathi preshitham mana: kena praana prathama: praithiyuktha:" – "Willed by whom does the mind fall (on objects), as though it is forced? Directed by whom does the *Praanaa* function?" (I.1).

By 'my' very presence, 'I' give the *chidhaabhaasaa* 'coating' to the thoughts and objects; but, 'I' am neither the thoughts nor the objects.

The *Aachaaryaa* desires to consolidate these messages, before continuing further. He says:

- इतरे इतर अध्यास सिद्यर्थ - To reveal the superimposition of *anaathmaa* over *aathmaa* / to reveal the 'mixing-up' of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* / to reveal the mutual mixing-up of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*,
- वक्ष्यमाण - which is going to be said later,
- उक्त व्यतिरेक अनुवादः - the distinction between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, which has been already discussed, is repeated.

Anuvaadha: - re-statement / consolidation; *vyathirekha* – distinction (between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, in this context); *uktha* - already stated.

"The distinction between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, which distinction has been already discussed before, is re-stated (in the following verse), for the purpose of talking about the 'mixing-up' of the *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*" – is the gist of this *sambhandha gadhyam*. The 're-statement' is in the *sloka* that follows.

Verse 100 – Chapter II :

घटबुद्देर्घटाच्चार्थाद्द्रष्टुःयद्वद्विभिन्नता ।

अहंबुद्देरहंगम्याद्दुःखिनश्च तथा द्रुसे :॥ १०० ॥

The seer of the jar is different from the idea of the jar and the jar. Similarly Consciousness is different from the idea of the ego and from what is signified by the idea of the ego i.e., the individual who is subject to suffering.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "'I', the *aathmaa* is different from the *anaathmaa*, which consists of thought and the relevant object."

The entire *anaathmaa* is reduced to 'thought' and 'object'. 'Thought' is the internal world and 'object' is the external world. They are co-existent; they rise simultaneously during *jaagrath avasthaa* and dissolve simultaneously during *sushupthi avasthaa*.

As *Ramana Mahrishi* eloquently presents in *sad-darsanam*: "*dhiyaa sahodethi dhiyaasthamethi lokasthaththo deepraavibhaasya esha: | dheelokajanmakshaya dhaama*

poornaam sadhvasthu janmakshaya soonyam ekam – “The world rises along with the mind and resolves along with the mind; its existence is revealed by the mind; whereas, the *sadvasthu chaithanyam*, because of which the world and the mind rise and dissolve, neither ‘rises’ nor ‘resolves’ but is the ever-existent *poorna vasthu*”.

The world of thoughts and objects – the internal world of thoughts and the external world of objects – are both *anaathmaa*; and they simultaneously rise in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and simultaneously resolve in *susuhpithi*. That is what is being said here, by the *Aachaaryaa*.

- घटबुद्धेः - From the *ghata vrutthi*:/ the idea of ‘pot’(‘*buddhi*’, in this context means, ‘thought’ or ‘*vrutthi*’)
- घटाच्च अर्थात् - and from the pot, which is the object,

The ‘pot thought’ (the inner world) and the ‘pot object’ (the external world) are both *anaathmaa* and are illumined / revealed by ‘me’, who is different from both the thought and the object. What is the reason? Thoughts and objects rise – ‘I’ am; thoughts and objects dissolve – then also, ‘I’ am there. ‘I’ am *anvayaa* ; thoughts and objects are *vyathirekhaa*. *Yath anvaya*: (or whatever is *anvaya siddham*) has to be different from *vyathirekha*.

Therefore, from *ghata buddhi* and *ghata arthaa*,

- द्रष्टुः विभिन्नता - the *saakshi chaithanyam* is different.

‘*Dhrashtaa*’ is the *saakshi chaithanyam*, who is bestowing / giving the ‘coating’ of *chidhaabhaasaa*, to the thought, which is *pramaanam* and the object, which is *prameyam* and thus revealing both. *Dhrashtu*: - means ‘of the *saakshi chaithanyam*’; *Vibhinnathaa* - difference / distinction.

But, the problem is, that, even though the Consciousness and the thought are distinct, experientially, one cannot separate them. They are physically ‘inseparable’; the ‘separation’ has to be intellectual, by applying the five principles / features governing Consciousness, viz., (1) Consciousness is not a part, product or property of a thought (2) it pervades every thought – but is distinct from every thought (3) it is not limited by the boundary of thought (4) it continues even after thought dissolves (5) and that continuing Consciousness – ‘I’ am.

Just as the ‘pot thought’ results in a ‘pot object’, the ‘I’ thought obtaining / rising in the *jaagrath avasthaa* and dissolving in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, should also have a corresponding object, which would also belong to *anaathma prapanchaa*. What is that object? It is nothing but the body-mind complex, also an *anaathmaa* object, which is revealed by the ‘I’ thought. And, the ‘I’ thought and the object of the ‘I’ thought, viz., the

body-mind complex are distinct from 'I', the *chaithanya aathma*. That is being said here, by the *Aachaaryaa*

- यद्वत् तथा - In the same manner , as the *ghata vrutthi* & *ghata arthaa* are different from the *dhrashtaa*,
- अहं बुद्धेः - from, the 'I' thought (*buddhi:*, in this context also, means 'thought')
- अहं गम्यात् च - and from the object of 'I' thought (viz. the body-mind complex)

'*Aham ghamya:*' means 'the object of the 'I' thought' or the object of '*aham*'.

The 'object' of '*aham*', as normally understood by an individual, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, is the body-mind complex. In other words, what is normally referred to, by the use of the word 'I', is the body-mind complex and not the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

What type of body-mind complex or *sareera thrayam*?

- दुःखिनः च - which *sareera thrayam anaathmaa* (which is the meaning of the word I) is also an embodiment of *dhu:kham*,

(An aside: If the *anaathmaa* mind is an embodiment of *dhu:kham*, how come that one experiences *aanandaa*, at times? *Vedhaanthaa* replies: "Just as *chidhaabhaasa* is 'coated' over the mind, by *chaithanyam*, the 'experiential' pleasure also is only an *aanananda aabhaasaa* 'coating' given on the mind, by 'I', the ever-*aananda saakshi*. The mental pleasure does not belong to the mind. In reality, the external sense objects do not give the *aanandaa* ; the *aanandaa* is, now and then, given by 'I', the *saakshi*, as a 'coating' ".

Thus, the whole world gets three (types) layers of 'coating' – *sadhaabhaasaa* coating, *chidhaabhaasaa* coating and *aananda aabhaasaa* coating, all from 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

"*Asthi bhaathi priyam roopam naamachethyamsa panchakam aadhyathrayam cha madhroopam jagadhiroopam thathoadvayam*" (I am *sacchidhaanandha:*)

- दुःशेः विभिन्नता - 'I', the *chaithanyam*, am distinct.

Dhrusi: - *aathmaa / chaithanyam*.

"The *aathmaa / chaithanyam* is different from the 'I' thought and the 'I' object, just as the seer of a pot is different from the 'pot thought' and the 'pot object'" is the gist of the verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 101:

एवमेतयोरान्मानात्मनो :स्वतः परतः :

सिद्धयोलौकिकरज्जुसर्पाध्यारोपवदविध्योपाश्रय एवेतरेतराध्यारोप इत्येतदाह ।

Thus the self is self-established and the non-self is established by another. They are superimposed on each other, as in the ordinary rope-snake illusion. As in the latter well-known case, this mutual superimposition of Self and non-Self over each other, is based on nescience. This is brought out now:

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "in the previous verse, we have consolidated that *anaathmaa* has got four components – *idham vrutthi:*, *idham vrutthi vishaya:*, *aham vrutthi:* and *aham vrutthi vishaya:* - an object 'thought', the object of the thought, 'I' thought and the corresponding object of 'I' thought viz., the body-mind complex. All four are *anaathmaa*; of these, '*idham vrutthi*' and '*aham vrutthi*' are internal *anaathmaa*, while, '*idham vrutthi vishaya*' and '*aham vrutthi vishaya*' are external *anaathmaa*. And, who am 'I'? 'I' am different from all the four; 'I' give the coating of *chidhaabhaasaa* for all the four." That's what the *aachaaryaa* wants to say.

- एवं - "In this manner,
- एतयोः आत्म अनात्मनोः - of the *aathmaa*, the single component and the *anaathmaa* consisting of four components
- स्वतः परतः सिद्धयोः - which are independently and dependently revealed,

Aathmaa svatha: siddha: - *Aathmaa* is independently revealed / self-revealed

Anaathmaa paratha: siddha: - *Anaathmaa* is dependently revealed.

'Dependently revealed' means 'it requires the *chidhaabhaasaa* coating coming from 'me'. Only when the *anaathmaa* gets *chaithanya sambhandhaa*, its existence is revealed. Acquisition of *Chaithanya sambhandhaa* (as discussed earlier) can be in three ways - primary, secondary or tertiary. But, *anaathmaa* necessarily *has to* get *chaithanya sambhandhaa*. That's why, it is called *pramaanaa siddham* or *paratha: siddham*.

In contrast, *aathmaa* does not require *chidhaabhaasa sambhandhaa*, to reveal its existence, because *aathmaa* itself is of the very nature of Consciousness ; i.e., it is endowed with the original Consciousness itself and is therefore, called *svatha: siddha:* |

And, between these independently revealed *aathmaa* and dependently revealed *anaathmaa*,

- इतरे इतर अध्यारोपः - mutual 'mixing-up' (occurs),

'Mixing-up' is not only of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*; their properties are also erroneously 'mixed-up'.

This profound concept/ topic is the beginning of the *Brahma Soothraas – Adhyaasa Bhaashyam* – "Yushmadhasmath prathyaya gocharayo: vishayavishayino: thama: prakaasavath viruddhasvabhaavayo:"| Sureswaraachaaryaa borrows the idea from his *guru, Sankaraachaaryaa*.

(*Guru* alone gives *vidhyaa* 'coating' on the *sishyaa*; and, before 'coating', 'scraping' has to be done and that 'scraping' is the *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi* acquisition.)

In describing this mutual 'mixing-up' of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, since one is *sathyam* and the other is *mithyaa*, 'sathya anrutha mithuni krithya' will be apt.

What is this mutual 'mixing-up' due to?

- अविध्योपाश्रयः एव - because of ignorance only,

What is that ignorance? *Moola avidhya* – the fundamental basic ignorance.

For this mutual 'mixing-up' of the Real and unreal, *Vedhaanthaa*, generally gives the example of the 'rope' and the 'snake'. 'Rope' is real and the 'snake' is unreal. The 'real' rope and the 'unreal' snake are 'mixed up' due to ignorance.

But, when this example is given, many people get confused. In the 'rope-snake' example, 'snake' is a mental projection; this aspect is not the essential part of the example. The erroneous 'mixing-up' part **alone** should be considered important. But, critics of *Advaita* make the mistake of interpreting the *rajju-sarpa* example, as the *Advaitins'* declaration of the world as 'mental projection'. 'Challenge' to the *Advaita* philosophy is very often made by extending this example wrongly in this manner – unwittingly or wantonly.

It should be noted by any serious student, that whenever an example is given for any fact, there will be some common factors between the two – the fact and the example – and there will be some uncommon factors also. And, it is up to the student to co-operate with the *guru* and look at the example in the right perspective - appropriate the common factors and ignore the uncommon factors. This, in fact, is *sraddhaa*. The non-cooperative student, on the other hand, will stress on the uncommon factors and find fault with the example. The *guru* can never help such a student.

In the rope-snake example, 'snake' is admittedly a mental projection. Through this example, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* does not intend to say that the world is a mental projection; on

the other hand, he emphasizes that 'the world **with** the mind' is a projection of *moolaa avidhya*, and, therefore negatable by *saasthraas*.

Sureswaraacharya also gives the *rajju-sarpa* example for the 'mixing-up' of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. He gives an adjective to the example

लौकिक - the well-known:

- लौकिक रज्जुसर्प अध्यारोपवत् - similar to the well-known (example of) mixing-up of the rope and the snake (the rope being real and the snake being unreal)"

How does the 'mixing-up' take place? When the rope is mistakenly talked of as 'this is a snake', the word 'this' refers to the rope, which is real and the word 'snake' is the unreal product of ignorance. By the use of the word 'is', existence to a snake is given; which snake, in reality, does not exist. The 'real' and 'unreal' have been mixed up. 'Mixing-up' of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* and superimposition of the qualities of *anaathmaa* on *aathmaa*, are similar.

- इति एतद् आह – This is brought out now.

101. Chapter II, Verse 101 and 103 (12-07-2008)

After separating *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, now Sureswaraacharya wants to talk about their relationship; and the relationship is *sathya-anrutha sambhandha*; or *adhyaasa-adhishtaana sambhandha*; one is of higher order of reality and the other is of the lower order of reality.

The *anaathmaa* was presented variously by the *Aachaaryaa*. In one context, he divided *anaathmaa* into four components – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam*, *prameyam* and *pramithi* or *prama*. On another occasion, he divided it into three – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. Later, the *aachaaryaa* divided *anaathmaa* into two – in the form of *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – i.e. thought and object – internal world and external world.

Whatever be the type of division, the entire *anaathmaa* is superimposed upon *aathmaa*, like *rajju-sarpaa*, it was said. And when the rope-snake example is given, it should be remembered that the example is extendable only with regard to certain aspects and not in entirety. One wrong extension, as already mentioned, is, that, because the rope-snake is a mental projection, the example results in the misunderstanding that the *Advaitin* says “the world is a mental projection”. But, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* does not mean this by the *rajju-sarpaa* example – he avers that “the world, **along with the mind**, is a projection **caused by ajnaanam**”. One should clearly understand the objects of any example – which aspects of the example should be extended to the subject discussed and which should not be. The primary purpose of the *rajju-sarpaa* example is to show that they (*anaathmaa* and *aathmaa*) belong to different orders of reality and that one depends on the other.

And, in this context, it should also be remembered, that when the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* says that *anaathmaa* is superimposed on *aathmaa* he never talks about ‘beginning’ of *anaathmaa* in time. In the rope-snake example, when we talk about the superimposition of snake on the rope, we can talk of the ‘arrival’ of the snake as if ‘in time’; but, when we talk about superimposition of *anaathmaa* on *aathmaa*, we do not mean a fresh and new arrival of *anaathmaa* at a particular time. The *rajju-sarpa* example should not be extended, in this aspect of ‘time’; unlike *rajju-sarpa*, *anaathmaa* is *anaadhi*. When we say that *anaathmaa* is superimposed, we only mean that it is *mithyaa*; we never talk about the ‘beginning’ of *anaathmaa*; it is *anaadhi*; this *mithyaa anaathmaa* has been there from ‘beginningless’ time; and before its manifestation, the *mithyaa anaathmaa* existed in potential form.

Aathmaa is also *anaadhi*; *mithyaa anaathmaa* is also *anaadhi*. We are accepting two *anaadhis*; *sathya anaadhi aathmaa* and *mithyaa anaadhi anaathmaa*. And, if there are thus

two beginningless things, how does the *Advaithin* proudly declare his '*advaitam*' philosophy? The explanation is that the *Advaithin* only says that there are no two *sathya vasthus*, but only one *sathya vasthu – aathmaa*. He can happily accommodate infinite number of *mithyaaa vasthus* with one *sathya vasthu*. Addition of *mithyaa* does not disturb *advaita dhrushti*.

This *anaadhi anaathmaa* is now in manifest form, in the form of internal 'thought' universe and external 'object' universe. And, as mentioned earlier, before manifestation, the *anaathmaa* existed in potential form. This potential *anaathmaa* is given different names; one is *prakruthi*; another is *maayaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa uses yet another name '*moola avidhyaa*' or '*ajnaanam*'.

To repeat: *Moola avidhyaa* or *ajnaanam* is potential *anaathmaa*, also known by the names, *maayaa* or *prakruthi*.

Why does Sureswaraachaaryaa call it *ajnaanam*? When *anaathmaa* is solidly available as the 'tangible' material world, how dare the *Aachaaryaa* call it *ajnaanam*? The *Aachaaryaa* himself has answered this: "Whatever is negated or falsified by *sruthi* is called *ajnaanam*." *Sruthi janya jnaanena* – i.e. by the knowledge generated by *sruthi* / by the *pramanaam* of *sruthi* - this world is negated. *Katopanishad* (II. i. 11), for example, declares "*neha naanaasthi kinchana*" – "There is no plurality at all here".

Whatever is negatable and whatever is negated does not have its own intrinsic existence. If *anaathmaa* had its own intrinsic existence, *sruthi* would not 'negate' it, just as it never negates *aathmaa*, which has got its own intrinsic existence. The very fact that *sruthi* repeatedly negates *anaathmaa*, shows that *anaathmaa* does not have its own existence. Whatever is negatable by *jnaanam* is called *ajnaanam*.

The four words – *ajnaanam (moola avidhyaa)*, *prakruthi*, *maayaa* and *anaathmaa* – are synonymous. The only subtle difference is that the words *ajnaanam*, *prakruthi* and *maayaa* are used when *anaathmaa* is in dormant form, while the word *anaathmaa* is used when *ajnaanam / prakruthi / maayaa* is in visible, tangible form; i.e., the three words - *ajnaanam*, *prakruthi* and *maayaa* – are used for *avyaktha roopa anaathmaa*, while the word *anaathmaa*, is used for *vyaktha roopa anaathmaa*. Just as the same material (H₂O, in chemical parlance) is called water in liquid form, is called steam when it is in *avyaktha* form and is called ice when it is in solid form, *mithyaa* matter, *avyakthaa avasthaayaam* (in dormant form), is called *ajnaanam* or *maayaa* or *prakruthi* and the same *mithyaa padhaartha*, *vyaktha avasthaayaam* (in manifest, visible form), is called *anaathmaa*.

Both *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* are experienced simultaneously - 'I', the *sathya vasthu / chaithanyam / saakshi am aathmaa*; and the experienced world – the internal world of 'thoughts' and the external world of 'objects' – is *anaathmaa*. What are the resulting problems? Sureswaraacharya points them out: (1) the 'isness' of the *aathmaa* is mistakenly transferred on *anaathmaa*, while *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa* by itself and (2) we do not realize / recognize this fact, because of the *aavarana sakthi* of *ajnaanam*. We have transferred the existence of *aathmaa* to the *anaathmaa* and we think *anaathmaa* has got intrinsic existence.

Experience of *anaathmaa* itself is not a problem; but assuming that *anaathmaa* has got its own existence and is capable of hurting 'me', results in *anaathmaa* becoming a 'threat' to me. What is required is not 'wiping out' *anaathmaa* ; it can continue ; the erroneous attribution of the threatening power to the *anaathmaa* alone needs to be removed. This is to be done by 'taking away' the 'existence' from the *anaathmaa*

i.e., by understanding its *mithyaa* nature, just as clearly as when viewing oneself in the mirror, the viewer is very clearly aware that his mirror image is not a second entity, having the same order of reality as oneself. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* points out, that, what is required is a simple 'sorting out'. This is the content of the verse (101).

Chapter II: Verse 101 –

अभ्रयानं यथा मोहाच्छशभृत्यध्यवस्यति।

सुखित्वादीन्धियो धर्मास्तद्वदात्मनि मन्यते ॥ १०१ ॥

Just as, on the moon, is superimposed the movement of the clouds, the qualities of the mind like pleasure and pain are ascribed to the pure Self.

Sureswaraacharya is now explaining the mutual transference of the attributes of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, which is called *anyonya dharmaadhyasa*: |

Experientially, how does this take place? The *dharma* of *anaathmaa* is *raaghaa, dveshaa, samsaara, sthoolathvam*, maleness / femaleness, *varnaa, aasramaa* etc.; and, these *sareerathraya dharma* are transferred on to 'me' and I claim shamelessly that I am *brahmana, kshakthriyaa* etc., even though 'I', the *aathmaa*, am *jaathi-neethi-kula-gothra dhooragam, naama-roopa-guna-dosha varjitham (Viveka choodaamani – Verse 254)*. But, I am superimposing *anaathma dharmaa* upon myself.

And, there is a reverse 'transfer' also - 'reality' or 'existence'. 'Reality' or 'existence' belongs to 'me' only; the *anaathmaa* does not have 'reality' or 'existence' of its own. What is the proof? *Sruthi* negates the universe; but, even though *sruthi* does the *nishedaa*, I am shamelessly attributing 'reality' to the *anaathmaa*.

If I am merely attributing 'reality' to the *anaathmaa*, it may not matter. But. this 'attribution' makes the world a 'threat'. The *abhayahethuprapancha*: becomes *baya hethu*: / Every moment of anxiety is revealing conversion of *abhayahethu anaathmaa* into *bayahathu anaathmaa*. To remember the 5th capsule of *Vedhaanthalaa*, "when I forget my real nature, the world becomes a threat and life becomes a struggle; when I remember my real nature, the world is an entertainment".

The *rajju-sarpa* example was given by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to this *sloka*. In the *sloka* itself, another example is given. All these examples are given by Adi Sankara in his *Aathma Bodhaa*, which is a beautiful text. The beauty of that text is, that, every *sloka* reveals an important concept of *Vedhaanthalaa*, the first half of the *sloka* revealing the concept and the second half giving an example, to make the concept easy of understanding. The text is popular because of this fact. Another text, which gives several such examples is *Aparokshaanubhoothi*/ Sureswaraachaaryaa, being a disciple of Adi Sankara, takes the liberty of 'borrowing' the example given by his *guru* - *Sasabhruthi abhayaanam adhyavasyathi* /

Sasabhruth means '*chandra*:', the moon. Why is the moon called '*sasabhruth*'? The moon has a dark spot, which appears like a rabbit. In Sanskrit literature, the dark spot on the moon, is very often compared to a rabbit – *sasa*:, in Sanskrit. Since the moon 'carries' a rabbit, it is called a 'rabbit-holder' – *sasa bhruth* |

Though the moon has got its own motion (as per astronomy), it is 'relatively' stationery in the sky, when compared to the surrounding clouds, which, blown by the winds, move faster than the moon. The fast motion of the clouds creates an illusion that the moon is moving fast. Instead of seeing the clouds as moving fast, away from the moon, which is the fact, the viewer tends to see the moon as moving fast, away from the clouds. This common experience is given as an example for the *adhyasam*.

- यथा - Just as
- अभ्रयानं - the movement of the clouds,

Abhram literally means 'that which holds / carries water' and is, therefore, a name for the clouds; *yaanam* means 'travel'.

- शशभृति अध्यवस्यति - is transferred to / superimposed on the moon,
- मोहात् - because of delusion,

Another example that can be thought of is: when one is travelling by train and the train reaches the destination, the tendency is to say "the destination has come", instead of saying "the train has reached its destination".

Yet another example : When I am gloomy, I say that the day is gloomy.

- तद्वत् - in the same manner,
- सुखित्वादीन् धर्मान् - the various attributes like pleasure etc. (including raaghaa, dveshaa etc. belonging to the sareerathraya anaathmaa),

Dharmaa: - attributes such *sukithvam*, *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *bhayam*, *krodhaa* etc. *Sukithvam* – happiness; refers to experiential pleasure. 'Experiential pleasure' belongs to *anaathmaa* only, while only *svaroopa aanandaa* belongs to *aathmaa*. I make the mistake of transferring the 'experiential pleasure' to *aathmaa*. *Sathva guna janya sukham* also belongs only to *anaathmaa*. (*Sathvam sukhe sanjayathi* – Ch. XIV – Bhagavadh Githa).

Where do these attributes belong?

- धियः - belonging to the mind,
- आत्मनि मन्यते - are superimposed on aathmaa.

Manyathe – superimposed.

And, interestingly, after erroneously making this transfer, the seeker complains "I do not have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*; therefore, how can I claim liberation?" Even as one is negating *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, one is only reinforcing one's *mano-adhyaasaa* | Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*raaghaa*, *dveshaa* etc. are not 'your' problems". Ironically, *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is required to know that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not required for liberation. From another perspective, *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* has fulfilled its purpose, when the seeker realizes that *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is not required for liberation, since liberation is the seeker's unconditional nature.

Verse 102 – Chapter II :

दग्धत्वं च यथा वह्नेरयसो मन्यते कुधीः।

चैतन्यं तद्ब्रदात्मीयं मोहात्कर्तरि मन्यते ॥ १०२ ॥

Just as a deluded fellow ascribes the burning propensity of the fire to the red-hot iron, the consciousness that belongs to the Self as such properly, is ascribed, in delusion, to the agent (i.e. the mind or ego).

The previous *sloka* is to show that *anaathma's* attributes are erroneously transferred on to *aathmaa*; this *sloka* is to show that *aathmaa's* 'attribute' (essential nature or feature) of 'reality' is erroneously transferred to *anaathmaa* and *anaathmaa* is seen as real enough to threaten or hurt. To convey this message also, an example is given by the *Aachaaryaa*.

What is that example? A red-hot iron ball – which is another popular example given in *saasthraas*. When an iron ball is placed in fire and taken out after some time, it would have acquired the heat and brilliance of the fire and would have become red-hot; the iron ball, by itself, does not have the heat / burning power or brilliance as intrinsic qualities; the burning power and brilliance are the intrinsic qualities of only the fire, passed on temporarily to the iron ball; even so, they are wrongly attributed to the ball, by an observer, who remarks 'the iron ball burns'. When the remark '*aya: dahathi*' is made, the 'burning' nature of the *agni* is wrongly transferred to the *aya*: | The *Aachaaryaa* uses this example in this verse (102).

- यथा - Just as
- वन्हेः दग्धत्वं - the heat / burning power of the *agni*
- अयसः मन्यते - is wrongly attributed to iron (a ball of iron or a piece of iron),
- कुधीः - by an unintelligent person, (who exclaims '*aya: dhahathi*'),
- तद्वत् - in the same manner,
- चैतन्यं आत्मीयं - the sentiency / consciousness which intrinsically belongs to 'I', the *aathmaa*,

Aathmeeyam - belonging to the aathmaa.

- कर्तरि मन्यते - is falsely superimposed on the karthaa ahamkaaraa (the anaathmaa mind),

Karthari – antha:karane / vijaana maya kose / anaathmani.

Not only the is the *chaithanyam* erroneously superimposed on the *anaathmaa* , the existence and reality are also superimposed ; one tends to look upon the *anaathmaa* and its attributes as real. Because of what?

- मोहात् – because of indiscrimination / non-discrimination.

When this is said, some people ask the fundamental question "when you say 'a person superimposes', who commits this mistake of 'superimposing'? Is it the *aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*?"

It should be remembered that *aathmaa* is *akartha* and *aboktha* and therefore, never acts by itself; and, therefore, it can never be said that "*aathmaa* is committing the mistake" (it cannot commit anything, let alone a mistake).

Then, can it be said that "it is the *anaathmaa*, which commits the mistake"? *Anaathmaa*, by itself, is *jadam* and a *jada vasthu* cannot do any action. Therefore, the *anaathmaa* also cannot be said to commit the mistake. Then, what is the answer to the doubt raised?

It should be remembered, that, whenever normally one refers to '*jeeva*' or '*I*' etc., it is the 'mixture' of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, that is being talked out. The meaning of the word '*I*' (in general usage) is the *aathma-anaathma* mixture – *amsadvayam*. This '*I*', which has got *amsadvayam*, has got a higher, 'real' *amsa* and a lower, 'unreal' *amsa*. All transactions are done by this mixture '*I*' only – the mixture of the higher real *amsa* (*aathmaa*) and the lower unreal *amsa* (*anaathma sareerathrayam*)- neither by *aathmaa* **alone** nor by the *anaathmaa* **alone**.

And, the tendency is to mistake the lower, unreal *amsa* of 'mine' as the 'Reality'; this tendency in fact, is, *samsaara*. What, therefore, is *moksha*? For *moksha*, one need not 'eliminate' the lower self ; one has to only understand the lower *amsa*, for what it really is ; to understand the *aparaa prakruthy* , as *aparaa prakruthy*, with the awareness that it is of a lower order of reality.

But, at the same time, the *anaathmaa* should be looked upon with respect also; because, even to claim "I am of a higher order of reality', the lower order – the *anaathmaa ahamkaara* / mind - is required. The 'lower order' can be made use of, but with the clear understanding that it is of the lower order. This 'clarity' / 'wisdom' is what is required for liberation and not *Samaadhi*, mystic experiences etc.

The lower '*I*' and *jagath* can be allowed to continue, along with the real, higher '*I*', but, with the attitude that the *mithyaa sareerathrayam* and the *mithyaa jagath* are all for one's free entertainment only. If the *anaathma ahamkaara* and mind are put an end to, one cannot even claim to be a *nithya-muktha aathmaa* and from this perspective, the lower '*I*' – the mind – is, in fact, a blessing.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 103:

सर्व एवायमात्मानात्मविभाग :प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणवर्त्मन्यनुपतितोऽविध्योत्सङ्गवर्त्येव न परमात्मव्यपाश्रय :।

All this distinction between Self and non-Self falling, as it does, in the field of knowledge like perception, is grounded in nescience and does not rest on the supreme Self.

Because of the understanding of this superimposition, we get (or we are supposed to get) the clarity that the entire duality, that is talked about, is nothing but *mithyaa* only. Because, 'duality' requires *anaathmaa*; and *anaathmaa* is a product of *avidhyaa* (*avidhyaajanyam*) and therefore *mithyaa*; and if a 'second' thing is *mithyaa*, the duality born out of the 'second' *mithyaa* thing must also be *mithyaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- आत्म अनात्म विभागः - The 'division' or 'duality' on account of the two components *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*,
- सर्व एव - whatever be the type of division,

The 'division' may be *pramaathaa* and *prameyam* division or *bokthaa* and *boghyam* division or the 'seer' and 'seen' division or any other similar division. To remember (part of) verse 8 the *Dakshinamurthy Sthothram* – "*viswam pasyathi kaarya kaaranathayaa svaswaami sambhandhatha: sishya acharyathayaa thathaa eva pithru puthraadhi*" – "the world is seen variously related - as cause and effect, as possessor and possession, as father and son, as teacher and taught etc." . These are all different types of divisions, simultaneously generating relationships. The unique approach of *Vedhaanthalaa*, is, that, while people tend to look upon 'relationships' as 'security', *Vedhaanthalaa*, in a diametrically opposite perception, looks upon them as 'insecurity', because of the reason that the 'relationship' invariably causes constant anxiety that the 'relationship' / 'security' may be lost and in fact, will be lost, one day or other. Sense of insecurity is never removed by 'relationships'; it only reappears in the form of anxiety. *Vedhaanthalaa* sees relationships as *dvaitham* and *dvaitham* as the cause of *bhayam* – "*dvitheeyaath vai bhayam bhavathi*" – "It is from a second entity that fear comes" (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – I. iv.2). "Therefore", *Vedhaanthalaa* says "*advaitam* alone is security"; ironically, the tendency of the people is a fear of *advaita darsanam*, perceiving it as 'loneliness' in the absence of a second entity to be 'depended' on. *Gouda Paadhaachaarya* refers to such people, who are afraid of being detached – who are afraid of the 'yoga' of detachment (*asparsa yoga*, as he names it) - as "*abhaye bhaya dharsina:*"- "they see fear in the fearless" (Verse 39 – *Advaita Prakaranam – Maandookya Kaarika*).

In short, the *aathma anaathmaa vibhaagha:*, the division, results in 'relationships', with consequent anxiety (of the loss of the relationship) and consequent insecurity.

- प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाण वर्त्मनि अनुपतितः - which division is proved by all the five *pramaanams* other than *Vedhaanthalaa*,

The 'division' / duality is proved / corroborated / substantiated / reinforced by all the *pramaanams* (except *sruthi*). *Prathyaksha pramaanam* proves *aathma – anaathma* division. Once *prathyakshaa* proves 'division', *anumaanaa* (logic) also will prove *dvaitham* only. The

Advaitin admits that 'logic' will prove *dvaitam* only. In the same manner, the other *pramaanams* – *upamaanam*, *artha patthi* etc. also will prove *dvaitam* only. But, *Advaitam* has a rather audacious explanation for this: "all *pramaanams*, other than *sruthi*, will establish *dvaitam* only, because, all those *pramaanams* themselves, are born out of *ajnaanam* only. Only *Vedhaanthaa* has the capacity to declare *advaitam*, because *Vedhaanthaa* is not *ajnaana janyam*". This topic had already been discussed, in the 1st chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Varthma - field; the (*pancha*) *pramaani* are referred to as *varthmani* – the 'fields' of the (five) *pramaanams*, beginning with *prathyakshaa* ; *Anupathitha*: - falls .

The literal meaning of "*prathyakshaadhi pramaana varthmani anupathitha*:" is "that, which falls within the fields of the *pramaanams*, beginning with *prathyakshaa*" and the essence is "that, which is proved by *pancha pramaanaani* , other than *sruthi pramaanam*" . This is an adjective to '*aathma-anaathma-vibhaagha*.' – 'the division between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaad* .

This duality, which is proved by the *pancha pramaanaani* other than *Vedhaanthaa pramaanam*, is grounded in *ajnaanam* (nescience) only. The *Aachaaryaa* uses a nice expression to convey this:

- अविद्या उत्सङ्ग वर्ती - resting in the lap of avidhyaa (ignorance),

Avidhyaa – *ajnaanam*; *uthsangha*: means a lap; *varthee* - resting in.

Just as a baby rests on its mother's lap, the sense of duality, generated by *ajnaanam*, i.e. the baby born to the *maathaaji* of *Avidhyaa*, rests on the lap of its mother i.e. it (duality) is grounded in *avidhyaa* or *ajnaanam*.

'Avidhyaa uthsangha varthee' is also a *viseshanam* (adjective) of *aathma-anaathma-vibhaagha*: |

Whatever is within *ajnaanam* is *mithyaa*.

- न परमात्म व्यपाश्रय :- does not have real existence on the *aathmaa*.

Vyapaasraya: - based on / existing upon.

This may give rise to a doubt. It has been repeatedly said that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is resting on *aathmaa*, *aathmaa* / *brahman* being *sarva adhishtaanam*. But, in

this portion, Sureswaraacharya says *dvaitham* is resting on *ajnaanam* – not on *aathmaa – na paramaathma vyapaasraya*: | Are these two views not contradictory? Which view is correct? The explanation is: The *dvaitha prapancha* is resting on *ajnaanam* only / *mithyaa ajnaanam* only / negatable *ajnaanam* only / negatable *mayaa* only ; but, then, that *maayaa* itself is resting only on the *sathya adhishtaanam Brahman* – because *maayaa*, for its existence has to 'borrow' from *aathmaa / Brahman*. *Dvaitham* is resting on *ajnaanam* and *ajnaanam* is resting on *aathmaa*. Therefore, *dvaitham* also ultimately rests on *aathmaa*, though indirectly. There is no real duality which is directly resting on *aathmaa*. There is a *mithyaa* duality resting on *mithyaa ajnaanam* and that *mithyaa ajnaanam* is upon the *aathmaa*. That's why, *Advaita* does not look upon pure *aathmaa* as the 'creator' of the world; *aathmaa with maayaa* only is the Creator.

At the same time, though *Vedhaanthaa* (the *Upanishads*) repeatedly declares that *dvaitham* is the cause of fear and insecurity, it must be noted that, *dvaitham*, by itself, is not a cause of fear. On the other hand, after *jnaanam*, the *Advaitin* will declare the same *dvaitham* as entertainment and therefore, as welcome.

If *dvaitham*, by itself, is the cause of *samsaaraa*, and therefore *mokshaa* requires escaping from the world of duality, it will result in the corollary of *Bhagavaan*

Himself becoming a *nithya-samsaari*, since He does not, obviously, have *videha-mukthi* ; but, is eternally in this world of duality; He has to create, and He has to sustain His creations . If *dvaitham* is the cause of problems, *Bhagavaan* will have to be considered a *nithya samsaari*. But, *Bhagavaan* is *nithya-muktha*:

This would make it clear, that, really speaking, *dvaitham* is welcome 'entertainment'; but, if and when taken as 'Reality', it becomes the cause of *samsaaraa*.

The technical term used to denote "*dvaitham*" taken as 'real' is '*abhaadhitha dvaitham*' – 'unfalsified *dvaitham*'.

'Falsified duality' is 'entertainment; '*abhaadhitha dvaitham*' or 'unfalsified duality' is *samsaaraa*.

102. Chapter II, Verse 103 and 104 (19-07-2008)

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 103:

अस्याश्चाविध्यायाः सर्वानर्थहेतोः कुतो निवृत्तिरिति चेत्तदाह ।

In answer to the question as to how this nescience, which is the root-cause of all evil, is terminated, the following is formulated:

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to emphasize that *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* do not have the same order of Reality; that, *aathmaa* is ever free from the contamination of *anaathmaa*; and, that, escaping from *anaathmaa* requires only the mere understanding that *anaathmaa* is of a lower order of reality; and, that, therefore, the *anaathmaa* show can be allowed to continue, as it is.

One need not physically escape from *anaathmaa*, either by oneself running away from *anaathmaa*, in the name of *videha mukthi* or by pushing away the *anaathmaa*. Neither 'running away' is required; nor 'pushing away'. Let everything continue as it is; the 'separation' automatically takes place when the *aathmaa* is understood as of a higher order of reality than *anaathmaa*, and as *nithya asangha svaroopaa*: | An example is the cinema screen, on which the movie can be allowed to continue even permanently, because of the fact that the different scenes of the movie - scenes of flooding or of ravaging infernos - cannot damage the screen. The 'moving' movie cannot 'move' the immovable screen.

"Let the *anaathmaa jagath* / events / objects / persons continue to act on and on; but, they cannot, in any way, disturb 'me', because they are all only *mithyaa*". This 'understanding' alone is required. No other extra-ordinary event need take place; of course, this 'understanding' itself is 'extra-ordinary', because, people generally do not understand the value of this 'understanding'. People, who need and look for 'extra-ordinary' events, can take this clarity itself as an extra-ordinary event.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is emphasizing this aspect; because, *saamkyaa* philosophy, which comes very close to *Vedhaanthee* on *aathma-anaathma-viveka*:, misses the last step of falsifying *anaathmaa*. Therefore, with the intention of falsifying the *anaathmaa*, the *aachaaryaa* is writing this introduction.

It has already been seen that the *anaathmaa* consists of three components: (1) the mind (2) the sense organs and (3) the world. All of them come to existence, by borrowing *chidhaabhaasaa* from 'me'. The mind directly borrows *chidhaabhaasaa* from 'me' and becomes *pramaathaa*; the sense organs 'secondarily' borrow, i.e. they borrow *chidhaabhaasaa* not directly, but, *through the mind*, and become the *pramaanams*; the

'borrowing' of *chidhaabhaasaa* by the world, is achieved in three steps; *jagath* borrows *chiadhaabhaasaa* through the sense organs which, themselves, have borrowed *chiadhaabhaasaa* through the mind; and the *jagath* becomes *prameyam*. But, what is common to all the three, is the fact, that all the three are 'borrowers' of *chidhaabhaasaa*. *Pramaatha* is *anaathmaa* no. 1. *Pramaanam* is *anaathmaa* no. 2 and *prameyam* is *anaathmaa* no. 3. The entire *thriputi anaathmaa* is *jadam* and is *mithyaa*.

Why do we say that this *jada-thriputi* is *mithyaa*? Ans: because, they are products of *avidhyaa*. Sureswaraachaarya conveys this in a colourful manner: "because all these three 'babies' are lying on the lap of *avidhyaa* 'mother'".

The *avidhyaa* referred to here, is the *moolaavidhyaa*. This *moolaavidhyaa* is not a condition of the mind; but is the producer of the mind itself.

The *moolaavidhyaa* is *parinaami-upaadhaana-kaaranam* for the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi*. *Moolaavidhyaa* being *parinaami-upaadhaana-kaaranam* (the changing material cause) and *thriputi* being *parinaami kaaryam* (the changed product), the *thriputi* has to rest on the 'lap' of *moolaavidhyaa*, since *kaaranam* is the *aasrayaa* for *kaaryam*.

And, where, in turn, does this *moolaavidhyaa*, with the *thriputi* on her lap, rest? "It is resting on 'me', the *saakshi aathmaa*". This is an important fact to be noted. Verse 18 of the *Kaivalya Upanishad* "*Thrishu dhaamasu yadhbhogyam bokthaa boghascha yadhbhaveth thebhyo vilakshana: saakshee chinmaathroham sadaasiva:-*" "I am distinct from all those which are the subjects of experience, the objects of experience and the instruments of experience, in all the three states; 'I' am the witness, which is pure Consciousness and which is ever auspicious", is very relevant in this context. "In all the three *avasthaas*, whatever subject/object/instrument are there, all of them are resting on *avidhyaa* and that *avidhyaa* is resting on 'me'" is the essence.

Why should *moola-avidhyaa* be considered as 'resting' on me? The reason: *Moolaaavidhyaa* not only does not have *chith* of its own; *Moolaaavidhyaa* does not have *sath* (existence) of its own also. I lend 'existence' to *moolaavidhyaa*, which, in turn, produces the *thriputi*; and after they come into existence because of 'my' grace, 'I' lend *chidhaabhaasaa* to all of them - *moolaavidhyaa* and *pramaathru-pramaana-prameyam* - and allow the 'drama' to go on.

This power of the *moolaavidhyaa* to produce the *thriputi* is called *vikshepa sakthi*:|

From another perspective, the existence of *moolaavidhyaa* is a blessing; that it has a *vikshepa sakthi* is a blessing; that the *vikshepa sakthi* can produce *thriputi* is a blessing; and, that because of the *thriputi*, the *jaagrath-naatakam* and *svapna-naatakam* are going

on, is a blessing. All these are, in a way, blessings, because, without *moolaavidhyaa*, *Brahman* / *aathmaa* cannot do anything ; even claiming 'I am *Brahman*' will not be possible.

But, then, there is a problem; the problem is, that, the same *moolaavidhyaa* has *aavarana sakthi* (veiling power) also, because of which *sakthi*, we do not realize that every one of the *thriputi* is of the lower order of reality / existence. Therefore, what is required is only deft handling / removal of the *aavarana sakthi* of the *moolaavidhyaa*; thereafter, one can allow the *moolaavidhyaa* to continue, allow the *thriputi* to continue and allow the world to continue.

The *aachaaryaa*, in the first part of this *sambhanda gadhyam*, pointed out, that the *thriputi* is grounded in *avidhyaa* and does not really rest on the supreme Self – *na paramaathma vyapaasraya*: / To continue:

- कुतो निवृत्तिः - "How is the removal / termination (to be accomplished),
- अस्याः च अविद्यायाः - of this *moolaavidhyaa*, which is the producer of the mind (*pramaathaa*), sense organs (*pramaanam*) and the world (*prameyam*) and
- सर्व अनर्थ हेतोः - which is the cause of all the troubles ?"

Anartham – problems (like *samsaaraa*); hethu: - cause.

When we say that *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause of all problems, the entire *moolaavidhyaa* need not be blamed; it should be noted, that, the *aavarana sakthi* part of *moolaavidhyaa* alone is the problem ; therefore, what is attempted to be destroyed through scriptural study, is only the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa*. The rest of the *moolaavidhyaa*, i.e., the *vikshepa sakthi sahitha moolaavidhyaa* need not be destroyed ; it only needs to be falsified and should be falsified.

The job of the seeker is, thus, "to destroy the *aavarana sakthi* and falsify the *vikshepa sakthi*", akin to removing the poisonous fangs from a cobra, allowing the cobra to survive and even using it as an *aabharanam*. The *thriputi* needs to be only falsified and not destroyed.

'*Nivrutthi*:' (in the text) literally means 'removal' or 'termination'; and, in this context, '*moolaavidhyaa nivrutthi*:' is 'destruction of *aavarana sakthi*:', and falsification of *vikshepa sakthi*:' |

'Falsified *vikshepa sakthi*:' will be called *maayaa*. Even *Bhagavaan* allows *maayaa* to continue and He enjoys *srushti-sthithi-laya* - as indicated by the *Thaithreya Upanishad*

statement "sokaamayatha" – "He (Brahman) desired" (*Brahmavalli – manthraa 6*). Therefore, where is the need for a wise seeker – a *jnaani* – to complain against the world?

- इति चेत् - If this question is asked (that, how the destruction of aavarana sakthi and falsification of vikshepa sakthi are to be achieved),
- तद् आह - that question is being answered:

Verse 103 – Chapter II :

दुःखराशेर्विचित्रस्य सेयं भ्रान्तिश्चिरन्तनी ।

मूलं संसारवृक्षस्य तद्बाधस्तत्त्वदर्शनात् ॥ १०३ ॥

The root of this tree of transmigratory existence, which abounds in extraordinary varieties of evil, is this ageless illusion. That illusion is annihilated by the vision of Reality.

- सा इयं भ्रान्तिः - This moolaavidhyaa

The 'villain' of the samsaaraa vision is moolaavidhyaa, referred to, in this verse, by the word bhraanthi:; moolaavidhyaa is the parinaami-upaadhaana- kaaranam for the thriputi, while Chaithanyam is called vivartha-upaadhaana-kaaranam of thriputi.

When it has thus been said that moolaavidhyaa is the aasrayaa for thriputi and Brahman is the aasrayaa for moolaavidhyaa, the statement, invariably, gives rise to a question: "When and why did this moolaavidhyaa 'arrive' and 'rest' on Brahman?" Natural intellectual questions are 'when / why / where / how etc.'

Sureswaraachaaryaa answers all these questions by the use of the word 'chiranthani', which means 'anaadhi' - 'ageless'. The questions 'when / why / where /how etc.' will be relevant only when moolaavidhyaa 'arrives' at a given time. But, moolaavidhyaa is as beginningless as 'I', the saakshi chaithanyam.

- चिरन्तनी – (which is) anaadhi,

This gives rise to another question. If '**both (the two)**' of them (i.e. aathmaa / Brahman **and** moolaavidhyaa) are considered beginningless, what happens to the concept of Advaitam? Does not this perspective revolt against Advaitam? The Advaitin's answer is that, the anaadhi moolaavidhyaa can never disturb the non-dual status of chaithanyam, since the Advaitin is of the firm conviction that moolaavidhyaa is of a lower order of 'reality', in comparison to chaithanyam. 'Sathyam + mithyaa' = 'ekam' (one) only.

This *moolaavidhyaa* is:

- मूलं - the root cause
- सन्सारवृक्षस्य - of the *samsaaraa* tree,

What type of *samsaaraa* tree?

- दुःखराशेः विचित्रस्य - which tree is a source of different varieties of sorrow.

Till knowledge is achieved i.e. as long as the seeker is in the *jeeva-isvara-jagath* triangular format, without moving to the *aathma-anaathma* binary format, the world is looked upon as 'source of sorrow'. World is *dhu:kha mayam* in the triangular format; but, once the seeker comes to *jnaana yoga*, he should not use the term 'source of sorrow' to describe the world, since such use would indicate that the seeker is still considering the world as of the same order of reality (as *chaithanyam*). The adjective '*Dhu:kha raase:*' to the *samsaara vruksham* is applicable only during *ajnaana avasthaa*. From the standpoint of the ignorant people, who are still in the triangular format, the *samsaaraa vrukshaa* is a 'bundle of sorrow' (*dhu:kha raasi*). For that *samsaara vrukshaa*, this *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause.

And, therefore, what should the seeker do, to remove the *dhu:kha raasi* / *samsaara vrukshaa*? The *moola kaaranam*, which is the *moolaavidhyaa*, should be removed. 'Removal of the *moolaavidhyaa*' is the solution and therefore, the project of the seeker. And, how? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers:

- तद् बाधः - The removal of this *moolaavidhyaa* (is achieved)

And, (as already discussed) what do we understand by 'removal of *moolaavidhyaa*? *Moolaavidhyaa* is not proposed to be totally eliminated, since its total elimination will mean 'removal of the world etc.' What is proposed is only the destruction of the '*aavarana sakthi*' part of the *moolaavidhyaa*.

Whatever has to happen according to our *praarabhdhaa karma*, we should allow to continue, but, with the firm conviction that the pain (or pleasure) is only a *mithyaa* response to *mithyaa* situations, themselves caused by *mithyaa praarabhdhaa*, which itself is because of the *mithyaa vikshepa sakthi* of the *mithyaa moolaavidhyaa*. This conviction, that, all these are *mithyaa*, is possible, only by the removal of the *aavarana sakthi*; in fact, only on the removal of *aavarana sakthi*, the significance of the word '*mithyaa*' is also understood properly; that, it is not a mechanically uttered word; but, when used, gives a profound meaning that 'I' am of a higher order of reality, not touched by the events that 'come and go'.

`Thadhbhaadha:' means `thasyaa: (bhraanthe:) bhaadha:' - 'removal of the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhya*'.

And, how will the *aavarana sakthi* go?

- तत्त्व दर्शनात् - by *aparoksha jnaanam* of the higher order of reality, called *aathma chaithanyam* / *saakshi chaithanyam* / *kootastha chaithanyam* / *brahma chaithanyam* / the 'original Consciousness'.

`Thathva darsanaath' means `adhishtaana darsanaath'.

`Darsanam', in this context, means `aparoksha jnaanam', which, in turn, means 'learning to use the word 'I', for the *aathma*'. If and when a seeker uses the words *aathmaa* or *Brahman* for *adhishtaanam* – i.e., as `aathmaa is the *adhishtaanam*' or as `Brahman is the *adhishtaanam*', in the 'third' person, it only goes to show that the seeker is yet to realize that 'I' am, in fact, the *aathma/Brahman*; and that, even as he craves to experience the *adhishtaanam*, misapprehends *adhishtaanam* as an 'object' to be experienced. Even 'craving to experience' is an 'obstacle' (may be the 'final' – nevertheless an 'obstacle'). The seeker should stop 'craving for experience'. Then what is *darsanam*? 'Learning to use the word 'I' for the *adhishtaana chaithanyam* – the ever-evident Consciousness'.

"*Thathva darsanaath thadhbhadha: (bhavathi)*" - "The removal of *moolaavidhya* is achieved by *aparoksha jnaanam*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 104 (Chapter II):

तद्वादस्तत्त्वदर्शनादिति कुतः सम्भाव्यत इति चेदत आहागोपालाविपालपण्डितमियमेव प्रसिद्धिः।

That it is annihilated by the vision of Reality can be understood by this consideration which is universally acknowledged:

- तद्वादः तत्त्वदर्शनात् (इति वाक्यं) –" (This statement, that) 'the negation of *moolaavidhya* takes place because of *thathva darsanam*' -

In the last quarter of the last *sloka*, this statement was made, that, 'the negation of *moolaavidhya* takes place because of *thathva darsanam*, i.e., *adhishtaana jnaanam*'.

- इति कुतः सम्भाव्यते - how is this statement legitimate or logically possible ?

The doubt is: "Why is *adhishtaana jnaanam* is being insisted on for *moolaavidhyaa bhaadha*: ? Is there not any other method, that can be tried?"

The doubt is quite common, since, there is a popular, but a contrasting view that there are several paths to *mokshaa*, - *karmaa* path, *bhakthi* path, *Raja yogaa* path, *jnaanaa* path etc., (i.e., *jnaana maargaa* considered as only one of the different paths). "Under such circumstances, why is *jnaanaa* alone being insisted on?" is the question.

(Swami Dayananda humorously responds to a similar question 'why are you so fanatic about *jnaana*?', by answering, 'I would better be a fanatic, rather than a lunatic'; because, many different paths are **not** available for 'removal' of ignorance. The earnest seeker has to be 'fanatic' about *jnaana*; fanaticism in a legitimate context *is* permissible. The *Advaitin*, therefore, insists that '*jnaath eva kaivalyam*'.)

- इति चेत् - If such a question is asked,
- अत आह - the answer is given.

What is the answer? It is an obvious and universally known fact that, on *any* subject, *jnaanam* (knowledge) alone can remove *ajnaanam* (ignorance). Whoever has this firm conviction is not a fanatic; but is a wise person. The *Aachaaryaa* gives this answer, in his own inimitable style.

- आगोपाल अविपाल - Beginning from a cowherd or a shepherd,

Aa – beginning from; *gopaala* – cowherd ; *avipaala* – shepherd. The words 'cowherd and shepherd' are used to denote illiterate persons.

- पण्डितं - up to the greatest scholar,

'Aagopaala avipaala panditham' - (in short, means) 'To the entire humanity'

- इयं एव प्रसिद्धिः - this law is well known.

No formal education is needed to understand that only 'knowledge' eliminates 'ignorance'; even a cowherd will know that his 'ignorance' of the number of cows in his herd, will be eliminated by counting the cows i.e. by acquiring 'knowledge' (on the number of the cows), though he may not be able to express this fact, in the form of a law, viz., "'knowledge' eliminates 'ignorance'".

This law is true with regard to *moolaavidhyaa* also.

In *Vedhaantha*, all forms of worldly ignorance, other than *moolaavidhyaa*, are called *thoolaavidhyaa*. Ignorance of the presence of an object - say a pot or ignorance of a subject – say Mathematics, etc., will come under *thoolaavidhyaa*, while *brahma- adhishtaana-*ignorance is called *moolaavidhyaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the law which is applicable to *thoolaavidhyaa* is the very same law applicable to *moolaavidhyaa* also. Thus, an *anumaana vaakyam* is given – “*Moolaavidhyaa jnaana baadhyaa avidhyaathvaath thoolaavidhyaavath*” meaning “*moolaavidhyaa* is removable by knowledge only, because it is also an *avidhyaa* like any other *thoolaavidhyaa*”. The statement “*Iyam eva prasiddhi:*” indicates this fact. It is explained in the *sloka* that follows.

Verse 104 – Chapter II:

अप्रमोत्थं प्रमोत्थेन ज्ञानं जानेन बाध्यते ।

अहिरज्ज्वादिवद्बाधो देहाध्यात्ममतेस्तथा ॥ १०४ ॥

The cognition springing from error is sublated by a cognition springing from right apprehension in the case of snake-ropes illusion. Similarly, the conception of the body etc., as the Self is sublated by the right knowledge of the Self.

A plain *anumaana vaakyam* is presented in this *sloka*. “*Moolaavidhyaa jnaanabadhyaa avidhyaathvaath thoolaavidhyaavath*” is the logical statement.

- अप्रमोत्थं ज्ञानं - A falsely born perception / cognition

jnaanam – cognition / perception ; *apramottham* – ‘falsely born/ risen’. ‘*Apramottham*’ should be taken as an adjective, in this context, to *jnaanam*.

- बाध्यते - is always negated / negatable later,

Even in the scientific field, theories arise as *jnaanam* ; society accepts the theories and live with the theories , based on the understanding / notion that they are right ‘knowledge’. But, in quite some instances, the scientists themselves, after some time, based on further research, conclude that the originally propounded theory was wrong. When the latter ‘knowledge’, correcting the initial theory, arises, the former ‘seeming knowledge’ is called ‘false knowledge’. Obviously, a ‘false knowledge’ is not considered as ‘false knowledge’, till it is negated or falsified later. Similarly ‘world perception’, even though is ‘false knowledge’, is not ‘false knowledge’ until it is negated later.

प्रमोत्थेन ज्ञानेन - by right cognition / knowledge.

An interesting 'aside': This fact, viz., 'a false cognition can be negated later by right knowledge', results in a big problem for the entire humanity, especially in the scientific field. Scientists invent so many theories. After a few years or decades, some of them are falsified, while the other theories may continue for some more time without 'falsification'. In effect, at any given time, all the unfalsified theories constitute, what is considered 'knowledge'. Alternately, present 'knowledge' is nothing but 'currently unfalsified theories'.

Analyzing further, at any given time, the society is not sure as to which current theory will be falsified later and which theory will withstand 'falsification'. The so-called 'knowledge', therefore, is also eternally subject to 'doubts', because, no scientist also can ever confidently guarantee that his theory will never be falsified at any time later; this is because, it is a known fact, that even theories which were once considered to be based on sound footing, have been disproved or falsified later.

Ultimately, the so-called 'knowledge' turns out to be only 'beliefs'. In reality, the society is living on 'beliefs' only; one can only say 'this particular 'knowledge'/ 'belief' is not yet falsified'.

In contrast, the *Advaitin* claims that *advaita jnaanam* alone will remain as permanent *jnaanam*, which will never be / can never be negated later.

But, how? Why is it said "that *advaita jnaanam* alone will remain as permanent *jnaanam* ; that *advaita jnaanam* alone can never be called just a belief ; that *advaita jnaanam* can never be negated later"?

The explanation: "Once the seeker comes to *Advaitam*, he negates the very *thriputi* itself – the *thriputi* consisting of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. Once the *thriputi* itself is negated, in the absence of *pramaathru-pramaana-prameyam*, where is the question of the generation of another new knowledge / *prama* ? When further *prama* itself is not possible, where is the question of negating the *advaita jnaanam*? *Thasmaath advaitam eva sathyam; advaita jnaanam eva abhaadyam jnaanam*".

The *Advaitin*, therefore, is not worried about any fresh scientific theories also; he is not afraid that any new invention or discovery will negate the *advaita jnaanam*, since, he has the conviction, that all of them are *mithyaa*.

In short, while, Science cannot confidently claim any theory as final, in contrast, *advaita aacharyaas* have confidently declared that *advaitam* is an irrefutable fact.

Reverting to the text:

Apramottham – *apramaya uttham*- *apramaa roopena uttham* - a cognition that has risen falsely / falsely born cognition; similarly, *pramottham* – *pramaya uttham* - *pramaa roopena uttham* - rightly born cognition.

What is the example? The popular and well-known 'rope-snake' example.

अहिरज्ज्वादिवत् - as in the case of 'snake cognition' and 'rope cognition'.

'Snake cognition' is the former cognition and 'rope cognition' is the latter. The later 'rope' cognition falsifies / negates the earlier 'snake' cognition.

A repeated reminder: This example does not convey the message that the *Advaitin* believes that the world is a 'mental projection'; the example is only with regard to the falsification aspect (i.e. the fact of 'rope cognition' falsifying 'snake cognition'.) It should not be extended to convey that the world is a mental projection, in the manner of the snake being a mental projection. The *Advaitin* does not say that the world is a mental projection; his contention is that the world **and** the mind, are the projection of *moolaavidhya*, which is resting on *aathmaa*.

Ahi: - snake; *rajju* – rope.

- तथा - In the same manner,
- देहादि आत्म मते: - the false notion that 'I am the body' / 'there is a real body and I am that body',
- बाध: - will be negated.

By what? By the right knowledge that 'I' am the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

103. Chapter II, Verse 104 to 106 (26-07-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is discussing the difference between *saamkhyaa* and *vedhanthaa* philosophies.

In *saamkhyaa* philosophy, the entire *anaathmaa* is *sathyam*, whereas, in *Vedhaanthic* teaching, the entire *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*, because the *anaathmaa* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*.

'I', the *aathmaa*, with the help of *moolaavidhyaa*, have projected the entire universe, consisting of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. This *moolaavidhyaa* is called *prakruthi* – the basic matter.

According to *Vedhaanthaa*, the *moolaavidhyaa* does not have the same order of reality, as 'I', the *aathmaa*, have.

We know this fact, that, *moolaavidhyaa* / *prakruthi* does not have the same order of reality as *aathmaa*, because all *Upanishad vaakyams* negate *prakruthi*; and whatever is negated cannot be real.

'I', the *aathmaa*, which is *anaadhi*, along with *moolaavidhyaa*, which is also *anaadhi*, have projected the *thriputi* of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. *Pramaathaa* is the mind; *pramaanam* is the sense organs; and, *prameyam* is the external universe.

Pramaathaa, the mind, is intrinsically *jadam*; *pramaanam*, the sense organs, are also intrinsically *jadam*; and, of course, the *prameya prapancha* is also *jadam*. All these three are *jadam*, by themselves. The *pramaathaa* mind gets the *pramaathaa* status, because, 'I', the *aathmaa*, bless the mind with *chidhaabhaasaa*; and therefore, with 'my' blessing, the *pramaathaa* gets borrowed sentiency; and, in the same manner, with 'my' blessing only, the *pramaanam* also gets borrowed sentiency; and, *prameyam* is also known, only when the *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades objects, through the *anatha:karana vrutthi*. Thus, all these three – the *thriputi* – have only borrowed existence (since they are 'projected' by 'I', the *aathmaa*, along with *moolaavidhyaa*); all the three have only borrowed Consciousness also. *Sath* of the *thriputi* is borrowed – they have *sadhaabhaasaa*; *chith* of the *thriputi* is also borrowed – they have *chidhaabhaasaa*. (Though generally the suffix '*abhaasaa*' is added to '*chith*' only – as *chidhaabhaasaa* – the suffix can be added to *sath* also – as *sathaabhaasaa*)

Thus, the *thriputi* has got *sadhaabhaasaa* and the *thriputi* has *chidhaabhaasaa*; both *sath* and *chith* are lent by 'me' only, to the *thriputi*.

But, the problem that we face, is, that, since the *moolaavidhyaa* of *jeeva* has got both *aavarana sakthi* and *vikshepa sakthi*, while the *vikshepa sakthi* projects the *mithyaa thriputi*, the *aavarana sakthi* veils the fact that the *mithyaa thriputi* is *mithyaa*.

This happens only in the case of *jeeva* (as against *Isvara*). *Isvara* is also *aathmaa* only ; *Isvara* also has got *moolaavidhyaa* ; from *Isvara's* angle also, the universe is projected by *moolaavidhyaa* only (what is called as *maayaa* / what is called as *prakruthi* is nothing but *moolaavidhyaa* only).

But, there is an important difference. What is that difference? In the case of *Isvara*, while the *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* projects the *mithyaathriputi* (as in the case of *jeeva*), *Isvara* has the advantage, that, in His case, *aavarana sakthi* is non-functional / in-operative. Therefore, to *Isvara*, *aavarana sakthi* cannot and does not cover the fact that the *mithyaa thriputi* is *mithyaa*. *Isvara* 'projects' (the *thriputi*), with the clear and firm knowledge (that the projected *thriputi* is *mithyaa*) - as the Lord declares in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (verse 6 – chapter IV) : “*Ajo api san avyayaathmaa bhoothaanaam Isvaropi san prakruthim svaam adhishtaaya sambhavaami aathma maayaya*” – “Even though I am birthless and deathless and even though I am the Lord of (all) beings, still, I come into being through my own *maayaa*, by resorting to my *prakruthi*”. *Moolaavidhyaa* minus *aavarana sakthi* is called *maayaa*.

Since, in the case of *jeeva*, the *aavarana sakthi* is operational , it follows, that, if *jeeva* wants to become like *Isvara*, the *jeeva* has to eliminate the *aavarana sakthi*. The *jeeva* can continue to possess *moolaavidhyaa*, but, has to convert the *moolaavidhyaa* into *maayaa*, by eliminating the *aavarana sakthi*, since, as indicated earlier, *moolaavidhyaa* minus *aavarana sakthi*, but, with the *vikshepa sakthi* retained, is *maayaa*. When the *aavarana sakthi* is eliminated / removed, with the *vikshepa sakthi* continuing to exist, the *thriputi* will also continue to exist; but, the *jeeva* will clearly understand the *mithyaa thriputi* **as** *mithyaa thriputi*.

Thereafter, the *jeeva* can allow the mind - *pramaatha* to continue, the senses - *pramaanam* to continue and the world - *prameyam* to continue even for **eternity**, with the firm convictions “I, am the *aathmaa*” and “*mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathishtitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi* - everything is born in 'me' alone; everything is based on 'me' alone; everything resolves into 'me' alone – (*Kaivalyopanishad* – verse 19)”.

At this stage, the *jeeva* never prays to *Bhagavaan* to facilitate his (*jeeva's*) 'running away' from the world, in the name of *videha mukthi*. The concept of *videha mukthi* is only in the “*jagath-jeeva-Isvara*” format - the triangular *ajnaani* format. The *jnaani* does not crave for

"freedom from re-birth". For him, the world can be allowed to be born again , again and yet again ; even if the *srushti-sthithi-laya* cycle continues for eternity, the *jnaani* is not affected.

This (maturity) is accomplished by *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa*. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says (in verse 104):

- प्रमोत्थेन जानेन - With the help of knowledge, which arises through *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa*,
- अप्रमोत्थं जानं बाध्यते – the misconception regarding *thriputi* is gone.

Twofold misconceptions are there; the first misconception is that "*pramaathaa* – the *ahamkaaraa* is *sathyam*". While this concept itself is a serious blunder, the more serious blunder is the second misconception "'I', am that *pramaathaa*".

"*Pramaathari sathyathva buddhi:*" and "*pramaathari aathmathva buddhi:*" are the two misconceptions. By 'knowledge', the seeker removes both the misconceptions and gets the convictions "*pramaathaa* is *mithyaa*" and "*pramaathaa* is **not** 'myself'".

- अहिरज्ज्वादिवत् - As in the case of the rope-snake,
- तथा - in a similar manner,
- देहादि आत्ममतेः बाधः (भवति)- the misconception of "the body etc., as the Self ", is eliminated.

Negation of *thriputi* (by 'negation' is meant 'falsification') takes place; and 'disidentification' from *thriputi* also takes place. This "falsification-cum-disidentification" is called 'wisdom'. This is an intellectual / cognitive process, because both (negation of *thriputi* and dis-identification from *thriputi*) have to take place only in the intellect.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 105:

लौकिकप्रमेयवैलक्षण्यादात्मनो नेहानधिगताधिगमः प्रमाणपलम् ।

Here the product of right knowledge is not the discovery of what was unknown before, because the Self differs from objects of ordinary modes of right knowledge.

This is a very, very important and significant verse. Though the subject matter of the verse has been discussed earlier in various other contexts, it bears repetition and has to be noted and remembered by a serious student.

Here Sureswaraacharya says "the whole wisdom is a sorting-out process - the falsification of *pramaathaa* and the disidentification from *pramaathaa*; this wisdom is born out of the

analysis, that is done with the help of *guru, saasthra vaakyam*. It is only an analysis-born clear understanding, in which no new experience is involved. The wisdom is a **new** understanding based on the **available** experiences of *avasthaathrayam; jaagrath avastha* is an available experience, *svapna avastha* is an available experience and *sushupthi avastha* is an available experience; based on these available experiences, the student does an analysis, using *sruthi, yukthi* and *anubhavaa*. Through the analysis, a **new** understanding is accomplished; but, there is **no** new experience involved".

The *Aachaaryaa* is logically explaining why no new experience is involved. The idea he gives is: "New experience is possible only in the case of *anaathmaa*; because every *anaathmaa* is initially an unexperienced *anaathmaa* and the unexperienced *anaathmaa* (for instance, a tree or a pot) becomes experienced, when *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades. This pervasion of *chidhaabhaasaa* converts the unexperienced *anaathmaa* into experienced *anaathmaa*, which is called a new experience. These new experiences are possible, whenever *chidhaabhaasaa* pervades by the operation of *pramaanam*. And, if and when one gets extraordinary, mystic experiences, they are also only unexperienced mystic *anaathmaa* becoming experienced mystic *anaathmaa*, because of pervasion of *chidhaabhaasa*. All experiences – whether ordinary or mystic - deal with only *anaathmaa*; this process of 'experiencing' takes place because of *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi*, also known as *pala vyaapthi*. Conversely, it can be said, that, *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi* or *pala vyaapthi* is responsible for new experiences. But, this happens only in the field of *anaathmaa*"

And, then continues: "A similar new experience is not possible with regard to *aathmaa*, the *saakshi*."

The reason is, that, *aathmaa*, unlike *anaathmaa*, is **ever** experienced; it does not come under unexperienced category; it need not be converted into a newly experienced entity; therefore, it does not require *chidhaabhaasa vyaapthi / pala vyaapthi*. And, therefore, *aathma anubhavaa*, as a **time-bound, new** experience – ordinary or extraordinary – is impossible and illogical. Whoever talks about getting *aathma anubhava* at a given particular time, has only mistaken some *anaathma anubhavaa* – he might have got an *anubhavaa* alright - as *aathma anubhavaa*. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* points out, in this portion.

- लौकिक प्रमेय वैलक्षण्यात् आत्मन्ः - Since Aathmaa, the saakshi, is different from all the worldly objects,

Vailakshanyam – difference ; *loukika prameyam* - all the worldly objects, which are called *prameyam*, which are *anaathmaa*, which, by themselves, are not available for experience, but, which, therefore, require *chidhaabhaasaa* for getting 'experienced'.

Aathmaa, on the other hand, is different – it is not *prameyam*; it is *aprameyam*; it is self-illuminating - *svaprakaasam* - and therefore, does not require *chidhaabhaasaa* to be experienced. (It is interesting to note that the same adjectives are used for *Sri Lalithambal* in the sacred *Lalitha Sahasranaamaa* – "*aprameyaa svaprakaasaa*".)

Therefore, *aathmaa* being thus different:

- इह – in the case of *aathma jnaanam*,
- अनधिगत अधिगमः - a new experience of an unexperienced thing,

Anadhigatham – unexperienced; *adhigama:* - new experience.

- न प्रमाणपलम् – is not the result of *Vedhaantha vichaaraa*.

A new experience of an unexperienced thing is not involved, in the field of *aathma jnaanam*.

In short, *Vedhaantha sravana manana nidhidhyaasanam* is not going to result in a new experience. Therefore, the seeker should stop working for / looking for a new experience ; the effort should be only to accomplish a new understanding which is based on the analysis of already available experiences.

Pramaanapalan - (in this context) result of *sravana- manana- nidhidhyaasanam*.

This is further explained in the verse that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 105 –

अविध्यानाशमात्रं तु फलमित्युपचर्यते ।

नाज्ञातजापनं न्याय्यमवगत्येकरूपतः ॥ १०५ ॥

Only the destruction of nescience is spoken of here as the effect of knowledge figuratively. It would not be right to describe the effect as the revelation of what is unknown before, for the Self is solely of the nature of awareness itself.

This idea is borrowed from the well-known, oft-quoted verse 4 in Ch.XVIII of *Adi Sankara's Upadesa Saahasri* : "*siddhaath eva ahamityasmaath yushmaddharmo nishidhyathe*" – " self-knowledge involves only removal of misconceptions regarding 'myself' , which is all the time experienced as "'I' am, 'I' am, 'I' am'".

The *saakshi anubhavaa* is always there; from that *saakshi*, the *thriputi* has to be separated / distanced. 'Distancing the *thriputi*' is self-knowledge; and, this 'distancing the *thriputi*' is not a physical job; it is a cognitive job.

Just as, in the mundane world, an individual wears a pair of spectacles or a pair of contact lenses to view the objects/ persons around, the *thriputi* is also 'put on', in the *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas*, to experience the *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* worlds, while in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, the *thriputi* is resolved and only the *saakshi* exists.

'Removal of misconception' is 'knowledge'.

The misconception, as already indicated, is twofold. First is that "*pramaathaa* is *sathyam*" and the second is that "that *sathyam pramaathaa* is 'myself'".

And, how does the 'removal of the misconception' take place? With the help of a thought process; 'knowledge' involves *vrutthi vyaapthi*; *pala vyaapthi* is not required; *chidhaabhaasaa* is not required; but, *vrutthi vyaapthi* – a thought process – is required.

And, what is the thought process? "*Thriputi* is *mithyaa*; 'I' am not *thriputi*; 'I' am the *saakshi* of *thriputi* ; and therefore different / distinct from *thriputi*. While *thriputi* is *mithyaa*, 'I' am *sathyam*".

Entertaining this thought process, understanding its significance, is alone wisdom.

Wisdom does not consist in going to a thoughtless stage or going into a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* / *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. Wisdom is something that takes place in *savikalpaka avasthaa*, in which *guru*, *saasthraa* and *pramaanams* are involved.

The seeker deliberately entertains the thoughts "this *thriputi* is incidental; 'I' am using them; but, 'I' am distinct from them. Even though 'I' use them, the *thriputi* belong to a lower order of reality".

To make this 'understanding' clear, the following line of reasoning helps : "I am perfectly aware, that, when I dream, the dream *thriputi* that I use and the dream experiences I get, by the use of the dream *thriputi*, are certainly not real ; in other words, I, the 'waker', use a lower order dream *thriputi* to have a lower order dream experiences. In the same manner, 'I', the *paaramaarthika saakshi*, use the lower order *jaagrath thriputi* to have the lower order *jaagrath* experiences also".

The resulting convictions are: "*Praathibhaasika svapnaa* is of lower order of reality; *Vyaavahaarika jaagrath* is **also** of lower order of reality; only *paaramaarthikaa saakshi* is *sathyam* and that *saakshi*, 'I' am.

"I make use of the *jaagrath thriputi* for *jaagrath avasthaa* experiences and *svapna thriputi* for *svapnaa avasthaa* experiences. When I am in *sushupthi*, I am rid of both types of *thriputi* and 'I' am *saakshi maathram*, which 'I' am regularly experiencing in the *sushupthi avasthaa* - '*sanmaathra: karana upasamharanatha: yobhooth sushuptha: pumaarl*' – 'on folding up all the functions of the senses, that *Purusha:*, enters into a state of deep-sleep and there becomes 'Existence' alone' (Verse 6 – *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram*)".

- अविध्या नाशमात्रं तु - Only the destruction of nescience / removal of misconceptions
- फलं इति उपचर्यते - is figuratively said to be a new 'knowledge' (or result).

The 'new knowledge' is nothing but 'removal of the misconceptions'.

Why do we say that there is no new experience? The *Aachaaryaa* explains:

- अवगति एक रूपतः - Since the *saakshi* is of the nature of Consciousness and is **always** experienced as " 'I' am",

Avagathi: – chaithanyam; eka – only; roopatha: - of the nature of .

Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram (verse 7) declares: "baalyaadhisu api jaagradaadhisu thathaa sarvaasu avasthaasu api vyaavrutthaasu anuvarthamaanam aham ithi" – "In all stages of life like boyhood etc., in all states like waking etc., similarly in all conditions also, constantly and persistently manifests as " 'I' am" ".

- अजातजापनं न न्याय्यं - a new experience is illogical / implausible / impossible.

Jnaapanam - a new experience or a new revelation; *ajnaatha* – unrevealed

In this context, *Swamiji* quotes a book which he had read, wherein the author had highlighted in red, an experience the author had had in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. He had claimed that in his *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, he saw a very, very white light which appeared, gradually pervaded all round, went around his *guru's* photograph three times and then engulfed the author himself and "after I was in self – experience for a brief period" gradually ebbed away. While *Swamiji* does not question the veracity of the author's claim, with regard to the author's experience or the light that had appeared to him, *Swamiji's* contention is that the 'light' or the 'experience' had nothing to do with *aathmaa* – since the light 'arrived' and 'departed' / the experience 'came' and 'went away'. It must be remembered that *aathmaa* is *anaaghamaapaayee* - does not have 'arrival' or 'departure'. But, unfortunately, considering such extra-ordinary experiences as *aathma anubhavaa* is a mistake commonly committed by people. Sureswaraachaaryaa, through this verse, tries to correct such mistakes / to rectify

wrong understandings; he avers "a new experience is not there ; 'knowledge' is only removal of the misconception regarding the ever experienced "'I' am".

"*Ajnaatha jnaapanam*" - a new revelation of an unrevealed *aathmaa*; "*Na nyaayyam*" – is not logically possible.

That's why, *Kenopanishad* declares "*Prathibodhavidhitham matham*" – "*Brahman* is known as the witness awareness, in **every** thought" (II.4).

"In **every** experience, *aathma anubhavaa* is there" - is the essence (of this verse of Sureswaraachaaryaa and this *manthraa* of *Kenopanishad*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 106:

यस्मादात्मानवबोधमात्रोपादानाः प्रमात्रायादयस्तस्मात् ।

Because the phenomena of the knower etc. are the outcome of the non-apprehension of the Self alone, it follows:

In this, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that, one need not have any doubt regarding the existence of 'I', the *saakshi*, different / distinct from the *thriputi*.

And, why is it, that there need not be any doubt?

The *Achaaryaa* gives the reason: "Because the *thriputi*, by itself, is *jadam*, while *saakshi* is *chaithanya roopam*".

Going to the fundamentals: What is *thriputi*? Ans: *Pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*.

Pramaathaa means mind, in fact, the *antha:karanam*, consisting of *mano-buddhi-chittha-ahamkaaraa* ; *pramaanam* means the sense organs ; and the world is the *prameyam*.

All the three are *jadam*, by themselves.

And, why are they *jadam*? The *Aaachaaryaa* had given the logic "because they are *moolaavidhyaa janyam* - born out of *moolaavidhyaa*, which is also *jadam*". *Jada kaaryathvaath thriputi api jadam* |

And, if 'I' am talking about the presence of *thriputi* in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas* and 'I' am talking about the absence of *thriputi* in *sushupthi avasthaa*, there must be and there is 'I', the *saakshi*, who am illumining the presence **and** the absence of the *thriputi*.

On this, the *Aachaaryaa* is going to elaborate. These are all very beautiful discussions.

Thriputi, by itself, cannot reveal itself.

Pramaathaa cannot reveal pramaathaa; pramaathaa cannot reveal pramaanam; pramaathaa cannot reveal prameyam.

So also, *pramaanam* cannot reveal *pramaathaa*; *pramaanam* cannot reveal *pramaanam*; *pramaanam* cannot reveal *prameyam*.

Third: *Prameyam* cannot reveal *prameyam*; *prameyam* cannot reveal *pramaanam*; *prameyam* cannot reveal *pramaathaa*.

“Thus” Sureswaraacharyaa says “each one of the *thriputi* cannot reveal itself and cannot reveal either of the other two also”.

Why? Because each one of the *thriputi* is *jadam*. *Pramaathaa* is mind, which is *jadam*; *pramaanam* is sense organs, which is *jadam*; *prameyam* is the world, which is *jadam*.

Then who is revealing them? ‘I’, the *saakshi*, give *chidhaabhaasa* to the mind; then alone, the mind is revealed; not only is it revealed, it is able to function as *pramaathaa*. Then, through the mind, ‘I’ give *chidhaabhaasa* to *pramaanam*; then only, *pramaanam* is revealed and is able to function as *pramaanam*. Thereafter, through the *pramaathaa* and *pramaanam*, ‘I’ lend *chidhaabhaasaa* to the world and only then, the world is called ‘known’ or ‘*prameyam*’. Without ‘my’ *chidhaabhaasaa*, the world can never be *prameyam* – a ‘known object’.

“Why are you doubting the existence of ‘I’, the only awareness principle, which is making the *thriputi* ‘known’?” asks Sureswaraacharyaa.

- यस्मात् - Since
- प्रमात्रादयः - Pramaathaa etc. / pramaathaa, pramaanam and prameyam/ mind, sense organs and world,

It should always be remembered that “*pramaathaa* = mind”. What is the proof? Because *pramaathaa* is available only when the mind is active. The moment mind is resolved, in *sushupthi*, the *pramaathaa* - the ‘knower’ limb of *thriputi* is gone; and once the ‘knower’ limb is gone, since through the mind alone, sense organs get *chidhaabhaasaa*, the *pramaanam* is also absent / resolved in *sushupthi*. From this, it is very clear that, when the

mind is operative, *pramaathaa* 'is' and when the mind is resolved, *pramaathaa* 'is not'. Therefore, mind alone is the *pramaathaa*.

- उपादानाः - have got their material cause
- आत्म अनवबोध मात्र – as only *moolaavidhyaa*,

Anava bhodha – *moolavidhyaa*; *maathra* – only.

The statement, "The *thriputi* has got its material cause in the form of *moolaavidhyaa*" only means "*thriputi* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*" or "*moolaavidhyaa* is the material cause of *thriputi*".

The definition of *moolaavidhyaa* will depend upon the context- whether of *jeeva* or *Isvara* ; in the context of *jeeva*, *moolaavidhyaa* will be defined as *aavaranasakthi-sahitha-moolaavidhyaa* and in the case of *Isvara*, the same *moolaavidhyaa* is defined as *aavaranasakthi-rahitha-moolaavidhyaa*, which is re-named as *maayaa*.

"Moolaavidhyaa being jadam, the *thriputi* also has to be jadam only"-*"Pramaathraadhayaa: jadaa: jada avidhyaa kaaryathvaath"* |

- तस्मात् - therefore,

Therefore, what is the conclusion?

None of the *thriputi* can know itself or any of the other two. But, what is our experience?

The *thriputi* **is** known; but, since, it cannot be known by any member of the *thriputi* ; it follows, that, it must be known by someone outside the *thriputi*. That someone is called "*thriputi saaksh*" and "*avasthaathraya saakash*" etc.; and, that someone alone 'I' am.

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* says, in the beautiful *sloka* that follows.

Chapter II: Verse 106 -

न विदन्त्यात्मनः सत्तां द्रष्टुदर्शनगोचराः ।

न चान्योन्यमतोऽमीषां ज्ञेयत्वं भिन्नसाधनम् ॥ १०६ ॥

The seer, the seeing and the object seen, do not by themselves cognize their own being. Nor do they cognize one another reciprocally. Therefore their becoming objects of cognition depends on something transcending them.

- द्रष्टु दर्शन गोचरा :- The thriputi, consisting of the *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* and the *prameyam*

Dhrashtru – *pramaathaa*, the mind; dharsanam – *pramaanam*, the sense organs; gocharaa: - *prameyam*, the external objects.

- न विदन्ति - can never know
- आत्मनः सतां - their own existence,

The mind can never know its existence by itself – i.e. as “I, the *pramaathaa*, is in existence”; so also, the sense organs can never know of their existence, by themselves i.e. as “I, the *pramaanam*, is in existence”; so also, the world. Then someone may ask “Okay. Each one may not know itself by itself. But, why cannot they know the other two?”.

An aside: “Swami Chinmayaanaadaa used to tell a story, to show the difference between Heaven and Hell. Once, in both Heaven and Hell, the elbows of the occupants were made to be stuck in such a way that they could not bend their arms. Food was served. There was no way that anyone could help oneself to the food, because of the stuck elbows and consequent inability to bend the arms. But, there was a contrast. In Hell, every one sat looking at the food helplessly, starving all the time. In Heaven, each one used his hand to feed the person in front – thus, helping each other mutually. *Parasparam bhaavayantha: sreya: param avaapsyathaa* (*Baghavadh Githa* – III.1). This is the difference between the occupants of Heaven and Hell”

The question may be asked: “Granted that *pramaathaa* cannot know itself. But (as in the story above) why should not the *pramaathaa* know the *pramaanam* and *prameyam*? So also, *pramaanam* can know *pramaathaa* and *prameyam* and so on”.

Even if this happens, no one will know **all** the three. But, one knowing the other two is also not possible.

The *Aachaaryaa* says in the second line:

- अमीषाम् अन्योन्यं च न (वेत्ति) Among these three, no one member knows the others also / they do not know each other mutually also.

Ameeshaam - among the three; *anyonyam* - (in this context means) mutually.

“Ameeshaam (madhye) anyonyam cha na (pramaathradhaya: vidhanthi)” will be the restructured sentence of “ameeshaam anyonyam cha na”|

'*Pramaathaa* knowing the other two or *pramaanam* knowing the other two etc.'" is not possible.

Therefore, what is the conclusion now? "To make the *thriputi* known (since we do know them), we require a *saakshi*, which is aware of the arrival of *thriputi* in *jaagrath avasthaa* (therefore *jaagrath avasthaa* is called *savikalpaka avasthaa*), which *saakshi* is aware of the arrival of *thriputi* in *svapna avasthaa* (therefore, *svapnaa* is called *savikalpaka avasthaa*) and which *saakshi* is aware of *sushupthi*, in which *thriputi* is resolved (therefore, *sushupthi* is called *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*)".

This is what the *Achaaryaa* says:

- ज्ञेयत्वं - The known status (of the *thriputi*)
- भिन्न साधनम् - (is) because of some other illumining factor.

Bhinna saadhanam – "bhinnam saadhanam yasya thath".

Thriputi are known because of some illumining factor, which factor, obviously, cannot be *jadam*, since, if it is *jadam*, it will require another illumining factor.

That 'illumining factor' is called the *saakshi*.

And, who is that *saakshi*? That *saakshi*, 'I' am.

Thriputi is an incidental addition and an incidental *deletion* – everyday 'I', the *saakshi*, am experiencing the arrival and departure of the *thriputi*.

104. Chapter II, Verse 106 to 108 (02-08-2008)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about the relationship between *aathmaa* and *thriputi*.

The entire *thriputi* consisting of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*, is a product of *avidhyaa*. *Avidhyaa*, otherwise known as *maayaa* or *prakruthi* is *jadasvaroopam*.

Since the cause, *avidhyaa*, is *jadasvaroopam*, all the effects / products of *avidhyaa* also have to be *jada* in nature. *Pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – all these three, are, therefore, *jadam* by themselves. *Pramaathaa* referring to the *antha: karanam*, *pramaanam* referring to the sense organs and the *prameyam* referring to the *sabdhaadhiprapancha*: - all the three are *jadam*, being products of *jada avidhyaa*.

Since they are, by themselves, *jadam*, they do not have the capacity to reveal themselves. *Pramaathaa*, the mind, cannot say, by itself, "I, am *pramaathaa*, the mind". Likewise the *pramaanam* and the *prameyam* also cannot reveal themselves. None of the three has the capacity to reveal itself.

Further, none of the three will be able to reveal either of the other two also, the reason being the same - *jadathvaath*; just as, the *jadasvaroopam* (insentient) clip on the desk (in front of *Swamiji*) can neither reveal itself nor the desk; and the *jadasvaroopam* (insentient) desk also cannot reveal itself nor can it reveal the clip.

None of the *thriputi* can ever reveal itself nor mutually any of the other two also. But, even though this is the truth, we find that we *are* aware of the presence of the *thriputi* – *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya* existence, their *jnaana vyavaharaa* and its consequent experiences, both in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas*. This (the fact, that, *thriputi* cannot reveal itself but *thriputi is* known to us) means that *thriputi* is getting revealed by some principle **other than** *thriputi*. That principle is *thriputi-saakshi*. And, that *saakshi* cannot be a product of *avidhyaa*, since, if it is a product of *avidhyaa*, that *saakshi* also, like *thriputi*, will be *jadasvaroopam* and will require yet another principle to reveal it.

Therefore, *saakshi* is not *avidhyaa kaaryam* (a product of *avidhyaa*); therefore, (i.e. since *saakshi* is not *avidhyaa kaaryam*), *saakshi* is not *adhyastham* (a falsely cognized thing); therefore, (i.e. since *saakshi* is not *adhyastham*), *saakshi* is not *mithyaa*; and therefore, (i.e. since *saakshi* is not *mithyaa*), *saakshi* is *sathyam*. Thus, the existence of *sathya saakshi*, other than *thriputi*, is firmly established and must be accepted by all the people.

Thereafter, we say: "**that** *sathya saakshi*, 'I' am. 'I' am witnessing the arrival of the *thriputi*, during *jaagrath* and *svapna*, from *avidhyaa*, which *avidhyaa* is in existence, in the *sushupthi*

avasthaa also. 'I' am not only witnessing the 'arrival' of *thriputi* in *jaagrath* and *svapna* but 'I' am also witnessing the 'resolution' of *thriputi* in *sushupthi*. In other words, 'I' am the 'witness' to the *savikalpka avasthaa* in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* in *sushupthi*. Thus 'I' am the *adhishtaanam* and 'I' am the 'illuminator' of the *thriputi*." That is what is said in verse 106, completed in the earlier class.

- Dhrashtu dharsana gocharaa: - The *thriputi* (*pramaathru-pramaana-prameyaa*.)
- *aathmana*: *satthaam na vidhanthi* - do not know their own existence.
- *Aathmana*: - in this context, is a reflective pronoun meaning 'their own' (not, *sacchidhaandha aathmaa*).
- *Ameeshaam anyonyam api (na vidhanthi)* – (They do not know the existence) of others also / mutually also they do not reveal their existences.

And, therefore, all these three must be revealed by some non-material principle; *pramaathaa* is material; *pramaanam* is material; *prameyam* is material. These three-fold material must be revealed by a non-material entity, that is called *saakshi*.

And, therefore,

- (*ameeshaam*) *jnyeyathvam* - The 'known status' of the *thriputi bhinna saadhanam* - is because of some other factor.

Ameeshaam - means 'their' and in this context, 'dhrashtu dharsana gocharaanaam' / 'pramaathru pramaana prameyaanaam'. *Jnyeyathvam* - 'known status'.

The 'known status' of the *thriputi* is because of some other 'knower' principle / 'witness' principle, which principle is *saakshi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 107:

द्रष्टादेरसाधारणरूपजापनायाह ।

The distinctive characters of these factors, the seer etc. are brought out:

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "I have been using the words *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* / *dhrashtaa*, *dhrusyam* and *dharsanam* / *graahasam*, *grahanam* and *graahyam*. The words have not been defined so far, assuming that the meanings are well known. But, now, I will define them (the *thriputi*) to make sure that their meanings are understood".

- ज्ञापनाय – To teach (the student),
- असाधारणरूपं - the unique status / the original nature / *svaroopam* / *lakshanam*
- द्रष्टृदे: - of the thriputi,

Dhrashtaa – Pramaathaa; aadhi: - 'etc.'; dhrashtraadhe: - of the pramaathaa etc. i.e. of the thriputi consisting of pramaathaa, pramaanam and prameyam.

- आह - the author says this: (in the verse that follows).

Verse 107 – Chapter II:

बाह्य आकारवान् ग्राह्यो ग्रहणं निश्चयादिमत् ।

अन्वय्यहमिति ज्ञेयः साक्षी त्वात्मा ध्रुवः सदा ॥ १०७ ॥

The object of knowledge is the external factor having sensible form. Knowledge consists of judgment etc. The knower in relation to this, is ego. The witness of all these, is the Self, abiding always.

The Aachaaryaa defines thriputi, in this sloka.

- बाह्यः आकारवान् ग्राह्यः - The object of knowledge, external to the body (i.e. the entire world) is endowed with form.

The word *graahyam* means *prameyam* or *dhrusyam* – the object of knowledge.

And, what is that *prameyam*?

- *Baahya*: - which is outside the physical body / the entire world.

Not only is it external, and therefore requires the five sense organs for its getting experienced, the apertures of the sense organs must also be open; only then the external world can be perceived.

And, what is the nature of the *prameya prapancha*?

- *Aakaaravaan* – endowed with form.

The word *aakaara*: means *roopam* - form or colour. That's why we call the external world *naamaroopa prapancha*:

The word roopam indicates all the pancha gunaa: - sabda, sparsa, roopa, rasa and gandha.

Therefore only, the *saguna prameya: prapancha:* or in short, *prameyam*, is material in nature.

The materiality of the *thriputi* must be assimilated well. Only then the non-material 'I', the *aathmaa*, becomes more and more pronounced.

Body is material, mind is material, thoughts are material and the world is material. Among these entire material *thriputi*, all of us have got one non-material feature. What is that? We are all 'aware'.

The 'awareness' – '*unarvu*' in Tamil – will be clear, once we assert the materiality of the body, of the brain, of the thoughts, of all the bio-chemistry required in the brain and of all the neurological impulses belonging to the brain i.e. once we clearly understand that **all** these are material in nature.

This is the reason why Sureswaraachaaryaa is stressing on the 'materiality' of the *thriputi*.

The word '*aakaaravaan*' means '*saguna matter*'. Not only is it *sagunaa; prameyam* is *savikaaraa* also, 'continuously changing'.

"*Graahya: baahya: aakaaravaan*" is the first sentence in the verse, describing *graahyam* or *prameyam*.

The next sentence is "*grahanam nischayaadhimath*".

- ग्रहणं - Pramaanam (in this context)

What is *pramaanam*?

- निश्चयादिमत् - consists of / is endowed with, varieties of cognitive thoughts / experiencing thoughts.

Varieties of cognitive / experiencing thoughts are termed *pramaanam*.

Why do you say that a 'thought' is a '*pramaanam*'?

Because, only in the presence of 'thoughts' (*vrutthis*), the *prameyaa* will be known. If *ghatavrutthi* is not there, existence of the 'pot' will not be known; if *patavrutthi* is not there, the existence of '*pata*' will not be known. During *sushupthi*, when thoughts resolve *by themselves*, or in *samaadhi*, when thoughts are *deliberately removed*, the *pramaana vrutthis* are resolved and the *prameya prapanchaa* is also simultaneously resolved.

Pramaanam alone reveals *prameyam*. What is that *pramaanam*? Ans: 'Thought'.

Is thought material or non-material? We have to very confidently assert that every thought is also material in nature.

Why is 'thought' material? Because, 'thought' is born of the 'mind' and 'mind' is material.

But, why is 'mind' material? Because, it is born out of the *sathva gunaa* of the *pancha bhoothaani*, which *bhoothaani* are material.

Stating the same in the reverse order, *Bhoothaas* are material; therefore, their product, the 'mind' is material; and therefore 'thought', the product of the mind is material – every *pramaanam* is material.

'*Grahanam nischayaadhimath*' means 'the *pramaanam* consists of cognitive thoughts which are of the nature of *nischya jnaanam* etc.'

Nischayam means 'conviction' or 'clear knowledge'.

The *Aachaaryaa* says *Nischayaadhi* - i.e. 'clear knowledge **etc.**'; because, thoughts are not only of the nature of clear or valid knowledge; at times, they are of doubting nature also. Even doubtful knowledge is a form of knowledge / is also *vrutthi jnaanam*. The *samsaya vrutthi jnaanam* is also a *grahanam*. In fact, even *viparyaya* ('*viparyaya*:' means 'wrong') *vrutthi jnaanam* is also *grahanam*.

Nischaya vrutthi jnaanam, *samsaya vrutthi jnaanam* and *viparyaya vrutthi jnaanam* are all *grahanam* only.

Thus, cognition is of several types. Right knowledge / cognition, doubtful cognition, wrong cognition and even memory (*smrithi*) are all varieties / forms of cognition. Memory, whether it is *pramaa* or *bhramaa*, is also a form of cognition.

But, all cognitions are also material or *jadam*. *Pramaanam* is also *jadam*.

In the term '*nischayaadhi math'*, the suffix '*math'* means 'endowed with'.

Then, what about *Pramaathaa*?

In the second line of the verse:

- अन्वयी अहं इति ज्ञेयः - The *pramaathaa* is nothing but the *ahamkaara*: / *aham vrutthi*:, which associates itself with every form of knowledge.

When there is *sabda vrutthi*, I claim I know the sound; when *sabda vrutthi* is replaced by *sparsa vrutthi*, the *sabda vrutthi* is gone and the *sparsa vrutthi* has come, but I still know the sound. The *ahamkaaraa*, the I-thought, continues throughout all these changing *vrutthies*.

This I-thought, which is connecting with knowledge 1, knowledge 2, knowledge 3 and so on, corresponds to the sub-stratum of all the thoughts, which sub-stratum is nothing but the mind. That *antha: karanam*, upon which all *vrutthis* takes place, is also material and is called *Pramaathaa*. In other words, *Pramaathaa* is the *ahamkaaraa* obtaining throughout the *jaagrath avasthaa*, connecting with every flowing knowledge. The *ahamkaaraa* does not obtain in *sushupthi*.

That *ahamkaaraa* which connects with every flowing knowledge is called *anvayee* (in this verse), meaning 'connecting' / 'claiming' *ahamkaaraa*.

When the *antha: karanam* is active, the *ahamkaaraa* is active; when the *antha: karanam* is resolved, the *pramaathaa* - the *ahamkaaraa* is also resolved.

- *Anvayee* - The persisting / continuous I-thought.

This term 'I-thought', in this context, is used not to refer to the *saakshi*, but to the mind, in keeping with the common use of the term; since, everybody generally uses the term 'I-thought' to relate to its *vaachyaartha*, the mind only and not the *lakshyaartha*, the *saakshi*. *Aham padha vaachyaartha* is the mind.

That *vaachyaartha* mind is the *pramaathaa*.

Is that mind *chethanam* or *jadam*, by itself? Before the arrival of *chidhaabhaasaa* from the *saakshi*, the mind is also *jadam* only. The mind becomes *chethanam*, only after getting blessed by *saakshi*, with *chidhaabhaasaa*.

In this context, it should be understood, that, while it is true, that, "mind is shining with *chidhaabhaasa*", if a statement that "mind is revealed by *chidhaabhaasa*" is made, it will be a wrong statement. "Mind is revealed by *saakshi* alone" is the right perspective.

A parallel can be drawn by the example of the moon and the moonlight. If, to the query "Is moon illumined by moonlight or sunlight?", an answer that "moon is illumined by moonlight" is made, it will obviously be a wrong answer, since, it **is** common knowledge that it is the sunlight which illumines the moon. It can be claimed that "earth is illumined by the moonlight", but, certainly not "the moon is illumined by the moonlight".

It is an important general law that, "the reflecting medium is never illumined by the reflected light; the reflecting medium is always illumined by the original light". In the same manner: mind is not illumined by *chidhaabhaasa*; *saakshi* illumines the mind; and, in this process, *chidhaabhaasa* is formed and illumines the *prameyaa* but, not the mind, just as moonlight illumines the earth and not the moon.

Therefore, "anvayee ahamkaara: / aham padha vaachyaartha: / antha:karanam / the mind, commonly denoted by the word 'aham', is the pramaathaa" is what is being conveyed by "anvayee aham ithi jneya:"]

Then, what is *saaksh*?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "First note that all these three material entities (the *thriputi*) whose activity is required for the entire *samsaaraa* / life process to go on - this material *thriputi* itself is subject to arrival and departure. This entire universe, which, we consider as a huge entity, is nothing but one of the *thriputi* arriving and departing".

When does this universe arrive? The entire universe is a *prameyam*; it is available only when there is *pramaanam*; that *pramaanam* is possible only when *pramaathaa* is; *pramaathaa* is the mind; but only when 'I' the *saakshi*, activates the mind, by lending *sath* and *chith*, the mind can be *pramaathaa*.

In the reverse order, when 'I', the *saakshi* activates the mind, by blessing it with *sath* and *chith*, *pramaathaa* rises; when *pramaathaa* rises, *pramaanam* becomes operational; when *pramaanaa* becomes operational, the world becomes alive.

Thus, all the *thriputi* is nothing but something which rises in 'me'. The term 'me', **in this context**, does not refer to either the mind or the sense organs, both of which fall under *thriputi* - but, refers to the *saakshi*.

'I', the *saakshi*, enliven two sets of *thriputi* – one is *jaagrath thriputi* and the other is *svapna thriputi* – (from a mature perspective) just to 'enjoy the show'. And, when I am tired of 'watching', 'I' resolve both sets of *thriputi* and go to "*saakshi chethaa kevalo nirgunascha*", which is called *sushupthi*.

Thriputi is subject to arrival and departure, whereas, 'I', the *saakshi*, am *dhruva*: /

- आत्मा साक्षी सदा ध्रुवः - The non-material Consciousness is always there, changelessly present.

In this context, it may be observed, that, because Consciousness is non-material, none of the scientific material instruments is able to study 'Consciousness'. Material instruments can have access only to the material world. Mind is material; sense organs are material. So, they can have access only to the material world. Similar are the Scientific instruments; they cannot have access to the non-material *aathmaa*, which is available only as the *saakshi*.

This will give rise to a question (which the *Aachaaryaa* does not talk of here, but will answer later): "If Consciousness is not available to any material instrument, how do you prove its existence?" This question can be answered by a counter-question "Is this question raised by material entity or non-material entity?" It should be remembered that the question itself – any question - cannot be asked by material *thriputi*. But, now that the question is raised, it should be realized that there is a non-material medium, in whose presence alone, the very question is raised. That non-material medium in which I am raising the question, that very word 'I', reveals the presence of non-material Consciousness. This topic is discussed by the *Aachaaryaa* later.

(Having raised the topic here, *Swamiji* adds a further note. He stretches out his palm and remarks: "Here there are two objects – my hand and the sunlight. If the light is not there, obviously, the hand, by itself, will not be perceived. In the same manner, if the hand is not there, the presence of the light also cannot be appreciated or recognized. Therefore, if one recognizes the light and the hand, it is because of the presence of the mixture. How does one present the concept? The presentation is very important, which goes as this: 'the light reveals the hand, by illumining the hand. Light is also revealed by the hand – **not** by the hand illumining the light but by manifesting the light. Light illumines the hand ; hand manifests the light'. In the same manner, Consciousness illumines the mind; but, the mind is also very much required, **not** to reveal the Consciousness but to manifest the Consciousness. Both are required – mind is required to manifest Consciousness and Consciousness is required to experience the mind. The 'phenomenon of getting manifested' is called '*abhivyakthi*:' and the 'phenomenon of getting illumined' as '*prakaasaa*'; *saakshi's abhivyakthi* is because of the mind; the mind's *prakaasaa* is because of *saakshi*. Therefore,

when the word 'I' is used, in that word 'I', the mind is experienced and *saakshi* is revealed / manifested. The manifested/ revealed *saakshi* is *lakshyaartha* and the experienced mind is *vaachyaartha*, of the word 'I'. In the example, the sunlight is manifested by the hand – if the hand were not there, the presence of sunlight would not have been appreciated; the hand helps you to recognize the sunlight. Sunlight is *lakshyaartha*, while the hand is *vaachyaartha*, when you recognize the presence of the hand in the light". In *Adhyaasa Bhashyam – Rathna Prabha Teeka*, this idea is beautifully brought out.)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 108:

सर्वकारकक्रियाफलविभागात्मकसंसारशून्य आत्मेति कारकक्रियाफलविभागसाक्षित्वादात्मनस्तदाह ।

As the Self is the witness of the distinctions like (1) the factors of action (2) the action and (3) the results of action, he is free from the relative existence consisting of these distinctions of the causal factors, action and results. That point is stated now:

The entire material *thriputi* is recognized because of the non-material medium of all-pervading Consciousness. At the same time, this non-material medium is 'manifest' only because of the material *thriputi* – just as the sunlight is manifest because of the hand (in the example earlier cited). In the absence of a reflecting medium, sunlight cannot be perceived; in pure space, the sunlight will be '**pervading**'; but, in that pure space, where there is no reflecting medium, sunlight cannot be '**perceived**'. In the same manner, even if 'matter' is not there, Consciousness will '**exist**'; but, '**cannot be manifested**'.

Consciousness is the light-like, space-like medium, in which *thriputi* rises and therefore the life-process is going on – in fact, going on and on. Even during *pralaya*, the 'switching-off' (of the *thriputi*) is not permanent; it is only temporary, as the 2nd verse of *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* indicates: "*Bheejasyaantharivaankuro jagadhidham praanghnirvikalpam puna: mayaakalpithadesakaalalalanaa vaichithriyachithrekrutham*" etc. - "The Universe, which, before Creation remains unmanifest like the future tree in a seed and is again projected as the world of endless variety, due to the delusory play of time and space" etc.

Sureswaraachaaryaa warns: "Do not identify with any one member of the arriving and departing *thriputi*." If you do, life will become a struggle or at the least, a monotony. After fifty or sixty years, life will become a burden and you may either question 'why this life at all?' and even pray to God to end your life sooner than later. Such attitudes result because of absorption in the *thriputi*. Therefore, one should 'stand aloof' from *thriputi* - of course, not physically, which is impossible – but 'cognitively'; i.e. the 'standing aloof' is only an 'awareness' or a 'cognitive process'.

As verse 28 – Chapter III of the *Bhagavadh Githa* proclaims “*Guna karma vibhaaghayo: thathvavith gunaa: guneshu varthanthe ithi mathvaa na sajjathe*” – “the knower of the truth of *gunaas* and their functions remains detached with the understanding that *gunaas* (sense organs) function among *gunaas* (sense objects)”.

“Let the *jaagrath avasthaa*, with its problems or the *svapnaa avsthaa*, with *its* problems come. Allow them to continue, but, claim the fact “‘I’ am that medium in which all these are possible; but, ‘I’ am *nithya asamsaaree saakshi aathmaa asm’*. Why can’t you come to this ‘binary’ format?; how long are you going to continue in the ‘triangular’ format, with the attitude “I am victimized; the world is the victimizer ; *Bhagavaan* is the saviour?” - wonders the *Aachaaryaa*.

- सर्व कारक क्रिया फल विभागात्मक संसार – The (relative) existence consisting of the distinctions of causal factors, actions and results.

‘*Kaarakaad*’ means the ‘various accessories responsible for action / transactions – in the forms of ‘subject’, ‘object’, ‘instruments’, ‘location’ etc.’

The *kaarakaas* are responsible for *kriyaas*. Every transaction is born out of *kaarakam*; *kaarakam* is the parent and *kriyaa* is the child.

When the *jaagrath avasthaa* comes, all the accessories also – subject, object, instrument etc. – arrive, resulting in transactions (*kriyaas*); the transactions / actions, in turn, result in varieties of painful and pleasurable experiences, which Sureswaraachaaryaa calls *palam*.

Kaarakaa produces *kriyaa* and *kriyaa* produces *palam*. *Palam* is thus the ‘grandchild’ of *kaarakaas*.

All the three – the *kaarakaas*, *kriyaas* and *palaani* - fall in *thriputi*.

And, this cycle of *karaka-kriyaa-palaani* alone is called *samsaaraa*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* calls it ‘*kaaraka kriyaa pala vibhaagaathmaka samsaaraa*’.

And, why is it called *samsaaraa*? ; because, it is in constant motion. There is no ‘rest’ in *anaathmaa*.

“Accepting the constant movement without expecting ‘rest’” (i.e. to continue in life, without complaining) is possible only when one is a *saakshi nishta*; when life becomes a ‘game’. Otherwise, life will become a *bhaara*: - a burden; that ‘burden’ is called *samsaaraa*. If, on

the other hand, one can grow old, without considering life as a burden, that attitude itself is called *moksha*: /

And, Sureswaraacharya says that, that *moksha* is attainable by only one means – *jnaanabalam*.

- आत्मा (:जातव्य) इति :शून्य (सर्व कारक क्रिया फल विभागात्मक संसार)- (It should be understood) that Aathmaa is free from samsaara, (described here as karaka kriyaa pala vibhaagaathmakathmaka) – the *thriputi*. The word 'jnaathavya:' (or a verb 'jnaayathe') is to be supplied, to complete the sentence.

But, this statement should be properly understood. It does not mean that *thriputi* is physically eliminated by *jnaanam* – *thriputi* can never become absent, since it is material in nature and 'matter' can never be created nor destroyed. Since *thriputi* can never be destroyed, 'freedom from *thriputi*' is not 'physical removal' of *thriputi* but 'falsification' of *thriputi* - the understanding that *thriputi* is of the lower order of reality. *Mithyaathva nischayaa* is the 'removal' of *thriputi*. It is a cognitive process. Whatever is *mithyaa*, is 'as good as not existent'.

Assimilating the conviction " *Thriputi* can be and is experienced; but it is uncountable, because of its lower order of reality- *mithyaathvam*" is *advaita siddhi*: /

And, why do you say that " *aathmaa* is free from *samsaara*"?

Sureswaraacharya gives the reason:

- आत्मन :कारक क्रिया फल विभाग साक्षित्वात् - because aathmaa happens to be merely the (non-material) saakshi of the (material) karakakriyaapalaaathmaka samsaaraa.

Non-material 'witness' cannot be affected by 'material events', just as the 'illuminating medium' is not affected by the 'illuminated objects'. *Soorya prakaasaa*, the illuminating medium, spreads all over the illumined objects; but, the *soorya prakaasa*: is " *acchedhya*:, *adhaahya*:, *akledhya*:, *asoshya*:" | In the same manner, 'I' am *chith prakaasa*: and why should I be afraid of the 'drama' of life ? Why should I look for *videha mukthi*:?

Another example (for *aathmaa*) is *aakaasa*:, in which all material objects 'exist'; but, *aakaasaa* itself is not affected by the objects existing in the *aakaasaa*.

- तदाह - That point is stated now (in the verse that follows)

105. Chapter II, Verse 108 to 110 (09-08-2008)

Verse 108 – Chapter II:

ग्राहग्रहणग्राह्यविभागे योऽविभागवान् ।

हानोपादानयोस्साक्षी हानोपादानवर्जितः ॥ १०८ ॥

He who is undivided manifesting himself through the divisions of the apprehender, apprehension and apprehended and witnesses the acts of appropriation and rejection, transcends all appropriation and rejection.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is here pointing out that *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – the *thriputi* – happens to be *jadam* by itself. *Pramaathaa* is the *antha:karanam*, which is *jadam*, *pramaanam* is the sense organs, which are also *jadam* and *prameyam* is the *baahyaprapancham*, which is also *jadam*.

All these three – the *thriputi* – are 'known' (experienced) and are active, only because of the non-material Conscious principle. This non-material Conscious principle is called the *saakshi*. And, the *saakshi* can be recognized in the *pramaathaa*, in the very word 'I' (as explained in the previous class).

Mind is illumined by the *saakshi*; therefore, the relationship between the mind and the *saakshi* is *prakaasya-prakaasaka-sambhandhaa* | The mind *has* to be illumined by *saakshi*, because mind is *jadam* and *saakshi* alone is *svayam prakaasa:* | But, at the same time, *saakshi* also, by itself, in the absence of mind, can never be recognized, as 'I am'. The mind is very much required for the 'manifestation' of the *saakshi*. Therefore, the relationship between the mind and *saakshi* is again (i.e. can also be termed) *abhivyanjaka-abhivyangya-sambhandhaa*. Mind is the 'manifestor' and the *saakshi* is 'manifested' because of the mind. Thus, *saakshi* requires the presence of the mind for **its** manifestation and the mind also requires *saakshi*, for **its** illumination.

Therefore, when the word 'I' is used, in that one word itself, *saakshi* is manifested by the mind and the mind is illumined by the *saakshi*. Both are simultaneously obtaining in the one word 'I' – just as (already quoted and explained in detail) in the one experience of an outstretched hand, the sunlight is 'manifested' by the hand (which gets illumined by the sunlight) and in the absence of the hand, the pure sunlight is not manifested by itself. Sunlight requires the hand for its manifestation, while the hand requires the sunlight for its illumination.

Therefore, when one uses the word 'I', one can either refer to the 'illumined' mind or to the 'manifested' *saakshi*. When the illumined mind is referred to, it is the *vaachyaartham* of the

word '*aham*'; and, when the manifested *saakshi* is referred to, by '*aham*', it is the *lakshyaartha* of the word.

In the *sushupthi avasthaa*, the illumined mind is resolved. Then, what happens to the *saakshi*? Is it present or not? The answer: *Saakshi is* present; 'I', the *saakshi is* present, during *sushupthi* also; but, because of the absence of the mind, 'I', the *saakshi*, though present, is not in manifested form; but, continues as the pure *Saakshi*. Because it is not available in the manifest version, I cannot use the word 'I'.

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa is saying: "the aim of *Vedhaantha* is 'claiming the manifested *saakshi* in the 'I', as the *sathyam* and seeing the illumined mind, which is the *pramaatha*, as *mithyaa*' (because *pramaatha* is subject to arrival and departure experientially and anything subject to arrival and departure is negated by *saasthraas* as *mithyaa*) and further says "after falsifying the *pramaatha*, 'put on' the *pramaatha* for *vyavahaaraa*".

Elsewhere, the *Aachaaryaa* says: "Wear the *ahamkaara kanchukam* ('*kanchukam*' means 'coat') for transactions"; just as 'dressing' is required for coming out in public, 'I' requires the *ahamkaaraa kanchukam* to come out to *jaagrath avasthaa*.

For *jaagrath avasthaa* and *jaagrath vyavaahaaraa*, and also for *svapna avasthaa* and *svapna vyavahaaraa*, 'I' put on the *ahamkaara kanchukam*, while for and during *sushupthi avasthaa*, 'I' remove the *ahamkaara kanchukam*.

During *sushupthi*, 'I', the *saakshi*, am self-evidently present, though, to say "'I' am present", I need the *ahamkaara kanchukam*. In other words, to 'exist', 'I' do not require *ahamkaaraa*; but, to say that 'I' exist (even without *ahamkaaraa*), I require *ahamkaaraa* – the material mind, the *pramaatha*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

ग्राह ग्रहण ग्राह्य विभागे

- In the *thriputi* division of
 - (i) *graahakam* - the *pramaatha antha:karanam*,
 - (ii) *grahanam* – the *pramaanam* sense organs and
 - (iii) *graahyam* - the *prameyam*,

It should be remembered, that, the *thriputi* is *jadam* by itself; but, becomes *chethanam*, because of *chidh aabhaasaa*.

The three divisions obtain in all matter; the *anaathmaa* matter is divisible; but, the *chaithanyam* which is manifested in the *thriputi* does not have the division; the fingers (in the example of the outstretched hand) have the division; but, the sunlight which is manifested in the divided fingers, does not have divisions. In the same manner, the divisionless *saakshi* is manifested in the divided *thriputi*; but, the division does not belong to the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

- यः अविभागवान् - that, which is undivided,

If a question "am 'I' divided or undivided?" is asked, the answer will be "if, by the word 'I', it is the illumined mind that is referred to, then, 'I' am divided; but, if 'I' refers to the manifested *saakshi*, that *saakshi* is indivisible". *Prakaasya antha:karanam* is *savibhaagam*; *abhivyaktha saakshi* is *nirvibhaaga*: |

This divisionless *saakshi* is self-effulgently present during the arrival of *thriputi* in *jaagrath* and *svapna* and it continues even after the departure of *thriputi*. That is said in the second line (of the verse):

- हान उपादानयोः साक्षी – the *chaithanyam*, which is the 'witness' of the 'arrival and departure' of *thriputi* / 'presence and absence' of *thriputi*,

Haanam, literally means rejection; in this case, the word 'rejection' means *abhaava*: (since, when you reject something, it becomes *abhaava*:), or 'disappearance'. *Upaadhaanam* literally means 'taking' and in this context, 'taking' means *bhaava*: or 'arrival'.

"*Haana upaadhaanayo*:", therefore means "*aagama apaayayo*:" i.e., "arrival and departure" or "*bhaava abhaavayo*:" i.e., "presence and absence".

Of what? We have to supply "*thriputi*".

Chaithanyam is the 'witness' of the 'arrival and departure' of *thriputi*; and, it should be remembered, that, when the word 'witness' is used, it does not mean that *chaithanyam* is 'doing' the job of witnessing ; such a conclusion would lead to the misunderstanding that *chaithanyam* is *kartha*, *pramaatha* etc. The statement "*Chaithanyam* is witness" should be understood as meaning "In the presence of *chithanyam*, the inert *thriputi* gets witnessed". The description of *chaithanyam* as *saakshi* or 'witness' is thus only figurative. An example of such a situation: "When one's brother gets married, one becomes a brother-in-law or sister-in-law (as the case may be) without doing any action whatsoever. It is the brother who

performs an act - the act of 'marrying', and his sibling gets the status of brother-in-law or sister-in-law, without doing any action". In the same manner, the *chaithanyam* / Consciousness becomes a *saakshi*, without any action, but, because of the inert *thriputi* getting witnessed, in the mere presence of Consciousness.

'I' am the *saakshi* of the arrival and departure of the *thriputi*. But, what about 'me'? The *Aachaaryaa* says: "the *saakshi* itself is **not** subject to arrival and/ or departure".

- हान उपादान वर्जितः - is (itself) free from arrival and departure.

Varjitha: - one free from.

The 'arrival-departure *saakshi*' is 'arrival-departure *rahitha*.' |

Suppose (purely academic) the *sakshi* itself has 'arrival and departure', what will be the consequence? In such a situation, the 'arrival and departure of the *saakshi*', will require another *saakshi*, whose 'arrival and departure' will require yet another *saakshi* and so on. There will be the problem of infinite regress. The *Aachaaryaa* refers to this fact, in another context, later.

"And, that *saakshi*, 'I' am".

Earlier also Sureswaraachaaryaa has discussed *saakshi*; here, in this portion also, the *Aachaaryaa* is again discussing *saakshi*. But, there is an important new addition here.

Previously the *Aachaaryaa* discussed the *saakshi* and *thriputi*, without talking about their 'orders of reality'; whereas, now, the discussion is going on with a new awareness, which is an extremely important awareness, that 'I', the *saakshi*, am *sathyam* and the *thriputi* / the material *thriputi* / the *saakshya prapanchaa* / the *anaathma prapanchaa* is *mithyaa*.

That's the reason why in spite of the so-called 'binary' format, 'I' remain *advaitam*. To repeat: "'I' remain *advaitam*, even in the so-termed 'binary' format, because, of the seemingly two components of the 'binary' format, one ('I', the *saakshi*) is *sathyam* and the other (the *pramaathraadhi thriputi*) is *mithyaa* (which is as good as non-existent)".

The *thriputi* is only a *vesham* for the drama to go on; and 'I', the *saakshi*, provide the screen for the *thriputi* drama to go on and on and on.

And, if one asks "when will the drama stop?" (i.e. if one seriously yearns for the cessation of the drama) it only means that one has unfortunately and wrongly attributed reality to the

thriputi. Once one has the wisdom, that the *thriputi* is only *mithyaa*, one will have no hesitation at all in allowing the drama to go on forever.

And, the firm conviction, that, "That *sathya saakshi aham asmI*" is "*naishkarmya siddhi*:"

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 109:

ग्राहकादिनिष्ठैव ग्राहकादिभावविभागसिद्धिः कस्मान्नेति चेत्तदाह ।

Why should not the being and non-being of these divisions, the knower, the knowing and the object of knowledge be regarded as cognizable by these factors themselves? It is said in reply:

Here, Sureswaraacharya is introducing a *poorva pakshaa*. What is that *poorva pakshaa*?

The *poorva pakshin* questions: "Why cannot the *thriputi* itself know the arrival and departure of the *thriputi*? Why do you introduce a *saakshi* outside the *thriputi*, to illumine the arrival and departure of the *thriputi*?"

Thriputi, of course, in this context, means *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*.

"Since the *thriputi* itself has the resources to 'know', i.e., since it is the *pramaathaa antha:karanam*, which is responsible for *ghata jnaanam*, *pata jnaanam*, *vraksha jnaanam* etc., in fact, including *vedhaantha jnaanam* also – i.e., since *thriputi* is capable of knowing all forms of knowledge – *paraa* and *aparaavidhyaa* - why can't that *thriputi* itself 'know' the arrival and departure of the *thriputi*?" is the question raised by the *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraacharya takes up this question for answering. The *poorva pakshin's* question is given in this introduction (*sambhandha gadhyam*).

- ग्राहकादि भाव अभाव विभाग सिद्धिः - The proof of the two conditions – the presence/ arrival of the *thriputi* and the absence / departure of the *thriputi*

The two different conditions, viz., the presence / arrival and the absence/ departure is called '*Bhaava abhaava vibhaaga*', which can also be termed '*aagamaa apaaya vibhaaga*'

'*Siddhi*:' means 'proof' or 'knowledge'.

'*Graahakaad*' means '*pramaathaa*' and '*aadhi*' means 'etc.'. Therefore, '*graahakaadhi*' means '*pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*' - the '*thriputi*'.

- ग्राहकादि निष्ठा एव) भवतु(- Let it (thriputi bhaava abhaava siddhi:) be known / proved by the *thriputi* itself.

`GraahakaadhI, as before, means `thriputI.

`Nishtaad' (*bhavathu*) means 'let it be present'.

What should be present? The *thriputi bhaava abhaava siddhi*:|

"Let the power of proving the absence of *thriputi*, be vested in the *thriputi* itself" is the literal meaning of the statement, while, the essence is "why can't *thriputi* know its absence?" This is similar to asking the question "why can't I know my absence?"; the fallacy in the question is obvious; "if, I am there to know my absence, it is not my absence".

- कस्मात् - Why is it not possible?
- इति चेत् - If this question is asked,
- तद् आह - the author gives the answer (in verse 109).

`ThadhI means (in this context) `thadh uttharamI.

Verse 109 – Chapter II:

स्वसाधनं स्वयं नष्टो न नाशं वेत्त्यभावतः।

अत एव न चान्येषामतोऽसौ भिन्नसाक्षिकः ॥ १०९ ॥

None of these factors can know how it is brought about and that it is destroyed, because, before its origin and after its destruction, it is not there to know. For the same reason it cannot know the origin and destruction of other factors. Therefore every one of them must be known by a witness other than itself.

What is the question? "Why cannot the *thriputi* know its own absence, without a *saakshi*?"

We have previously proved that *thriputi* cannot know even its presence, without a *saakshi*. Such being the case, where is the question of *thriputi* knowing its absence?

When *thriputi* cannot know even its presence without the *saakshi*, because, as already explained, in the absence of the sentient *saakshi*, *thriputi*, being *jadam* by itself (*jadathvaath*) cannot know its presence, even during its existence, *Kaimuthika nyaayena*, how can it know its absence?

Then, if subsequent question "Granting that *thriputi* cannot know itself, why cannot *thriputi* know its presence with *chidhaabhaasa*? Why is the *saakshi* required?" is raised, the obvious answer "the very *chidhaabhaasaa* is itself present, only because of *saakshi*", makes the question absurd.

Without *saakshi*, *chidhaabhaasaa* cannot come into existence. Without *saakshi* and *chidhaabhaasaa*, *thriputi* cannot know its presence. When *thriputi* cannot know its presence, how can it know its absence? This is argument no. 1 – "*jadathvaath*".

What is the second argument? Nobody or nothing can know his/her or its absence. Because, if somebody has to know his/her absence, he/she will have to be present, as the 'knower' to know his / her absence. And, if that somebody is present as 'knower', obviously he or she is not absent.

In Advaita Makaranthaa, there is a brilliant argument: "Na cha svajanma naasam vaa dhrashtum arhathi kaschana dhau hi praag uttharaa abhaava charama prathama kshanau" etc.

The theory to be proved is Nothing can know its birth and death. "*Svasya (mama) janma* and *svasya (mama) naasaa*, I do not know; because, once I am dead, I am not there to know my death and before my birth also, I am not there to know my birth".

To convey this idea, the author defines 'birth' and 'death' in a remarkable and unique manner. Birth of a person is defined by him, as 'the last moment of the prior non-existence of the person'. To explain: Before the person's birth, the person is absent. The absence before birth is called 'prior non-existence'. Then, what is birth, according to the author? When the 'prior non-existence' ends, that ending moment of the 'prior non-existence' is defined by him as 'birth' - "*Praag abhaava charama kshana: janma*" – "the last moment of the **prior** non-existence".

In the same manner, 'death' is "the first moment of the **posterior** non-existence".

Suppose, I want to witness my birth (the word I, in this context is not the *sachhidhaananda aathmaa* - the Witness Consciousness – but only the *laukika* / mundane 'myself'). This means that I should witness the 'last moment of my prior non-existence'. But, only if I am capable of witnessing my *prior non-existence*, I can witness 'the last moment of my prior non-existence' viz. my 'birth'.

Lakshmidhara kavi, the *aacharya* of *Advaita Makaranthaa* points out: (going step by step)" It is common sense that, I cannot witness my own non- existence; that means, I

cannot witness my *prior* non-existence; that means, I cannot witness the *last moment of my prior non-existence*; therefore, I can never, never talk about witnessing my birth."

That means 'my birth' is never proved by my 'witness'ing it; one may celebrate one's birthday; even the birthday of a *sanyaasi jnaani* may be celebrated by his 'ignorant' devotees, in their enthusiasm, as *jayanthi* or *vardhanthi*. But, in the vision of the *jnaani* himself: "I have never witnessed my birth; therefore, I am never born".

In the same manner, "I cannot witness my non-existence; therefore, I cannot witness my *posterior* non-existence; therefore, I cannot witness the *first moment of my posterior non-existence*; therefore, I cannot witness my death also".

Therefore, the 'witness' of the arrival and departure of a given object has to be only something other than the object; the object itself cannot 'witness' its own arrival and departure.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says (in verse 109):

- स्वसाधनं स्वयं न वेत्ति - The *thriputi* cannot know its own origination/ arrival, by itself;

In this context, the word *saadhanam* means *uthpatthi*: or *janma*. *Svasaadhanam* means 'its own origination / arrival'.

- नाशं वा (स्वयं न वेत्ति - the *thriputi* cannot know its own departure (also), by itself.;
Svayam is adverbial, qualifying the verb *vetthi*.

Why (cannot *thriputi* know its departure)? Because:

- स्वयं नष्ट) :सन्(- because of itself being gone (after its departure);
- अभावतः - and, because, it is absent (before its arrival)

Before its arrival, it is not there and after its departure also, it is not there .Then, how can it witness its birth or death?

In *sushupthi avasthaa*, *thriputi* cannot talk about the absence of *thriputi*. So also, in *samaadhi avasthaa* or *moorchaa* etc., *thriputi* cannot talk about the absence of *thriputi*.

It follows, therefore, that, there is 'something' other than the *thriputi*, standing witness to the arrival and departure of *thriputi*, which 'something' is called *saakshi*.

In *sushupthi*, what we experience is the *nirvikalpaka saakshi thathvam* alone. But, to say that "I am the *saakshi*", you require the *pramaathaa*, which obtains only in *savikalapka jaagrath avasthaa*.

That's why, it is said, that, in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, knowledge cannot be attained. Knowledge requires *pramaathaa*; *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* itself means "the *pramaathraadhi-thriputi* is resolved". Then, how can one talk of anyone attaining *jnaanam* in *nirvikalpaka samaadh*?

Jnaanam has to be gained only in *savikalpaka jaagrath avasthaa*, when *guru* is available and *saasthram* is available and when I have to declare "that *saakshi*, which I experienced in *sushupthi avasthaa* is my *svaroopam* and *this ahamkaaraa*, which I am using for *vyavahaaraa* is only incidental *kanchukam*".

- अतः एव – Therefore only,
- अन्येषां (साधनं नाशं) च न (वेत्ति) - any one of the *thriputi* cannot know the presence or absence of the other two also.

To explain: When *pramaathaa* is resolved, *pramaathaa* cannot know the *abhaavaa* of *pramaathaa* itself, because it is not there to know its absence. Sureswaraachaaryaa extends this: "Just as *pramaathaa* cannot know *pramaathru abhaava* after it has resolved, the resolved *pramaathaa* cannot talk about the *pramaanaa abhaavaa* and the *prameya abhaavaa* also". In short, it (resolved *pramaathaa*) cannot know the *bhaavaa* or *abhaavaa* of the other two (*pramaanam* and *prameyam*) also.

Atha: eva anyeshaam (bhaavaabhaavau) na vetthi |

अतः - Therefore,

What is the conclusion?

"This *thriputi* cannot know the absence of *thriputi*; at the same time, the absence of *thriputi* is known or experienced by me in *sushupthi avasthaa*; therefore, it should be and is witnessed by someone / something other than the *thriputi*, which someone / something is called *saakshi*, obtaining in *sushupthi* (also)".

- असौ - This *thriputi*

For referring to *thriputi*, Sureswaraachaaryaa has been using the word '*grahakaadhī*' meaning '*pramaathaā*' etc. '*Asau*', in this context, is the pronoun indicating '*grahakaadhī*' (being the same gender as *grahakaadhī*) or '*thriputī*'.

- भिन्न साक्षिकः - has someone (other than *thriputi*), as the *saakshi* / illuminator.

And, that *saakshi* experience we do have in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, of course, not experiencing it in the form of *thriputi*, i.e. not as "I am the experiencer of *saakshi*". *Sushupthi anubhavaa* / *nirvikalpaka anubhavaa* / *thriputi rahitha anubhavaa* **is** there for everybody; that alone is *saakshi anubhavaa*, and, therefore, nobody can be said to lack *saakshi anubhavaa*.

Our problem is that we have taken the *saakshi* as one of the things in the Creation. *Vedhaantha* wants to say that "*Saakshi* is not one of the things; it is the only thing". (But, of course, to make this statement, we require *jaagrath avasthaa*).

The purpose of *Vedhaantha saasthraa* is not to give the seeker the experience of *saakshi*; but it is meant to negate everything else as *mithyaa*.

Saakshi bhinnasya mithyaathva nischayaartham / saakshya nishedhaartham eva saasthram |
"Yannethi nethi vachanai: nigamaa: avochu:"- (Praatha: smaranam) |

The seeker need not work for *saakshi anubhavaa*, since he is *always* getting it; he has to work only for *saakshya nishedhaa*.

Unfortunately, *Mithyaathva nischaya: is* difficult, since we do intensely face and feel *samsaaraa* and its consequential problems and emotions. In fact, *mithyaathva nischaya: is* tougher than *advaita nischaya: |*

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 110:

ग्राहकादेरन्यसाक्षिपूर्वकत्वसिद्धेः स्वस्साक्षिणोऽप्यन्यसाक्षिपूर्वकत्वादनवस्थेति चेत्तन्न साक्षिणो व्यतिरिक्तहेत्वनपेक्षत्वादत आह ।

It may be argued that as the factors like the knower become known by another witness, the witness also is to be known by another witnessing agency. In that case, an infinite regress results. In reply, it has to be pointed out that the truth is not so, because the witness does not stand in need of a witness other than itself. This is said in the following:

The *poorva pakshin* is raising another question, based on this statement (*asau bhinaa saakshika:*).

"If the *thriputi* or *pramaathaa* requires a *saakshi* to prove itself (its presence and absence), then will not that *saakshi* require some other principle to know *its* presence? If *ahamkaaraa* requires *saakshi*, will not *saakshi* require another *saakshi*?"

What is the answer? *Pramaathaa* requires a *saakshi* to prove itself and others, since *pramaathaa* is the mind, which is *jadam* by itself; and because of its *jadathvam*, the insentient mind has to 'borrow' *chidhaabhaasaa* and with the help of the borrowed *chidhabhaasaa* alone, it has to prove itself and others. And, therefore, it requires the sentient *saakshi* to lend it the required *chidhaabhaasaa*. In short, *pramaathaa* requires *saakshi* because of its insentient nature - "*Pramaathu: jadathvaath*".

(This may give rise to a couple of questions: First question: *Kasmaath pramaathu: jadathvam*? Answer: *Pramaathu: antha:karana roopathvaath*.

Further question: *Anath:karanasya jadathvam kasmaath*? Answer: *Bhaudhikathvaath* and *savikaarathvaath*.

'*Bhaudhikathvam*' means 'born out of *pancha bhoothaas*'; in addition, the *pramaathaa* is *savikaaram* – subject to change also).

On the other hand, *saakshi* will not require another *saakshi* to prove itself; because, unlike *pramaathaa*, *saakshi* (being *chidh roopa:*) happens to be *svayam prakaasa:* |

Not knowing this difference, between *pramaathaa* and *saakshi*, viz., the '*Pramaathu: jadathvam*' and '*saakshina: ajadathvam*', the *poorva pakshin* raises this doubt.

- ग्राहकादेःसिद्धिः - "The proof / evidence of the *thriputi*
- अन्य साक्षि पूर्वकत्वात् - is because of some other external witness, an external witness other than the *thriputi*.

This wonderful compound word 'ग्राहकादेरन्यसाक्षिपूर्वकत्वसिद्धेः' has been recast, as a separate sentence above, for easier understanding.

(In an aside, Swamiji refers to how each sentence in Sanskrit, is to be analyzed by a serious student of Sanskrit grammar, the practice of which analysis will culminate in *Sanskrit jnaana nishtaa* - a thorough knowledge of the language - and jocularly remarks 'the saving grace is

that, for attainment of *mokshaa*, the seeker does not require *Sanskrit jnaana nishtaa*, but only *aathma jnaana nishtaa*.)

The essence of this portion (part of the question of the *poorva pakshin*): "Since the *thriputi* requires an external *saakshi* to prove its presence and absence, therefore":

- स्वसाक्षिणः अपि अन्यसाक्षिपूर्वकत्वात् - (Then) the *saakshi* also must be proved by another *saakshi*.

(The compound word 'स्वसाक्षिणोऽप्यन्यसाक्षिपूर्वकत्वात्' has also been recast, as a separate sentence, for easier understanding.)

- अनवस्था - In that case, there will be infinite regress".

This is the *poorva pakshin's* contention. His stand is that, " Since the existence or absence of *thriputi* is to be proved only by a *saakshi*, the *saakshi* also will not be proved without another *saakshi* to prove it; i.e., to prove the first *saakshi*, you require a second *saakshi*; if this is not accepted, the first *saakshi* will not be proved. On the other hand, if the necessity of a second *saakshi* to prove the first *saakshi*, is accepted, then a third *saakshi* will be required to prove the second *saakshi* and this will go on and on".

- इति चेत् - If such a question is asked (the *Achaaryaa* replies),
- तद् न – it is not true.

Because:

- साक्षिणः - For the *saakshi*,
- व्यतिरिक्त हेतु अनपेक्षत्वात् – the need of a witness, other than itself, is not there.

In this context, *hethu*: (normally meaning cause / reason) can be interpreted as *saakshi*.

In other words: "Saakshi no. 1 does not require *saakshi* no. 2, to prove it".

Why not? What is the logic? *Saakshi* is *chaithanya roopam*. On the other hand, *pramaathaa* is *jada antha:karana roopam* and, therefore, requires *saakshi*.

"*Vyathiriktha hethu:*" means "another *saakshi*" and "*anapekshathvaaath*" means "since not required".

अतः आह - Therefore, the author is making the following statement.

106. Chapter II, Verse 110 to 112 (16-08-2008)

Verse 110 – Chapter II:

धीवन्नापेक्षते सिद्धिमात्मान्यस्मादविक्रियः।

निरपेक्षमपेक्षैव सिद्ध्यन्त्यन्ये न तु स्वयम् ॥ ११० ॥

Unlike the mind which requires to be established by an external agency, the unchanging Self does not require another witnessing agency to become established. Others get established through the Self, which Self itself is independent of such presuppositions and does not require another to establish it.

Sureswaraachaarya is raising the level of teaching very gradually. As a first step, he raised the student, from the triangular format of *jeeva*, *jagath* and *Isvara*, to the level of the binary format of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* - but to the binary format of the *saamkhyaa* philosophers. Similar to the *Vedhaanthaa* philosopher, the *Saamkyaa* philosopher also talks about *aathmaa* and *anaathamaa* and of the clear distinction between the two – i.e., between Consciousness and Matter.

Modern scientists have not yet accomplished this, since they are not able to understand where the Consciousness should be located – whether it should be a part of Matter or a product of Matter etc. They are not able to decipher at all, what this Consciousness is.

But, the *Saamkyaa* philosopher, by sheer logic, has succeeded in separating Consciousness and Matter and arriving at the binary format, which, in itself, is a remarkable achievement. But, because he relies more heavily on logic and much less on *Vedhaanthaa*, he has committed two blunders, in spite of arriving at the binary format.

One of the blunders he has committed is: "considering the *aathmaas* as many" – that, each individual has a *separate* Consciousness, each experiencing the *anaathma prapanchaa*. He has thus caused a 'division' in Consciousness. It is perfectly in order to assume 'divisions' in Matter, because, Matter is *savikalpam* and is divisible. But, making a similar division in *aathmaa* is a blunder. The result is that 'I' become a localized witness. The discovery, that "'I' am a witness" is a great discovery; but, "localizing 'I'" i.e. "making 'I', 'one of the witnesses'" is a blunder.

The second and the greater blunder of the *saamkyaa* philosopher is that he gives the same order of reality to Consciousness and Matter, overlooking the fact, that, once they have the same order of reality, one will influence the other. Mutual influence cannot be avoided, if both of them belong to the same plane. Therefore, in *saamkyaa* philosophy, the *aathmaa* can never be totally free.

Since, there are, thus, two blunders in the *saamkyaa* binary format, the *Aachaaryaa*, after coming to *saamkyaa* binary format as an intermediary step, is now shifting from the *saamkyaa* binary format, to the *Vedhaanthic* binary format, when alone *Advaita siddhi* will take place.

Once the seeker comes to *Vedhaanthic* binary format, he should first understand that *anaathmaa* consists of *thriputi* – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. *Pramaathaa* is the 'mind', *pramaanam* is the sense organs and *prameyam* is the world. All these three – mind, sense and world – should be bracketed by the seeker as one unit and understood as *anaathmaa*, and, thereafter, (it should be understood) that, 'I', the observing Consciousness can never be pluralistic, because plurality of the Consciousness, is possible only if Consciousness exists within space. Space is included in *anaathmaa*, since space is one of the *pancha bhoothaas*. 'I' am the observing Consciousness, who am 'outside' space / not falling within space; and therefore 'I' cannot be divided into many. "I am non-dual Witness".

The second important point to be noted, is, that, *anaathmaa* has to be of a lower order of reality, since, if *anaathmaa* and *aathmaa* belong to the same order of reality, *aathmaa* will be subject to the influence of time, space and causation.

To sum up, in the *Vedhaanthic* binary format, "I am of a higher order of reality, 'witnessing' the *thriputi* lower order".

Jnaana vyavahaara and karma vyavahaaraa are taking place in the *thriputi* alone, while 'I' am not affected by either of the *vyavahaaraas* – 'I' am *avyavahaaryam*; "na antha: pragnyam, na bahi: pragnyam, na pragnyaana ganam, **avyavahaaryam**", as the *Maandookya Upanishad* declares. Then alone can 'I' claim liberation, even as 'I' am witnessing all *vyavahaaraa* - all knowledge transactions as well as karma transactions. "Let all transactions continue".

Emotional upheavals also are only part of *jnaana-karma-vyavahaaraa* and belong to *anaathmaa*. I am not to judge myself based on the emotional ups and downs ; but, should learn to just 'watch' the emotional upheavals and even at that time, practice to claim that 'I' am only the witness of even these events, which events belong to the *thriputi anaathmaa* only. But, of course, I have to use the mind to say that "I am not the mind". Thus, mind is an instrument of *pramaathaa* also ; mind is an instrument of the *saakshi* also; therefore, 'I', the *saakshi*, use the mind to claim that 'I' am neither the mind nor the emotional upheavals which are taking place as part of the *anaathmaa* journey.

The transition from *saamkyaa* binary format to this *Vedhaantaa* binary format, in which format, I claim, "*aham sathyam thriputi mithyaa*", is the current topic that is being dealt with, by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

Therefore, he says (in verse 110):

- **अविक्रियः** - The changeless / absolute
- **आत्मा** - self-revealing, 'I' the Consciousness principle,
- **न अपेक्षते** - does not require / depend on
- **सिद्धिम्** - a proof for its existence / revelation
- **अन्यस्मात्** - from any extraneous factor (in the form of pramaathaa/ pramaanam/prameyam),

Worldly objects require *thriputi* operations to prove their existence; *saakshi* does not require *thriputi* operation to prove its existence. On the other hand, *thriputi* operation itself is proved only because of the Consciousness medium. The non-localized Consciousness medium alone reveals the *thriputi vyavahaaraa*.

"Avikriya: aathmaa anyasmaath pramaana vyavahaaraaath siddhim na apekshathe".

Then, how am 'I' proved? Ans: 'I' am self-evident.

When am 'I' proved? Ans: Once 'I' am said to be self-evident, 'I' stand proved 'all the time'.

As has been seen before, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, the *thriputi* rises in 'me' and 'I' illumine the *thriputi* and its *vyavahaaraa* ; in *svapna avasthaa*, another type of *thriputi* arises and 'I' illumine the *svapna thriputi* and *svapna vyavahaara* ; in *sushupthi avasthaa* , *thriputi* is resolved and there is no *vyavahaara*; but, 'I' continue to exist as the generalized *saamaanya saakshi chaithanyam*. But, in *sushupthi*, 'I' cannot claim "'I' am the *saakshi*", because, to make this claim, I need the arrival of *thriputi*. In other words: to exist, 'I' do not require *thriputi* ; but, to claim 'my' existence, I require *thriputi*.

धीवत् - unlike the mind.

'Mind' is counter-example (i.e. 'unlike', not 'similar to'), since the mind cannot reveal itself (the reason being that mind is *jadam*, in nature).

The *Aachaaryaa*, therefore, makes a general rule: "Any dependent entity will have to depend upon an entity, which itself has to be independent, since, if that is also dependent, it will again require yet another entity to depend on".

Between the mind and the *saakshi*, mind is dependent and *saakshi* is independent.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- **अन्ये सिद्ध्यन्ति** – Everything else (apart from *saakshi*) proves its existence, 'Everything else' means: *pramaathaa* – the mind , *pramaanam* - the senses and *prameyam*- the world.
- **निरपेक्षं (साक्षिणं) अपेक्ष्य** - depending upon the independent *saakshi*.

'Nirapeksha:' means 'independent entity' and in this context, refers to *saakshi*. Nirgathaa apekshaa yasmaath sa: - Nirapeksha: | Tham – nirapeksham |

It should be clearly understood, that 'independent', in this context, means 'independent with regard to the revelation of its existence'. The *saakshi* does not depend upon anything else to prove its existence; it is self-evident.

- **न तु स्वयं** – But the Self itself does not (require any external factor, as it is self- evident).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 111:

यतो ग्राहकादिष्व्वात्मभावोऽविध्यानिबन्धन एव तस्मादन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विभज्यानात्मनः स्वयम् ।

The self-hood of the empirical knower etc., is grounded in nescience. Therefore, through reasoning, all such phenomena must be separated from the Self:

And, therefore, "raising our level" is "learning to distance 'myself' from the *thriputi*". The 'distancing' is not 'physical' distancing, since, 'I', the *aathmaa* cannot physically go away anywhere, obviously because 'I' am all-pervading.

The 'distancing' has to be done in a unique manner, similar to 'space' which 'distances' itself from the transactions of the world. Space remains '*asangha:*', whatever event happens in it. The word 'distancing' stands for '*asangathvam*', in this context, i.e. the word is used here, to mean 'not getting affected by / influenced by any *thriputi* event'.

"Learn to see yourself as the space-like Consciousness, which Consciousness accommodates *thriputi*, but, is not influenced by the *thriputi* events".

When the word *thriputi* (*pramaathru-pramaana-prameyaani*) is used, though the term itself may appear insignificant and simple, it should be understood to include the entire *akhilaanda koti brahmaanda*. Even the farthest galaxy is one of the *prameya vasthus* and falls within the *thriputi* only. The only difference is that the *pramaathaa* component of the

thriputi happens to be 'closer' (as it were) and the *prameyam* component of the *thriputi* is 'farther' (as it were) but, closer or farther, the whole *thriputi* is *anaathmaa* and 'one of the bubbles' existing in me. The use of the word 'one', (in 'one of the bubbles'), is significant because *svapna prapancha* is 'another' *thriputi*, in which also there is another 'time, space and cosmos'.

According to *saasthraas*, there are fourteen *lokaas* and each one is a relative universe, having its own distinct *thriputi*; but, all the *lokaas* of the *akhilaanda koti brahmaandaa* are like bubbles existing in 'me', the *chaithanyam*. I should make the claim that "I am the *chaithanyam*, in which these 'bubbles' appear and disappear".

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa declares in his treatise *Aathma Bodhaa* – "Upaadhaane akhilaadhaare jaganthi paramesware sargasthithilayaan yaanthi budhbudhaaneeva vaarini" (Verse 8) – "Like bubbles in water, the worlds arise from, exist in and dissolve into the supreme Lord (Brahman or aathmaa), who is the material cause and supporter of everything".

A *Vedhaanthic* seeker should internalize this view, that, "all the fourteen *lokaas* are like bubbles, existing in the medium of *chaithanyam*, which *chaithanyam* 'I' am". Therefore, the seeker should practice the *nidhidhyaasanam* "mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathistitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh brahmaadvayamasmyaham" (*kaivalya upaniashad*- verse 19) – "Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual *Brahman*)" |

An important result of such an approach/ attitude is, that, what appear as major problems in worldly life, would "disappear into thin air".

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- आत्मभावः - Identification
- ग्राहकादिषु - in the *thriputi*,

As explained earlier, 'grahakaad' means 'pramaathaad' and 'grahakaadh' means 'pramaathraadh' or 'thriputi'.

'Grahakaadhishu aathma bhaava.' means 'notion that 'I' am one of the *thriputi*'.

The moment 'identification' with *thriputi* comes, the triangular format, viz., "I am the victimized; the world is the victimizer and God is the savior" results.

- अविध्या निबन्धनएव : - is because of self- ignorance;
- यतः - therefore,
- अन्वयव्यतिरेखाभ्यां - by repeatedly employing the anvaya vyathirekha method,
-

Using the *anvaya vyathirekha* method, the seeker sees the *thriputi*, as one 'arriving and departing' and the 'Self' as one 'non-arriving and non-departing' and further that "whatever is 'arriving and departing' is not 'me'. It is only incidental *adhyasaa* upon 'me'".

"Understanding this *adhyasthaa* nature of the *thriputi*" is achieved by the *anvaya vyathirekha* method.

- अनात्मनः स्वयम् विभज्य - (the seeker) should learn to stand aloof from the *thriputi* (the seeker) should separate the *thriputi* from the Self.

This 'standing aloof' or 'separation' cannot be practiced when there are serious problems, because, during such situations, the mind will be under the control of the *pramaathaa* i.e. the *ahamkaaraa*. The individuality and the problems will take hold of the mind, which, therefore, will not be available for the *saakshi's* use, since, *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi* cannot use the mind simultaneously. Therefore, if one has to entertain the thought 'I do not have problems' even during problems, one has to repeatedly practice the thought when there are no problems or relatively less problems. During such periods, the mind will not be dominated by *ahamkaaraa* and will be available for *saakshi's* use; this available mind should be used to convince oneself that one can *never* have problems, which repeated 'thought' or 'claim' will enter one's subconscious mind and help during times of crisis, with the conviction "I have no problems; the crisis belongs to the *anaathma*; 'I' am only the witness of the crisis; and witness of the crisis is free from the crisis". This is called *nidhidhyaasanam* process – practicing the binary format meditation.

What is the '*nidhidhyaasanam*'? It follows in the verse.

Chapter II : Verse 111 –

उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशेषु योऽवगत्यैव वर्तते ।

जगतोऽविकारयावेहि तमस्मीति न नश्वरम् ॥ १११ ॥

He who remains through the origin, continuance and cessation of the world, in the form of unchanging awareness must be understood as the Self, as 'I am he'. Do not think of yourself as any of these transient factors.

What is talked about is the 'internalization' of the binary format.

- यः - "He (indicates *saakshi* in this context), who
- अवगत्या एव वर्तते – always remains in the form of chaithanya roopam,

Avagathi – chaithanyam ; avagathyaa - chaithanya roopena / saakshi roopena ; varthathe - remains all the time.

- अविकार्यो – changelessly (adjective to *avagathyaa*),

Chaithanyam remains as the changeless medium, like the *soorya prakaasaa*, the medium of light, in which different events happen illumined by the light, but the *soorya prakaasaa* itself does not undergo any change.

Consciousness is a medium similar to space or light, in '*asangathvam*' and '*avikaaryathvam*'.

Saakshi does not remain *chaithanya roopena* only, but, *saththaaropena* and *aananda roopena* also. Those two aspects are set aside for the present and the concentration, in the text, at the moment, is on the *chith* aspect alone, though the seeker is expected to ever remember the *Thaithreeya Upanishad Brahmaananda Valli* declaration – "*aananda aathmaa*".

Whenever anyone, at any given moment, complains about the absence of *aanandaa*, the complaint can be and is about the absence of only the 'reflected *aanandaa* in the mind'. It is an unfortunate and inevitable fact of creation, that, the mind cannot and does not have the 'reflected *aanandaa*' all the time. Availability of 'experiential *aanandaa*' fluctuates widely and is heavily dependent on *praarabhdtaa* also. *Vedhaantha* never promises this *prathibhimbhaa aanandaa* ; the *Vedhaanthic* seeker is not expected to work for *prathibhimbhaa aanandaa*; but should realize and claim " 'I' am the *bhimbha aanandaa* itself, which is not an object of 'experience', but, 'myself' ".

The saakshi remains avagathi roopena and aananda roopena. When? Sarvadhaa – all the time.

- उत्पत्ति स्थिति नाशेषु – during the times of srishti, sthithi and pralayam – creation, existence and dissolution,
- जगतः - of the entire cosmos including all the *akhilaanda lokaas*,

This means: "I should look upon the very creation as a temporary event in 'me' and, as a consequence, should not be averse to allow the event to continue".

This is the real *mokshaa*, and not what is more commonly believed to be *mokshaa*, viz. "escape from this birth, never to be born again".

The prayer to *Ishvara*, "Oh! Lord! This must be my last birth and after this life, I should never be born again" is very immature, from a *Vedhaanthic* viewpoint, though pardonable and acceptable at the *adhyaaropa* stage - the period of self-ignorance and triangular format. But, an advanced and informed *Vedhaanthic* seeker should eschew this prayer, with the realization "worlds appear and disappear only 'in' 'me'", as declared by the *Kaivalya Upanishad* (quoted already): "*Mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvam layam yaath'*" (verse 19) – "Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual *Brahman*".

'During all the three periods of *uthpatthi*, *sthithi* and *naasam* of the entire world', which expression means 'all the time', *saakshi* remains changelessly in the form of *chaithanyam*.

But, the *Achaaryaa* is worried that, when this statement viz., '*saakshi* remains all the time, changelessly in the form of *chaithanyam*' is made, the student may react "*saakshi* may be free; but, I am miserable". And, therefore, hastens to point out:

- तं साक्षिणं (अहं (अस्मि " - that saakshi, I am")
- इति त्वं अवेहि - thus, may you repeatedly meditate upon and internalize;

This – the binary format - should be the mindset of the *Vedhaanthic* seeker. Lord Krishna calls it *saamkhyaa bhaavanaa*, in the *Bhagavadh Githa*, in contrast to the *karma yoga bhaavanaa* or triangular format.

- न नश्वरम् - never claim the temporarily available *pramaathaa* mind as yourself.

'*Nasvaram*' means 'temporary' or 'transitory' and indicates the mind, in this context, since, the mind is available only in *jaagrath avasthaa* and not in *sushupthi avasthaa*, and is therefore 'temporary' or 'transitory'.

When the *Vedhaanthic* teacher says "*mokshaa* is *saanthi*:", the student understands this as 'peace of mind' and works for *mokshaa* in the form of *manas saanthi*: | In the initial stages of the teaching, the teacher does not discourage this thought pattern, since he is aware that a beginner of *Vedhaanthic* studies takes himself to be the 'mind'. In the early stages of teaching, termed *adhyaaropaa kaalam*, the teacher allows the student to consider *mokshaa* as *manas saanthi*: |

But, when the teaching advances to what is termed *apavaadhaa* stage, *mokshaa* can no longer be considered as *manas: saanthi:* | The teacher, at this stage, points out to the student : "The mind may be peaceful or not ; the conditions of the mind are determined by many factors, because the mind is one of the *anaathmaa*. Therefore, do not focus on the mind or on *manas: saanthi:*, which *saanthi* may be achieved or not. Your aim should be to claim *aathma saanthi:* - *aathmaa* meaning *saaksh'*".

And, when is there *saanthi* in *aathmaa*?

If the seeker works for permanent *manas: saanthi:*, the attempt will be fruitless; *manas:saanthi:* cannot be permanent, because mind is subject to changes. Even biochemical changes will cause disturbance to mental equilibrium; modern medical science says, that, during old age, hormonal biochemical changes take place in the body, which affect the mind also, causing depression and other emotional patterns .

Mokshaa cannot be *manas:saanthi:*, *mokshaa* is *aathma saanthi:*, which *saanthi:* **always is** , irrespective of the presence or absence of *manas:saanthi:* |

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* warns "*nasvaram na avehi*" – "do not claim the fleeting mind or the fleeting *manas: saanthi:* as yourself".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 112:

स्वतस्सिद्धात्मचैतन्यप्रतिबिम्बिताविचारितसिद्धिकात्मानवबोधोत्थेतरस्वभावापेक्ष
सिद्धित्वात्स्वतश्चासिद्धेरनात्मनो द्वैतेन्द्रजालस्य ।

As this magic show of duality forming the non-Self shines by the light of the self-established consciousness of the Self, as it presents itself owing to the absence of inquiry, as it springs out of the non-apprehension of the Self, as it involves reciprocal dependence and also as it does not establish itself, by itself, it follows:

A student may argue : "I am interested in *aathma saanthi:*, which I am willing to claim; but, I am interested in *manas: saanthi:* also". The *Vedhaanthic* answer for this is: " the seeker can always work for *manas: saanthi:* also, just as he/she works for maintaining the physical body healthy. The body is an useful instrument and therefore, must be kept fit. But, when this attempt to have a control over the *anaathmaa* - mind or body - is made, what should be remembered are the facts :

that, *anaathmaa* is not totally controllable; one can only contribute to the conditions of the *anaathmaa*, since one has enough free-will to make the contribution, but, one certainly does not have the power for total control. The mind can be used to control itself; it can be used to control the body – thus, control the infrastructure one is endowed with. But, it should be

realized and remembered that, all these can be and are only *contributions* towards control; not *total* control, since *anaathmaa* is not controllable by any individual factor, but, is subject to infinite number of factors, including *praarabhdhaa*.

that, the mind is of the lower order of reality; with which conviction alone, the seeker will know that 'whatever happens to the conditions of the mind, the real 'I' am not affected'. And, as a further consequence of this knowledge, will not be obsessed with controlling the *anaathmaa*. Control of the *anaathmaa*, as a hobby, is welcome. But 'obsession' with 'control of the *anaathmaad* is *samsaaraa*.

Because *anaathmaa* is, thus, uncontrollable and is *mithyaa*, the seeker should not be obsessed with its control. That is why Lord Krishna says in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (a popular verse – verse 22, Chapter XIV) "*prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha pandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaamkshathi*" – "He (the *jnaani*) does not hate brightness, activity and delusion as they arise, nor does he desire for them, as they withdraw".

Even a *jnaani's* mind, though generally *saathvic*, will alternate between *saathvic* (*prakaasam*) , *raajasic* (*pravrutthi*) and *thaamasic* (*moham*) conditions. In other words, emotional fluctuations can never be stopped even by a *jnaani*. In fact, Even *Bhagavaan's* mind, which is nothing but *maayaa*, is subject to fluctuations. Nobody can stop the fluctuations of *anaathmaa* mind. *Mokshaa* does not mean 'the mind remaining, all the time, in only one type of thought pattern'; it will be too idealistic a condition to expect.

Therefore, the seeker has to be very, very clear that he cannot afford to be obsessed with controlling of the mind, since it *is* uncontrollable; it is *mithyaa* also, because, on enquiry, the very existence of the mind becomes doubtful.

Being uncontrollable and being *mithyaa*, the effort for control of the mind can only be a hobby; never an obsession and also never a goal of life.

From what has been said, it can be understood, that, if 'control of the mind' is mistaken for *mokshaa* and the goal of life, the seeker will find that attainment of *mokshaa* will be eternally postponed. Even great saints (*mahasvaamis* and *rishis*) have been angry at times; therefore, if 'control of the mind' is considered as *mokshaa*, the great *mahasvaamis* and *rishis* also cannot be considered as *muktha purushaas*.

Going a step further, *Bhagavaan Paramasiva* is known as *aasutoshi* – the One who is easily pleased; if 'conditions of mind' are to be deciding factors of *mokshaa*, even the Lord will, therefore, be ruled out.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says: "The mind is *mithyaa* ; do not be obsessed by it. Use the mind without getting obsessed with it".

- अनात्मनः इन्द्रजालस्य – Of this entire anaathma prapanchaa consisting of dvaitham (meaning pramathru-prameyau) or thriputi (meaning *pramaathru-pramaana-prameyaani*), which is *mithyaa*,

'*Indrajaalam*' here means '*mithyaa*'. The more one probes into it, the more it will become 'nothing'.

The *Achaaryaa* describes the anaathmaa by the compound word "svathassiddha aathmachaitanyaprathibimbithaavichaarithasiddhikaathmaanavabodhothethaetharasvabhavaapekshasiddhathva", the various components of which explain the nature of anaathmaa.

- स्वतस्सिद्ध आत्मचैतन्य प्रतिबिम्बित - 'appear'ing in the light of the self-established consciousness of the Self,

'*Prathibimbitha*' means 'appearing'; it (the *anaathmaa*) is only an 'appearance'; but, when one attempts to study it, one will never be able to pinpoint what it actually is. The modern science also says "even the tangibility of the world is a myth. World is only non-tangible energy in motion, appearing tangible".

'Appearance' where?

'*Aathma chaithanya*' means 'in the light of the Consciousness of the Self'.

In 'me', the observer, the world 'appears' tangible.

What is the nearest example? The *svapna prapanchaa*, which appears very tangible in dream, but, which disappears on 'waking'.

- स्वतस्सिद्ध ' is adjective to *aathma chaithanyam*, meaning self-effulgent.

In essence, the first description of *anaathmaa* is: "Matter is a simple 'appearance' in 'me', the self-effulgent Consciousness".

The second description:

- *अविचारित सिद्धिक* – whose 'reality' will continue as long as one does not enquire into it,

Anaathmaa has got its 'existence', as long as it is not analyzed. *Avicharitha siddham* is another popular idiom used in *Vedhaanthaa*, which means "appearing real, as long as it is not enquired into".

Third description:

- *आत्म अनवबोध उत्त* – which is born out of ignorance,

Just as dream is born out of sleep, in the same manner, world is born out of 'being asleep to one's *svaroopam*'. 'Sleeping to *advaitam*' produces the dream of the universe.

107. Chapter II, Verse 111 to 113 (23-08-2008)

By doing aathma anaathma viveka, Sureswaraachaaryaa has established, that, 'I' am of the nature of saakshi chaithanyam, which is called the aathmaa and everything else, which is an object of experience, is anaathmaa .

Anaathmaa includes the entire universe, the physical body as well as the mind. To present in a technical language, *anaathmaa* includes *pramaatha*, the mind, *pramaanam*, the sense organs and *prameyam*, the external universe. And the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is material in nature.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa is focusing on the nature of *anaathma prapanchaa*, to establish its *mithyaathvam*, which is a very, very important conclusion that every *Vedhaanthic* student has to arrive it. Binary format will be efficacious only when *anaathmaa* is understood as *mithyaa*, because, only when one knows that *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*, one can boldly say, "'I' the *sathyam*, will be never affected by any event in *anaathmaa*." In other words, "that 'I' am *asangha*:" will be clear, only when *anaathma mithyaathvam* is established.

Therefore, in these *slokas*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is focusing on *anaathma mithyaathvam*.

The *aachaaryaa* wants to say that *anaathmaa* is a mysterious entity, which will never be available for logical explanation or definition. And since, it is logically inexplicable, one cannot even say '*anaathmaa* exists', because to say '*anaathmaa* exists', one should know what one means by the word *anaathmaa*. And, as one tries to analyze the *anaathmaa*, it is not even available for any explanation; the only explanation one will have, is, 'I do not know'.

Even if you explain the *anaathmaa* at one level, it will lead to another question at a different level, again, making us say 'I do not know'. Since 'I do not know' is the consistent answer, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, *anaathmaa*, the matter, is an embodiment of crystallized form of *avidhyaa*. Since 'I do not know' will be the answer, when you try to explain what the mind is or what the body is or what the world is, *anaathmaa* is '*avidhyaa* crystallized'. Whatever is '*avidhya* crystallized', is negatable by knowledge, by which it means, it is as good as non-existent.

To sum up : '*anaathmaa*' is 'mysterious'; 'mysterious' means 'crystallized form of ignorance' ; 'crystallized form of ignorance' means 'negatable by knowledge'; 'negatable by knowledge' means 'as good as non-existent' or '*mithyaa*'. And, therefore, it (any event in *anaathmaa*) cannot disturb 'me', the *asangha aathmaa*.

When it is said 'it cannot disturb 'me'', the word 'me' does not mean the mind, because the mind itself *is* an *anaathmaa* entity subject to disturbances, like the body, another *anaathmaa* entity. We can only manipulate the intensity of the disturbances; but, the nature of the mind is, that, it is an integral part of *anaathmaa*, which certainly is subject to disturbances . ('Subject to disturbances' means 'subject to influence by *anaathmaa* events').

What *Vedhaantha* says is: "I, **the aathma**, (**not** the mind), am not subject to any disturbance whatsoever ; we have to learn to claim this *asangha svaroopaa aathmaa*. Otherwise, no freedom is ever possible. Either you claim 'mind' as your 'self' and be ever bound or claim *aathmaa* as your 'self' and be ever free. The choice is yours".

Mokshaa is defined as '*asangha aathma svaroopena avasthaanam*' (ever dwelling in / identifying with the non-attached *aathmaa*); and is possible only when *anaathma mithyaathvam* is very well intellectually grasped by us. And, therefore, these verses are focusing on *anaathma mithyaathvam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* uses the term '*indrajaalam*'. '*Indrajaalam*' means a 'magical show', which, on closer scrutiny, disappears.

A magic show can be used only for one purpose – entertainment.

Recollecting (what *Swamiji* calls) the 5th Capsule of *Vedhaantha*: "For a person who remembers his real nature – viz., as eternal and all-pervading Consciousness - life is an entertainment (or a magic show; which show should never be probed into, but, watched only as an entertainment). The moment the person forgets his real nature, life instantaneously becomes a struggle".

"Whether one wants to live one's life as an entertainment or as a struggle is again one's choice" the *Aachaaryaa* implies, by the use of the term '*dvaita indrajalasya*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives different descriptions to this *anaathmaa* ; each description reveals its mysterious nature .

The first description is '*Svathasissiddha aathmachaitanya prathibhimbhitha*'. In this description, the word *prathibhimbhitha* is used to indicate the mysterious nature of *anaathmaa*. '*Prathibhimbhitha*' or 'reflection' is a mysterious entity. When there are a person and a mirror in front of the person, there is a reflection very clearly experienced by the person. If it is analyzed 'what is the nature of the reflection?' , it will be realized that the 'reflection' does not have an individuality of its own ; it has got some of the features of the

reflected person and it has got some of the features of the reflecting mirror and by mixing up these two, a mysterious third entity, called reflection is formed. But, the reflection cannot be counted as an 'independent' entity, because, the moment, the mirror and the person are separated, one does not know where the reflection is. The *Aachaaryaa* compares the world to a *prathibhimbhaa*.

But, it should be carefully noted, that, this example should not be overextended; in the case of the reflection, the reflection is a 'third' entity, because of the presence of two earlier entities - the reflected person and the reflecting mirror. One should not extend that aspect in the case of the *prathibhimbhitha anaathmaa*, concluding that, along with *aathmaa*, there must be a 'second' entity for the *prathibhimbhitha anaathmaa* to 'appear' as a 'third' entity. The example is given only to show that just as a reflection is an inexplicable mystery and merely an 'appearance' without an independent existence of its own, the world is also a mysterious 'appearance' without having an existence of its own.

Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram of Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa commences with the comment "viswam dharpana dhruyamaana nagaree thulyam" – "the universe (is) like a city seen in a mirror".

And, what is that *dharpanam* – mirror? As the *Aachaaryaa's* text indicates in this portion, *svathasiddha aathma chaithanyam* – the 'self-evident' Consciousness - is the *dharpanam*, and the entire world is a mysterious 'appearance'.

An incidental lesson resulting from this statement is that "therefore, too much of probing into the world is futile and should be avoided".

The next description of the *anaathmaa*, is '*avicharitha siddhika*', which term means 'having a 'seeming' existence as long as no enquiry is made'. This is exactly like the existence of the reflection cited in the example, where, on enquiry, the reflected face does not have an 'is'ness of its own.

If a reflection has got an existence of its own, the reflection must continue to exist, even when the mirror is removed or the person is removed. But, it does not. It follows, therefore, that, the reflection does not have its own independent existence; but, as long as one does not enquire or apply one's mind to it, one may assume the reflection to have an independent existence; from this perspective, therefore, this understanding 'there is a reflection' is a misconception; in the same manner, the conception, 'there is a world' is also a misconception and in fact, the biggest misconception.

First, one 'gives' existence to the world; this 'existence of the world' is itself a misconception; thereafter, one empowers the world to cause disturbances, complaining "the world is disturbing me"; and thereafter goes to *Baghavaan* with the prayer "Lord, somehow, I want to go away from the world, once and for all, never to come back again". This is one of the biggest ironies in life: "giving' existence to something which does not have existence; thereafter, 'empowering' it; thereafter 'struggling'; and thereafter 'wanting to escape' ".

In fact, efforts need not be directed towards 'escaping' from the world; but, should be directed only towards 'escaping' from these misconceptions, by a thorough and informed enquiry. Successful 'escape' from misconceptions, is *mokshaa*.

Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* describes *anaathmaa* as '*avicharitha siddhika*' – 'one whose existence is born out of non-enquiry'.

"Non-enquiry' is the food / nutrition which gives an existence to and nurtures your problems/ your worries also", implies the *Achaaryaa*, (since, the very 'existence' of *anaathmaa* is only a result of non-enquiry- '*Avicharithaa siddhika*')

The next description of *anaathmaa*, (given by the *Aachaaryaa*) is '*Aathma anavabodha uttha*', which means "crystallized version of 'I do not know' ".

The *Swamiji* gives the example of a sweet edible dish from the state of Andhra, which, at first sight, looks like a paper folded many times over; a person, who is new to the dish, does not realize that the 'dish' itself is what appears as paper and therefore, keeps on removing layer after layer of the 'paper', expecting to find the 'dish' inside the 'wrappings' and ultimately realizes the fact, that, what appeared like the 'wrappings' is, itself, the edible dish and actually there is nothing inside the 'wrappings'.

So also is the 'onion', from which peel after peel can be removed, without getting at anything tangible inside.

In a similar manner, one can go on 'unfold'ing the world; but ultimately find 'nothing' at all on enquiry. Therefore, what is it? It is 'ignorance crystallized' – 'I do not know'.

Swami Vidhyaanayaa describes this aspect aptly in his treatise *Panchadasi*. He describes the universe as '*prasna roopam*', which means that, the world gives rise to a spate of continuous questioning as to 'what it is', but, with the questioner never being able to arrive at a convincing answer.

This 'ignorance' is called *ajnaanam* or *anavabodham*. Therefore, the *Achaaryaa* describes the *anaathmaa* as '*anavabodha uttha*' - 'born out of ignorance' or 'ignorance crystallized'.

When it is said that, the world is 'born out of ignorance', what 'ignorance' is referred to?; i.e. ignorance of 'what' ? It cannot be said that the world is born out of 'ignorance of the world'. World cannot be born out of the 'ignorance of the world', because, obviously, '*ignorance*' of any object is not possible even before conception or '*birth*' of the object. It is simple logic.

Therefore, there can be the only answer that the world is born out of something which is 'non-world'. And, what is that non- world? Sureswaraachaaryaa says "there is only one thing which is outside the world and which is non-world; and that non-world is 'you' the Observer, which is not the world nor a part of the world".

That's why in the deep sleep stage, even when the whole world is resolved, *desa* (place) is resolved and *kaala* (time) is resolved, there is one unresolved 'Observer' of the resolved condition.

Even after the resolution of the world, 'I' am there; it would mean that, 'I' am 'outside' the world. And, when it is said that "'I' am outside the world", it should not give rise to a question 'where'. This is another wrong question, because, when this question 'where' is raised, the questioner is looking for a location in 'space' for 'I'. But, when 'I' am outside the world, am 'I' not outside space also, since space is also included in the world? And, what is outside space, cannot be located in 'space'; therefore, *aathmaa* is not available for an answer to the question 'where is it (*aathmaa*) located?'. The conclusion : "'I' (*aathmaa*) am ever present, without a specific location, available to locate all that can be located".

'I' cannot be located anywhere. But, thus, while "'I' am nowhere" is the right answer to the question "where is (am) 'I' located?", this answer may lead to the wrong conclusion that "'I' am non-existent". Therefore, a compromise is made and it is said "'I' am everywhere". "'I' am everywhere" is a compromised expression for saying "'I' am nowhere".

Whether you say "'I' am nowhere" or "'I' am everywhere", in that 'me', all these (*pramaathru - pramaana - prameya thriputi*) are dancing inexplicably; and, if a purpose for this 'dancing' is sought, it may be said, from one perspective, that, this magic show is made available to avoid boredom; that, a magic show with *pramaathru- pramaana - prameya - thriputi* is given for 'entertainment'. "Understand it as magic show – an entertainment - and have fun" (is the implied *Vedhaanthic* teaching).

Reverting to the text, the description '*aathma anavabodha uttha*' means 'born out of ignorance of 'myself'.

The next description given by the *Achaaryaa* is:

- इतर इतर स्वभाव अपेक्ष सि → - capable of proving its existence only by mutual / reciprocal dependence,

To explain: The *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* and the *prameyaa* are the *thriputi*. The *anaathma* material universe consists of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyaa*. *Pramaatha* means the mind 'matter', *pramaanam* means the sense organs 'matter' and *prameyam* means the universe 'matter'. An unique fact is, that, any one of the three depends upon any one or both of the other two to prove its 'existence'. All these are, therefore, what is termed, *anyonya aasrayaa* , reciprocally / mutually dependent.

That a *prameyam* can never be proved without a *pramaanam* is a well known fact; for example, without the eyes, forms and colours can never be proved; but, an interesting fact, which is generally lost sight of, is, that, the converse is also true; the eyes also cannot be proved, if forms and colours are not there. If there are no forms and colours at all in the world, one can never define the eye and one can never prove the existence of the eye.

Another example : If one gets up in the early morning and if there is a block in the ears, one gets a doubt whether the ear has just got a block or whether the hearing has been impaired permanently. In such a situation, there is no way of proving to oneself, the functioning of the ears, except by creating a deliberate sound. So also, to find out whether a new-born infant has got all sense organs (*pramaanam*) functioning, deliberate noises (*prameyam*) are made, shocking the infant to react. All these show, that, *pramaanam* is proved by *prameyam*, just as *prameyam* is proved by *pramaanam*.

And, both of them are proved by *pramaathaa*. An example: (as Swamiji remarks on the fact, in a humorous vein) "As you are attending the class, you are 'here'. But, you do not 'hear', if your mind is not 'here' (i.e. if your mind – the *pramaathaa* – is preoccupied with some other thought)". This shows that *pramaathaa* is required to prove the other two.

The other two - *pramaanam* and *prameyam* - also are required to prove the *pramaathaa*, as shown by the *sushupthi* (deep sleep), in which state, when the objective world and the sense organs are resolved, the mind is also resolved.

Sureswaraacharyaa bases his declaration on these facts, when he declares, that, each one of the *thriputi* depends on one or both of the other two to prove its existence - '*ithara ithara svabhaava apeksha siddha*'.

Since, none of them is, thus, independently existing, all the three should depend on something outside the three for existence. It cannot be said "why cannot each one 'borrow' existence from the other?" Such a suggestion will be similar to two beggars proposing "let us not beg any more; each one of us will borrow from the other, and live comfortably". It is obviously not possible; the 'lender' should be a 'non-beggar'. All the three, the *pramaatha*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*, who have only 'borrowed' existence, may be considered to be similar to the beggars in the example, in the matter of 'existence'. If they have to 'borrow' existence, the 'lender' of the existence, should be outside the dependent *thriputi* / the *mithyaa thriputi*. That 'lender' outside matter (the non-material entity) is the *aathmaa*.

"*Ithara ithara svabhava apeksha siddha*" means "each one of the *thriputi* proves its existence depending on the other two".

Therefore, all the three are *mithyaa*.

And, it could be understood, that, the word *mithyaa* does not mean non-existence. Both *visishtaadvaitam* and *dvaitam* have misunderstood the word *mithyaa* as 'non-existent'. *Vedhaantheta* never says *mithyaa* is 'non-existent'; *Vedhaantheta* says: "*mithyaa* 'appears', borrowing existence from 'me', just as my reflection appears, borrowing existence from me." The quotations "*Mattho naanyath*" (from *Srimadh Bhagavadh Githa*) or "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham*" (from *Kaivalya Upanishad*) are relevant, in this context. *Mithyaa* is not non-existent; it is very much existent with 'borrowed' existence.

- इतर इतर स्वभाव अपेक्ष सिद्धत्वात् - because of dependence on an external entity for proof of existence,
- स्वतःच असिद्धेः - (and thus) not being capable of establishing itself by itself,

Therefore only, the world does not have an existence of its own, similar to the reflection and is called *anaathmaa*.

Anaathmaa is the topic being discussed and all the adjectives (given to *Anaathmaa*, in this introduction) are in *shashti vibhakthi*, to go with '*anaathmana*.'| The introduction is an incomplete sentence grammatically. Its completion is in the verse that follows.

- *anaathmana*: - for this *anaathma*,
- *dvaita indrajalasya* – consisting of *dvaitam*, which is a magic show:

Swamiji, in an aside, advises: "Such being the case, why do you curse it (the *anaathmaa* and events in the *anaathmaa*)? Just enjoy the show. Take it as sports – ordinary or

adventure sports. As you get older, it becomes more and more adventure sports. In youth, we enjoy ordinary sports. As we grow older, be prepared for more and more adventure sports. But, it is not going to affect you ; the word 'you', in this context, does not mean the mind ; mind's disturbance is also part of adventure sports. The word 'you' means, 'I', the *saakshi*, who am watching the adventure sports, at the level of my own body-mind complex."

What does the *Achaaryaa* intend to say about the '*dvaitha indrajaalasya anaathmana: ?*' That is said in the *sloka*.

Chapter II: Verse 112 -

न स्वयं स्वस्य नानात्वं नावगत्यात्मना यत :।

नोभाभ्यामप्यतस्सिद्धमद्वैतं द्वैतबाधया ॥ ११२ ॥

Plurality is not self-cognized. Nor is it cognized by the pure awareness as one with itself, for they cannot be one. Nor is it cognized both intrinsically and by the awareness, for they cannot enter into such a relation. Therefore, it is clear that non-dualism results from the nullification of all duality.

- *नानात्वं* - A separate and independent existence
- *स्वस्य* – of this magic show called *thriputi* universe
- *न स्वयं (सिद्धं)* – is not proved by itself.

The independent or separate existence of matter is never proved by itself.

Why cannot matter prove its own existence by itself? One can give umpteen arguments. The simple and straight argument is that "matter can never prove its own separate existence by itself, because it *is* matter – *jadam*".

We showed earlier that *pramaathaa* cannot prove its existence without the other two – *pramaanaa* and *prameyaa* and that, the same is true about the other two also. Not one of them can prove itself without at least one of the other two; and therefore none of them has an existence separate from *aathmaa*.

- *Svayam* – By itself,
- *svasya* - anaathmana:
- *naanaathvam* - prathik satthaa
- *na (siddham)* - (*siddham* is supplied) is not provable.

In effect, what is the first point (made by the *Achaaryaa* in this verse)?: "*anaathmaa* does not exist separate from *aathmaa*".

Granting this, the next question is: "If *anaathmaa* does not exist separate from *aathmaa*, then can *anaathmaa* (matter) exist as identical with *aathmaa* / as 'one' with *aathmaa*?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa answers:

अवगत्यात्मना (अपि न सिद्धं) – Nor can Matter exist as identical with Consciousness.

'*Avagathi*' means 'Consciousness'; '*aathmaand*' (in this context) means 'as identical with' or 'in the form of *ittham bhaave*'.

Why is matter not identical with Consciousness? Ans: because their natures / characteristics are totally different. Matter is inert; Consciousness is not inert. Matter changes; Consciousness does not change. Matter has division; Consciousness does not have division. Such being the case, how can they be identical? They cannot be and are not identical.

Then, are they separate? It was already said, that, separately also matter does not exist.

So, matter does not exist separate from Consciousness; and, matter does not exist as identical with Consciousness. Therefore, to the question 'is matter different from Consciousness or identical with Consciousness?' / 'is it *bhinnam* or *abhinnam*?', the answer is 'it is neither *bhinnam* nor *abhinnam*'.

Then, can you say that it is both? Since, it is not separate or identical, can there be not a compromise? Why cannot you say "it is *bhinnam* also; it is *abhinnam* also?"

This is called *bedhaabhedha vaadhaa* – identity in difference.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa declares in his treatise, *Viveka Chhoodamani* "*Sannapyasanaapyubhayaathmikaa no bhinnapyabhinnaapyubhayaathmikaa no*" – "neither existent nor non-existent nor both; **neither same nor different nor both**" (verse 109).

Sureswaraachaaryaa also says that it is not possible:

- न उपाभ्यां अपि सिद्धं – One cannot also say that *anaathmaa* is both identical and different from *aathmaa*.

This is because of the obvious logical reason, that opposite adjectives cannot co-exist in one and the same locus. One cannot say that it is 'both identical and different simultaneously', because to say 'identical', is to exclude 'difference' and to say 'different' is to exclude 'identity'. 'Identity' and 'difference' are mutually exclusive attributes and since mutually exclusive attributes cannot co-exist in one locus, *'upaahbhyaam api na siddham'*.

Where does this line of reasoning lead to?: (1) Matter is mysterious and is inexplicable. (2) Since, it does not have an independent existence of its own, it is not countable as a second entity, similar to one's reflection being not countable as a second person. (3) What has borrowed existence / what is *mithyaa*, is 'experientable', but not 'countable'. (4) Therefore, (the conclusion is) : other than 'me', there is nothing worthy of counting or worrying about.

But, there is, of course, something which is 'experientable', which 'experience' an *advaitin* never negates. If an *advaitic aacharya* negates the experience of the world, he cannot even undertake to teach *Vedhaanthee*. The very *Vedhaanthic* class, 'imparting' knowledge is possible, because the *aacharya* is experiencing his own body, mind, knowledge and also those of his *sishtyaas*.

It should be clearly understood, that, *Advaitins* are **not** negating 'experience' of *anaathmaa*; they are only negating its 'countability'. Since, there is no second countable thing, the *Advaitins* say "*advaitam eva sathyam*".

- अतः - Therefore,
- द्वैतबाधया – since *dvaitam* has been negated, as not worth counting / since *dvaitam* has been nullified,

But, though '*dvaitam*' is not worth 'counting', it is worth 'experiencing' as an 'entertainment'. The more one studies the creation, the more does one realize how wonderful it is; so many *vibhootis* are there; *visvaroopaa isvara* / the *aparaa prakruthi* is available for one's 'experience'. No *advaitin* would like to escape from this wonderful *visvaroopaa Isvara*. The *Advaitin* does not hate the world; he does not curse the world ; on the other hand, he admires and appreciates the *visvaroopaa Isvara* / the *dvaita prapanchaa*.

At the same time, the *advaitin* does not worry also, since, he is very much aware, that, it (the *dvaita prapanchaa* and events in the *dvaita prapanchaa*) cannot touch his real 'me', the *asangha aathmaa*.

And, what is 'my' nature? "I' am of the nature of permanent peace, security and *aanandaad*".

"It is 'my' *aanandaa*, which I 'throw' into the mind now and then, as a 'reflection'. The reflection comes and goes. Experiential pleasures come and go. As I grow old, the quantum of experiential pleasures may even come down. But, whether they increase or decrease, I know that 'I' am *bhimbha aananda svaroopaa*: | In which case, where is *samsaaraa*? Why should I even work for *mokshaa*? I was, I am and I ever will be free. Why cannot you claim this wonderful glory of yours?" asks the *Aachaaryaa*.

'*Bhaadhaa*' means 'negating / not attributing reality/ not considering as a second reality'. Because of thus negating *dvaitham* - '*dvaitha bhadhayaad*':

- अद्वैतं सिद्धं - advaitam (non-duality) is clearly established.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 113:

यथोक्तार्थप्रतिपत्तिद्रढिम्ने श्रुत्युदाहरणोपन्यासः ।

To strengthen this conviction, the words of the *sruthi* are brought forward:

Sureswaraachaarya negated the duality or the *anaathma prapanchaa*, by using reasoning. The reasoning he used is: "matter cannot prove its existence by itself. Therefore, it does not have its own 'independent' existence. It has got only 'borrowed' existence. Therefore, it is as good as 'non-existent'".

This is '*yukthyaa mithyaathva siddhi:*', i.e., 'logically establishing the *mithyaathvam* (of the universe)'.

But, tradition holds that logic is not the ultimate proof. *Kathopanishad* declares "*naishaa tharkena mathiraapaneyaa*" – "This knowledge cannot be attained by reasoning" (I . 2 . ix) and also "*aneeyaan hyatharkyam anupramaanaath*" – "being smaller than the size of an atom, (*aathmaa* is) beyond reasoning" (I.2. viii).

Logic cannot be final proof. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says: "I have logically established something, which is also happily confirmed by the *sruthi pramaanam*. Everything that I say, is backed by the primary *pramaanaa*, that is called *sruthi pramaanaa* - *pramaana moordhanyaa api siddham*."

Not only can the world be negated logically, *sruthi* also negates the world; not casually, in one place; but, consistently, in every *Upanishad*, in one form or the other, *sruthi* negates *anaathmaa*.

In *Kathopanishad* is the most famous statement "*Neha naanaasthi kinchana*" – "There is no plurality at all here" (II.1. xi). The 'experienced' plurality does not exist factually, though it is 'experienced'.

In *Kaivalya Upanishad*, the 'negation' is more specific - "*na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na cha anilo mesthi na chaambharam cha*" – "*bhoomi*: is not there (for me); water is not there (for me); fire is not there (for me); air is not there (for me) ; space is also not there (for me)" (Verse 22). All these are not there 'factually'; but, they are available 'experientially' mysteriously.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* wants to say that there is *sruthi pramaanam* also, for the absence of duality.

This gives rise to a purely academic doubt in the mind of the *Vedhaanthic* student: "How do *dvaithins* and *visishtaadvaitins* interpret such *Upanishadic* statements, in their commentaries?" The answer: The *visishtaadvaitins* and the *dvaithins* consider such statements as conveying the message that "there is no second thing **like Bhagavaan**". According to them: "It is only the *advaitin* who has misunderstood these statements ; these and similar statements do not mean there is no second thing apart from *Brahman*; there *is* the *jeeva* ; there *is* the *jagath*; they are 'real' also ; what these *Upanishadic* statements convey, is, just that, the 'real' *jeeva* and the 'real' *jagath* are not as beautiful or as glorious as *Baghavaan Mahavishnu*." In other words, the *visishtaadvaitins* and the *dvaithins* look upon *Narayana* (but, not even *Siva*) as the Supreme Reality, and interpret the *Upanishadic* statements on 'negation', as conveying the message that all others, though 'real', are "not as 'real' as *Narayana*".

The *Advaitin*, on the other hand, does not view such *Sruthi vaakyaaanai / Upanishad vakyaaanai* as making any comparison between the 'Reality' of *Bhagavaan* and the 'reality' of others; but, as firmly declaring "*Na iha naanaa asthi kinchana*", and, therefore, their conclusion is that, everything other than *aathmaa*, is *mithyya*.

(*Swamiji*, in an aside, points out that a comparative study of the three philosophies, *advaitam*, *visishtaadvaitam* and *dvaitham* is a totally different 'ball-game'; but, though interesting, such a comparative study is not the object of his classes.)

Therefore, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* says:

- यथोक्तार्थप्रतिपत्तिद्रढिम्ने – For the reconfirmation of the knowledge of the idea mentioned / conveyed in the previous *sloka*,

Dhradimaa – confirmation / reinforcement ; the word '*dhrudam*' mean 'firm' and its abstract noun is *dhradimaa*; i.e., *Dhrudam* is adjective and *dhradimaa* is the noun, meaning 'firm' and 'firmness', respectively.

Dhradimne – For the sake of reaffirmation,

Reaffirmation of what?

- *Prathipatthi* – (of) the knowledge / *jnaanam*,
- *Jnaanam* of what?
- *Yathoktha artha* – the idea mentioned in the previous *sloka*,

What is mentioned in the previous sloka? '*Dvaitam naasthi*' has been said. How was it said? Through *yukthi pramaanam*, it was said. Sureswaraachaarya says *sruthi pramaanam* also says '*dvaitam naasthi*'.

- श्रुति उदाहरण उपन्यासः - presentation of quotations from sruthi (is done).

'*Upanyaasa:*' means 'presentation'.

Of what?

Udaaharanam – quotations / citations

Of what?

Sruthi – of sruthi vaakyam.

The presentation of quotations of *sruthi*, to prove that "'*dvaita nishedad*' is not only *tharka maathra siddham* but *sruthi pramaana siddham* also", is being done, in the verse that follows:

Chapter II: Verse 113 –

नित्यावगतिरूपत्वात्कारकादिर्न चात्मनः ।

अस्थूलं नेतिनेतीति न जायत इति श्रुतिः ॥ ११३ ॥

Since the Self is of the nature of eternal awareness, factors of action etc., do not belong to the Self. *Sruthi* says that the Self is 'Not gross' (B.U.II. viii.8), 'Not this, Not this' (B.U.II.iii.6) and 'Not born' (K.U. I.ii.18).

The *Aachaaryaa* refers to relevant, well known *Upanishadic manthraas*, mentioning only one or two words from each *manthraa*.

The 8th manthraa of the 8th Brahmanam (Akshara Brahmanam) of Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad (III. viii. 8) declares that 'It (the aksharaa or Self) is devoid of all attributes', the actual manthraa running "thadaksharam asthoolam ananu ahrasvam adheergam alohitham asneham acchaayam athamo avaayu anaakaasam asangham arasam agandham achakshushkam asrothram avaak amana athejaskam apraanam amukham amaathram anantharam abhaahyam na thadasnaath kinchana, na thadasnaathi kaschana" – " That aksharam (Self) is neither gross, nor minute, neither short nor long, neither red colour, nor oiliness, neither shadow nor darkness, neither air, nor ether, unattached, neither savour nor odour, without eyes or ears, without the vocal organ or mind, non-luminous, without the vital force or mouth, not a measure and without interior or exterior. It does not eat anything; nor is It eaten by anybody". Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Bashyam, concludes his translation of this manthraa, with the comment "In other words, It (aksharaa) is devoid of all attributes, for '**It (aksharaa) is one only without a second**'; so what is there, that can be specified and through what?".

"*neti, nethi*" is another *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* quotation (II.iii. 6)

"*Na jayathe*" is another quotation, but, from *Kato Upanishad* (I. ii. 18)

108. Chapter II, Verse 113 and 114 (30-08-2008)

Sureswaraacharya is focusing on the topic of anaathma mithyaathvam. First he established this by logic or reasoning, pointing out that the constituents of anaathmaa, viz., pramaathaa, pramaanam and prameyam do not have an independent existence / an existence of their own; but only mutually dependent existence; in other words, they have only a 'borrowed' existence, which, in fact, is the definition of mithyaathvam .

Mithyaathvam does not mean 'non-existence'; it means 'borrowed' existence; which alone, in another terminology, *Advaitha* refers to, as 'having a lower order of reality'; and gives the examples of dream, reflection etc.

Having established this logically, Sureswaraacharya claims, in this *sloka*, "this reasoning is based upon *sruthi* teaching only". *Veda* alone is the primary source of knowledge; *yukthi* is used, only to assimilate the teachings of *Veda*.

To establish his claim, the *Aacharya* gives various references from *sruthi*, in this *sloka* (113- Chapter III – 2nd line).

- इति श्रुतिः - Sruthi says,

The first quotation is:

- 'अस्थूलं' - 'Not gross',

Sureswaraacharya gives only a part of the relevant *Sruthi manthraa*. This word 'asthoolam' appears in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad - Akshara Braahmanam* (Chapter III - *Braahmanam* viii) – *manthraa* 8. The *manthraa* is a long one, giving 23 negations (*asthoolam*, *anannu* etc. etc.) and indicates that *aathmaa* is free from all dimensions and therefore all modifications. *Aathmaa* is both *nirgunam* and *nirvikaaram*.

The second reference is:

- नेतिनेति - 'not this, not this',

This is also again from *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (II.iii.6: 2nd Chapter - 3rd *Braahmanam*, known as) - *Moortha amoortha Braahmanam* - 6th *manthraa*. Not only in this particular

manthraa, but, later also, in several places, these words `nethi nethi' are repeated in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*.

The term `nethi' or `na ithi' reveals the negation of the world. The topic has been discussed earlier also and it must be remembered in this context, that, "what is negated, cannot come under 'existent' category; it cannot come under the 'non-existent' category also; because, what is existent cannot be negated, obviously because it is existent and what is non-existent need not be negated, because it is already non-existent. To repeat: the 'existent' **cannot** be negated and the 'non-existent' **need not** be negated. Therefore, whatever is negated (by *sruthi*) will have to belong to a third category, which is different from either of these two".

That third category, is, what is called `sadhasath vilakshanam', which is the definition of *mithyaa*. All reflections will come under `sadhasath vilakshanam'. All false projections will come under `sadhasath vilakshanam'. *Svapna* will come under `sadhasath vilakshanam'. Using these as examples, it should be understood that the entire *anaathmaa* also comes under `sadhasath vilakshanam', because, *sruthi* says `na ithi , na ithi'.

Why is `na ithi' repeated twice? The very name of the *Braahmanam* (section) in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, *Moortha amoortha Braahmanam* suggests the reason. *Moorthaa* means the tangible *anaathmaa*; *amoorthaa* means the non-tangible *anaathmaa*. *Sookshma sareeram* and *kaarana sareeram* will come under *amoortha anaathmaa*; *sthoola sareeram* and *sthoola prapanchaa* will come under *moortha anaathmaa*. But, both *moorthaa* and *amoorthaa* come under *sadhasath vilakshanam*.

Thus, *mithyaathvam* has been clearly revealed by the *sruthi pramaanam*.

Therefore, what is *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* is different from this *mithyaa anaathmaa*.

The next quotation is:

- न जायते ' - 'does not originate'

The relevant manthraa occurs in Katopanishad – Chapter I – 2nd Valli - 18th manthraa: "na jayathe mriyathe vaa vipaschith naayam kuthaschith na bhaboova kaschith ajo nithya: saasvathoyam puraana: na hanyathe hanyamaane sareere" - "This omniscient one does not originate or die. It did not originate from anything. It did not (become) anything. It is devoid of birth, growth, decay and death. It is not afflicted when the body is afflicted".

In this *manthraa* also, it is revealed, that, *aathmaa* is free from modification. That means *aathmaa* is not subject to the control of 'time' and 'space'. Time and space are operational only in the field of *anaathmaa*.

Swamiji points out : "Imagine the relief and enjoyment we will get, if we assimilate this fact, that, "I' am the timeless and spaceless *aathmaa*, who am not located anywhere; I do experience the world of changes, but, it is made available to me merely as a 'drama' or entertainment; 'I' am 'my'self not affected by any of the changes". This is the vision, to which Sureswaraachaaryaa is attempting to raise us".

So, if, thus, 'I' am not subject to any change, 'I' am free of any attribute, 'I' am merely watching the *anaathmaa*, which *anaathmaa* is without any reality and, 'I' am different from all of them (*anaathmaa*), what is 'my' nature?

The answer is given in the first line of the verse.

- नित्य अवगति रूपत्वात् - Because of the nature of eternal awareness,

'I' am the non-material, not-located Consciousness. Whenever we think of ourselves, the 'located' thinking must go away from our minds.

- आत्मनः - of 'I', the non-material Consciousness (different from the *anaathmaa*),

The very same *anaathmaa* is presented in another language.

कारकादिः - the karma-vyavahaara thriputi , consisting of kaarakaa, kriyaa and palam

Even though *anaathmaa* is only one, *Vedhaanthic* teachers present the *anaathmaa*, in different manners, in different contexts, so that the seekers will get different perspectives of *aathmaa* also. As even as the definition of *anaathmaa* changes, the definition of *aathmaa* also will change, because *aathmaa* is *anaathma vilakshana*: | Therefore, when *anaathmaa* is defined differently, *aathmaa* also gets defined differently.

And, there is a specific purpose behind this practice of giving different definitions to the *anaathmaa*. In each definition, a different problem centered on oneself gets highlighted, and gets release i.e. the different definitions release the seeker from different forms of problem; different types of worries and anxieties will be rid of , when the seeker looks at himself from different angles.

One definition that is popular, is : "*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi is anaathmaa*" (*pramaathaa* meaning 'knower', *pramaanam* meaning 'instrument' and *prameyam* meaning 'object'); it follows, therefore, that (since *aathmaa* is *anaathma vilakshana:*), *aathmaa* is *thriputi vilakshana:* |

Once the seeker is convinced about this aspect, that, *aathmaa* is *thriputi-vilakshana:*, the greatest advantage is, that, he will stop working for the experience of *aathmaa*. The reasoning being: any attempt for "experience' of *aathmaa*" will make *aathmaa* fall within the fold of *thriputi*. And, therefore, the moment the seeker gets convinced that *aathmaa* is *thriputi vilakshana:*, he will drop his attempt to 'experience' the *aathmaa*.

This is a great relief for a *Vedhaanthic* seeker, because one of the commonest yearnings and complaints of *Vedhaanthic* seekers (before realization of this *thriputivilakshanathvam* of *aathmaa*) is "I have not yet got *aathma anubhavaa*", which yearning leads the seeker to specially 'pray' for the misconceived '*aathma anubhavaa*'.

The definition, viz., "*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi is anaathmaa; aathmaa is thriputi- vilakshana:*", thus, helps the seeker to get over an unnecessary and impossible struggle. This (*thriputi vilakshanathvam* of *aathmaa*) is one approach.

The second approach is through the definition "*kaaraka – kriyaa - pala roopa: is anaathmaa*". *Anaathmaa* consists of another type of *thriputi*. The previous *thriputi*, viz, '*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi*' belongs to *jnaana vyavahaaraa* - the 'operations at knowledge level'.

Another *thriputi* is presented here - '*kaaraka-kriyaa-palam*'. It is well known that '*kriyaa*' means action - either physical action or mental action called *upaasanaa*. '*Palam*' means any result, which is a future event. '*Kriyaa*' means 'action'; '*palam*' means the 'result of action'. '*Kaaraka*' means 'all the accessories for action', accessories meaning 'subject, object, instrument, time-location, space-location, beneficiary etc.'

Vedhaantha says the entire *anaathmaa* can be accommodated in *kaaraka-kriyaa-palam-thriputi*, *kaaraka* producing *kriyaa* and *kriyaa* producing *palam*.

Once you define *anaathmaa* as *kaaraka-kriyaa-palan*, all the karma *vyavahaaraas* - 'operations at action level'- get included within *anaathmaa*. What, then, is *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* being *anaathma vilakshanam*, *aathmaa* is *kaaraka-kriyaa-pala-vilakshanam*, which means that *aathmaa* is beyond karma *vyavahaaraa*.

Earlier, it was said "*aathmaa* is beyond *jnaana vyavahaara*; so do not work for 'experience' of *aathmaa*". The advice now, is: "*aathmaa* is beyond *karma vyavahaaraa*; therefore, do not work for an 'event' called *mokshaa*". These two exhortations viz., 'do not work for 'experience' of *aathmaa*' and 'do not work for an 'event' called *mokshaa*' become necessary, because, these are the two events, *aathma anubhavaa* and *moksha praapthi*; which, every *Vedhaanthic* seeker, in the initial stages, is normally exercised about and works for. But, both these struggles are born out of ignorance. What ignorance or misconception? "That, I belong to or I am one of the *thriputis* of *anaathmaa*". The seeker places himself within the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* or within the *kaaraka-kriyaa-palam thriputi*. As long as one places oneself in one of these *thriputis*, one will be struggling for either *aathma anubhavaa* or *moksha praapthi*. | In fact, dropping these two struggles is itself *mokshaa*, claiming that "'I' am *jnaana vyavahaara, karma vyavahaara atheetha*: |"

"Aham Pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi vilakshanathvaath jnaana vyavahaara atheetha: | Kaaraka-kriyaa-pala-thriputi vilakshanathvaath karma vyavahaara atheetha: | Thasmaath aham vividha vyavahaara atheetha:" | And, this message is presented by the use of the single word 'avyavahaaryam'.

"*Aham sarva vyavahaara atheetha*: ; therefore, I do not have to work for *aathma anubhava* and, I do not have to work for *moksha praapthi*:"|

Then, what is a *Vedhaanthic* student expected to do? Ans: To claim, "'I' was free'; 'I' am free; and 'I' ever will be free. The non-material, non-located medium of Consciousness 'I' am; and, *in 'me'*, the non-material Consciousness medium, all *vyavahaaraas* go on ; but, 'I' am myself not involved in any *vyavahaaraa*."

"This being the case, allow the *vyavahaaraas* to continue. Why are *you* bothered?" is the consequent advice given by *sruthi* itself.

Reverting to the text, 1st line of the verse, '*aathmana: nithya avagathi roopathvaath, kaarakaadhi:*' – 'since *aathmaa* is of the nature of eternal awareness, the *thriputi* of *kaaraka-kriyaa-palam*,

- न आत्मा भवति(– cannot be the *aathmaa*.

'I', the *aathmaa*, do not come under *jnaanana vyavahaara thriputi*; nor under *karma vyavahaara thriputi* also; therefore, 'I' am untouched by any *vyavahaaraa*.

The *Achaaryaa* concludes the verse with '*Ithi sruthi: (vadhathi)*', implying 'whatever I am teaching is based on *sruthi pramaanam*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 114:

सर्वस्यास्य ग्राहकादेर्द्वैतप्रपञ्चस्यात्मानवबोधमत्रोपादानस्य स्वयं सेहुमसक्यत्वात्तत्सिद्देश्चानुपादेयत्वात् ।

All this knower etc., constituting the world of duality and solely the outcome of the ignorance of the Self, cannot be established by itself. Nor can it be established by the Self. Therefore:

Almost the same idea is presented in the form of the other *thriputi*. In the previous *sloka*, the *karma-vyavahaara-thriputi* was talked about. In this verse, the *Aachaaryaa* is presenting the *jnaana-vyavahaara-thriputi*.

- द्वैतप्रपञ्चस्य - (Of) the entire dvaita prapanchaa (which is otherwise called anaathma prapanchaa , which is otherwise called 'matter'),
- ग्राहकादेः - **which is in the form of graahaka, grahanam and grahyam (which is another set of terms for pramaathaa, pramaanam and prameyam)**, which is otherwise called *jnaana vyavharra thripui* ,
- सर्वस्य - (of) all of them,

Sureswaraachaaryaa boldly declares that, all the three are born out of 'ignorance' and therefore, they are '*mithyaa*', equivalent to any 'projection'.

- आत्म अनवबोधमात्र उपादानस्य – for all of which self-ignorance only is the cause / all born only out of self-ignorance,

Upaadhanam – kaaranam; aathma anavabodhaa – self ignorance; maathra – only.

This entire *thriputi prapanchaa* is born out of *aathma ajnaanam*, which is otherwise called *moola avidhyaa*. And, when Sureswaraachaarya uses the word 'ignorance', it should be very carefully understood, that we are not talking about an ignorance 'located' in the mind; but, we are talking about an ignorance, which is the cause of the mind itself, which existed even before the rise of the mind and therefore, which is not located in the mind.

Then, where is it located? Ans: Located in the *aathmaa* itself. Sureswaraachaaryaa will deal with this topic in the next chapter. The Introduction of the next chapter is a highly technical portion, on the analysis of *moolaa avidhyaa*, including the 'location' of *moola avidhyaa*.

And, out of this *moola avidhyaa*, the entire *thriputi* world has come. Therefore, it (the *jaagrath prapanchaa*) is not very much different from *svapna prapanchaa*.

Svapna thriputi is born out of ignorance of the 'waker'. *Jaagrath thriputi* is born out of ignorance of the *aathma svaroopam*. It is *jadam* and also *mithyaa*.

- स्वयं सेदुं अशक्यत्वात् - because they do not have the capacity to exist by themselves / they do not have an intrinsic existence of their own,

The *Advaithin* does not say "they (the *thriputi*) are non-existent". He only says "they are **dependently** existent, the 'existence' in them belonging to *aathmaa*. When you say 'bangle is', the 'is'ness does not belong to the bangle but to the gold. In the same manner, when you say '*thriputi* is', the 'is'ness does not belong to any one of the three, but belongs to the *aathmaa* only".

Seddhum - to exist; '*seddhum*' is derived from the root '*sidh*'; *svayam* – independently. *Svayam seddhum* – to exist independently; *asakyathvam* – incapacity.

- आत्मसिद्धेः च अनुपादेयत्वात् – and also because it cannot be established by the Self.

'*Aathma siddhi*:' is a compound word, to be split as '*aathmaana siddhi*:' |

This is just 'answering' a technical point. When an *Advaithin* cites the example of the bangle, there may be a question. When it is said "the bangle does not have an existence of its own", it means "bangle does not have an existence as bangle". The question may be: "All right; bangle does not have an existence **as** bangle; but, bangle has an existence **as** gold – i.e. it has an existence in the form of gold. Therefore, why can you not accept bangle's existence as gold, even though it does not have an existence as bangle? Similarly, world does not have an existence as world. But, world has an existence as *Isvara* / as *Brahman*. Therefore, do not say that the world does not exist; but, do accept, that the world is having existence as *Brahman* or *Isvara* – exactly like the bangle having existence as gold. *Kaarana roopena kaarya sattha asthi*."

If any such objection is raised, the *Advaithin* will answer "that, certainly, we do not mind. That is why, we say, *Brahman alone is*. When you say world exists **as** *Brahman*, what does it mean? It only means that the world does not have an existence as world. That, in effect, means that the world does not have an existence. That alone is called *mithyaathvam*".

Therefore, the *Aacharyaa* says '*Aathma siddhe: anupaadheyathvaath*' | *Thriputi*'s existence in the form of *aathmaa* / the *anaathmaa*'s existence in the form of *aathmaa*, cannot be taken

into account here, because *anaathmaa's* existence in the form of *aathmaa* means *anaathmaa's* non-existence in the form of *anaathmaa*.

Anaathmaa's existence in the form of *aathmaa* **is** there, when you say *anaathmaa* is non-existent in the form of *anaathmaa*. '*Anaathmaa* exists only in the form of *aathmaa*' means '*anaathmaa* does not exist in the form of *anaathmaa*'. To go back to the sample, 'bangle exists only in the form of gold' means, 'bangle is non-existent in the form of bangle'. 'World exists in the form of *Isvara*' means 'world is non-existent as world'. That alone is called *jagan-mithyaathvam* "Therefore", the *Achaaryaa* implies "may you understand there is no *thriputi* as *thriputi*; there is no *dvaitham* as *dvaitham*; therefore *dvaitham* is *mithyaa*".

Chapter II: Verse 114 –

आत्मनश्चेन्निवार्यन्ते बुद्धिदेहघटादयः।

षष्ठगोचरकल्पास्ते विज्ञेयाः परमार्थतः ॥ ११४ ॥

If the mind, body and objects like a jar, are denied of the Self, they ought to be understood as unreal, almost non-existent.

So, what is the conclusion?

If *anaathmaa* can exist only in the form of *aathmaa* i.e., if *anaathmaa* can exist only by 'borrowing' existence from *aathmaa*, the conclusion is "separated from *aathmaa*, *anaathmaa* loses existence. This would mean that it is *mithyaa*". That is what the *Advaitin* wants to stress.

- बुद्धिदेहघटादयः आत्मनः निवार्यन्ते चेत् – If *anaathmaa* is separated / segregated from *aathmaa*,

The term 'Buddhidehaghataadhaya:' indicates '*anaathmaa*'.

When I say 'bangle is *mithyaa*', what I mean, is 'once you remove the gold, which only is the *sathyam*, bangle is as good as non-existent'; you *have* the experience of the bangle; but, bangle comes under non-existent category, which alone is the definition of *mithyaa*.

- *Nivaaryanthey* - separated / segregated

The 'separation' need not be physically done; it can be done purely intellectually. The *Swamiji* cites as an example, a clip on his table and says: "I take this clip and I say 'clip is'. This is my 'experience'. But, I ask a question. Does the clip enjoy an 'is'ness of its own? I understand that the essence of the clip is the plastic; plastic alone has lent existence to the

clip and therefore, intellectually, I take away the 'is'ness from the clip and hand it over to the plastic. The moment I do that job intellectually, the clip has become *vaachaarambhanam vikhaaro namadeyam* – it is nothing but a 'name and form'. There is no subject called clip. This exercise, you should extend to the entire cosmos; doing this, at the clip level is easy. *Vedhaantha* says 'extend this same approach to the entire *thriputi*, which should include your property, your family members, your own mind and your own body'".

The whole creation is nothing but dancing 'name and form', not having any substantiality of its own. That is called *mithyaa*.

Then what is the only substance? 'I' am the substance, who is making the world 'as though' so tangible and real.

"*Aathmana: nivaaryanthe cheth'*" means "if I withdraw 'my' 'blessing'"; which blessing I give to the entire cosmos; in other words, by my 'grace', the world is existing.

Swamiji points out and exhorts: "This realization, that, 'I' give existence to the world' is the binary format. Forgetting this binary format, I become *jeeva* and go around, with the begging bowl, asking for grace. Stop asking for blessing from anything outside, because, anything outside 'me' is *anaathmaa*. Even *Bhagavaan*, if He is an object of my experience, becomes *anaathmaa*. Anything other than 'me' is *anaathmaa*. Why should 'I' ask grace from *anaathmaa*? When the truth is that, it is 'I', who am lending 'grace' to the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*, why should I go in search of grace? And, when I withhold 'my' 'grace', which I do regularly, during deep sleep stage (*sushupthi*), the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* – *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* – disappears. I am in *nirvikalpaka aathma svaroopam*. It is, therefore, obvious, that, I am 'lending' existence to this *thriputi*. This realization is itself called *mokshaa'*".

Therefore, '*Aathmana: nivaaryanthe cheth'* (when *anaathmaa* is separated from Self),

- ते - that *thriputi* (both *karama vyavahaarya thriputi*, consisting of *kaarakam*, *kaaryam* and *palam* and *jnaana vyavahaara thriputi*, consisting of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*)
- षष्ठ गोचर कल्पा: - become non-existent.

Sureswaraachaarya gives his message, euphemistically, in a nice language, using the term '*shashta (pramaana) gocharaa.'* | '*Shashta pramaana'* means 'the sixth *pramaana'*. '*Gochara'* means 'object'. The term '*shashta pramaana gocharaa'*, therefore, means the 'object of the 6th *pramaana'*. What is that *pramaanaa* and what is that object?

The 6th and last of the six *pramaanaas* in Vedhaantha is called 'anupalabdhi pramaanaa', the other five *pramaanaas* being *prathyaksha*, *anumaana*, *upamaana*, *arthaapatthi* and *sabda*.

Why do we count these five *pramaanaas* before *anupalabdhi*, counting *anupalabdhi* as the sixth one? There is a reason. These five *pramaanaas* reveal positive / existing entities. They are *bhaava pramaanaas* i.e. *bhaava vishaya bodhakapramaanaas*. The term '*Bhaava vishaya bodhakam*' means 'revealing things which are existing / which are positive'. Whereas, the 6th *pramaanam*, *anupalabdhi* reveals non-existence of things. An example: "When you say 'there is no elephant here', how do you know that fact? Because, you do not see an elephant. The non-existence of the elephant is known through non-perception. 'Non-perception' is the *pramaanam*, by which you know the non-existence of the elephant. This 'non-perception' or 'non-cognizance' *pramaanam* is termed *anupalabdhi* and is a means by which you know the absence of things". *Anupalabdhi*, being, thus, unique among the *pramaanaas*, revealing 'non-existence', as against the 'revealing of existent things' by the other *pramaanaas*, is ranked as the sixth *pramaanam*.

What is the object of *anupalabdhi pramaanam*? Abhaava: | Thus, the object of the five *pramaanams*, *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaana*, *arthaapatthi* and *sabdaa*, is *bhaavaa* and the object of the *shashta pramaanam* is *abhaavaa*.

The term used by the *Aachaaryaa*, in this verse, '*shashta gochaaraa*' means 'the object of *anupalabdhi pramaanam*', and, therefore, means '*abhaavaa*' or 'not there'.

The whole cosmos is 'not there'; problems and worries are 'not there'; all these *vyavahaaraas* and *thriputis* are not there, when I withhold my 'grace' i.e., when I do not 'lend' existence to them.

Swamiji goes on to point out: "And, when they are thus non-existent when I do not 'lend' them existence and come alive only when I 'lend' them existence, why should I be afraid of them at all? I am not afraid of a dream-world, because, I know that, the very 'is'ness of the dream world is given by me only. This cosmos is only another version of dream – perhaps, a higher version, to which also, it is 'I' who 'lend' existence. It is ironic that I get frightened of the *anaathma jaagrath prapanchaa*, to which 'I' have lent existence and as a consequence, indulge in prayers to 'escape' from this world".

'*Shashta gochara kalpaa*.' mean 'they are as good as non-existent'.

- (इति) विज्ञेयाः - May you understand (this),

(To stress that it is *aathmaa* which gives existence to the entire *anaathmaa*, Swamiji, in a lighter vein, says: "Enjoy' even all your worries, because *you* choose to lend 'existence' to them. If you enjoy worrying – because, some people, if they do not have worries, worry that they have nothing to worry about – and if you want to have a gala time worrying, lend 'existence' to the 'worries' and enjoy worrying. If you want to enjoy fear, lend 'existence' and 'enjoy' fear. 'Enjoy' *sathva*, *rajas* or *thamas*, by lending 'existence'. If *you* withhold 'existence' from them, they are as good as non-existent. This wisdom is called *mokshaa*. With this wisdom, continue your worries also; you will be *mukthaa*, 'enjoy'ing the role of 'worrier'. 'Enjoy' that also, but, with this awareness. *Bhagavaan* also does 'worrying' about the humanity, worrying that they are worried; and only because of *Bhagavaan's* worry about humanity, He has given the *saasthraa* for its guidance. But, though, *Bhagavan* also worries about His devotees, He enjoys His worries, because He knows 'I am lending existence to my worries'. The difference between *Bhagavaan* and us, is that *Bhagavaan* naturally knows this fact - that He lends 'existence' to His worries ; but, we have to learn this fact by *Vedhaantic* study".)

'(Ithi) *vijnyeyaa*.' means 'this is to be known'.

- परमार्थतः - from the dhrushti of Paramaarthaa / in absolute reality.

Here, the *Aacharyya* presents the *thriputi* in another language. He had already presented two versions. One version was *kaaraka-kriyaa-palam-thriputi*, from the context of *karma vyavahaaraa* and another version was *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi*, relating to *jnaana vyavahaaraa*. Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa presents a third version, which may be termed 'family-*vyavahaaraa*'. Even after any amount of *Vedhaanthic* study, worry about the family – the near and dear - is one part of *anaathmaa*, which stubbornly continues to retain its reality. An advanced student of *Vedhaanthaa* may be able to dismiss all the other components of the *anaathma prapanchaa* - even the galaxies - as 'unreal' , but, finds it extremely difficult – almost impossible - to view the family and the related worries as *mithyaa*. Only when the seeker is able to do that, he becomes a *sanyaasin*.

Without that particular *dhushti*, viz., viewing the *mithyaathvam* in the family also , *aanthara sanyaasa* does not take place ; CLASP ('CL' stands for '**CL**aim of ownership and controllership', 'A' stands for '**A**nxiety' and 'SP' stands for '**SP**ecial prayers') reduction does not take place; and '*mokshaa* claiming' never takes place.

Therefore, *anaathmaa* has to be presented in another form of *thriputi* – *buddhi deha ghataadhaya*: /

Buddhi means the mind or intellect / the *antha:karanam*. All of us have the tendency to identify with the mind, worry about the conditions of the mind and want to claim *mokshaa*, only based on the conditions of our mind; but, this is one of the biggest blunders; because, that means continuing in triangular format. As long as one judges oneself based on the conditions of the mind, one continues to give 'reality' to the mind; one continues to 'bless' the mind, which is *anaathmaa*, not only with 'existence' but with 'reality also; one common blunder is 'defining *manas:saanthi* as *moksha:*'; this is the biggest mistake, because, mind itself is 'not there'.

'*Manas:saanthi*' is not '*mokshaa*'. Then, what is *mokshaa*? *Mokshaa* is claiming that, "'I' am the mindless *aathmaa*, with *saanthi* as intrinsic *svaroopam*". Claiming this, is the real *Vedhaanthaa*. Towards this end, one should first learn to 'see' the non-existence of the mind; this is called *mano-naasa:* | The term '*mano-naasa:*' does not mean 'destroying the mind'; but, means, 'learning to see the mind as *mithyya*, not having an existence its own'. In other words, mind should be looked upon as *anaathmaa* no. 1.

Then, the next worry is about the physical body. Old age catches up with every one, though, in youth, one tends to think that one is 'outside' *jaraa*, while it will affect everybody else. Later, as one gets old, one realizes, as *Bharthruhari* eloquently points out, in his *Vairaaghya Sathakam* (verse 38) "*vyaagreeva thishtathi jaraa paritharjayantee*" – "old age looms (ahead) frightening man like a tigress". *Bharthruhari* implies "youth is like a horse; old age is like a tigress. The tigress is waiting patiently to pounce on the horse at the appointed time; but, pounce it will". *Sankara Bhaghavadh Paadaa* also warns in his *Bhaja Govindam* (verse 11) "*maa kuru ghanajana youvana garvam*"- "Do not be proud of your wealth, people and youth". The body-*anaathmaa* is always under the grip of the 'tigress' called *jaraa*. Therefore, one should learn to look upon one's body as *anaathmaa* no. 2.

The next one is *ghataadhaya:* | The term includes all the objects and also all the people in the family. '*Ghataa*' stands for not only 'possessions', but all *mamakaara vishayaa:*, not only property, but even the closest and dearest relations.

Buddhi deha ghataadhaya: is the third *thriputi*, which is subject to *ahamkaara* and *mamakaaraa*. This *thriputi* also must be seen as *anaathmaa* and *ahamkaara- mamakaara* rejection must be done with regard to this *thriputi* also. Otherwise, the seeker will never be able to claim *jeevan mukthi*; but will only focus on *videha mukthi*. If the seeker is keen to focus on *jeevan mukthi*, he has to get out of this *thriputi* and realize that all these (mind, body, family, property etc.) are also non-existent in reality; they are *mithyaa*, but 'I' have given them temporary existence only for my enjoyment.

109. Chapter II, Verse 115 to 119 (06-09-2008)

In these verses, Sureswaraacharya is highlighting *anaathma mithyathvam*, because, only when *anaathma mithyaathvam* is clearly grasped, *aathma's mukthi* or freedom can be claimed by an individual.

With this intention, Sureswaraacharya is establishing *anaathma mithyaathvam* by presenting *anaathmaa* in different languages. *Anaathmaa* was first presented as *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi*, from *jnaana vyavahaaraa* angle. Then, it was presented as *kaaraka-kriyaa-pala-thriputi*, from *karma vyavahaaraa* angle. Again it was presented as *buddhi, deha* and *ghata:*, from the standpoint of *samsaara vyavahaaraa* angle.

The three *vyavahaaraas* belong to three forms of *thriputi*, while *aathmaa* is *avyavahaaryam*; it is beyond all these three *vyavahaaraas* ; therefore, it is ever free ; and that ever-free *aathmaa* , 'I' am. Conveying this message is the goal of Sureswaraacharya.

The *Acharya* said in verse 114 (covered in the previous class) : "Minus the *aathmaa*, *anaathmaa* is as good as non-existent. Being *mithyaa*, it does not have an existence of its own".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 115:

कुतो न्यायबलादेवं निश्चितं प्रतीयते । यस्मात् ।

On the strength of what principle is this arrived at? It is this way:

- कुतः - Why do you say so?

Sureswaraacharya is himself raising the question: Why do you assert that the entire *anaathma prapancha* is dependent on you, the *aathmaa*?

And, gives the answer:

- न्यायबलात् एवं निश्चितं प्रतीयते –By the strength of reasoning, this is clear.
Nyaaya balaath – By the strength of reasoning; *evam pratheeyathe* – this idea is grasped.

How is this idea grasped?

- निश्चितं - firmly / convincingly / doubtlessly (this idea is gathered, by the strength of reasoning),

What idea is meant by 'evam' ('this idea')? Ans: The idea, that "the entire world is dependent on me". The *Aachaaryaa* is 'turning the tables'. Instead of saying 'I am dependent on the world and my family' (which is the common perception), Sureswaraachaaryaa says 'the whole world is dependent on 'me''.

- यस्मात् – because of the following reason.

The *Aachaaryaa* gives the 'reasoning' in the *sloka* (115).

Chapter II: Verse 115 –

नित्यां संविदमश्रित्य स्वतसिद्धमविक्रियाम् ।

सिद्धान्ते धियो बोधास्तांच आश्रित्य घटादयः ॥ ११५ ॥

On the support of the self-established, unchanging and eternal consciousness, arise the acts of knowledge in the mind. It is through such acts of the mind, that the external objects like a jar reveal themselves.

What is the reason? "The whole world can be reduced to thoughts and objects".

Of course, this is an idea already mentioned before, which the *Aachaaryaa* reminds us of, here: "The whole world is nothing but the internal thoughts and the corresponding external objects".

'Object' cannot be proved without 'thought' and 'thought' cannot exist without a relevant 'object'. For instance, 'ghataa' the object and 'ghataa', the *vritthi*, co-exist; and both of them resolve simultaneously. During *sushupthi*, thoughts and objects are resolved; during *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*, both of them rise together. Therefore, the world can be defined as 'thought plus object'. Also, both of them are inert by themselves, and both of them are proved to exist only because of 'I', the *saakshi*, which *saakshi* reveals the thought also, and through the thought, reveals the object also.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- धियः बोधाः सिद्धान्ते – The thoughts of the mind prove their existence,
- नित्यां संविदं आश्रित्य - depending on the eternal Consciousness.

`Bodhaa:' means 'thoughts' or 'idham vrutthi:' |

Thoughts belonging to what?

'Dhiya: '-of the antha: karanam'. So, 'dhiya: bodhaa:' mean 'antha:karana vrutthaya:'|

- घटादयः तां आश्रित्य (सिद्धायन्ते) – The external objects like a jar etc. prove their existence, depending on the thoughts.

'Ghataadhaya:' means 'the objects relevant to those various thoughts, like pots etc.:'; and, 'thaam' refers to thoughts.

'Pot', for its existence, depends on the 'thought'; i.e. the existence of the pot is proved by 'pot-thought' only. And, 'thought's existence' is proved by Consciousness only. Thus, 'world' depends on 'thoughts'; 'thoughts' depend on 'Consciousness'. Therefore, everything ultimately depends upon the *chaitanyam* only.

Verses 18 and 19 of the *Upadesa Saaraah* of *Ramana Maharshi*, are relevant, in this context. The verses run:

**"vrutthayasthu aham vrutthim aasrithaa: |
vrutthayo mano vidhyaham mana: || 18 ||
ahamayam kutho bhavathi chinvatha: |
ayi pathathyaham nijavicharanam || 19 ||"**

"Mind is thought-forms and the thought-forms are but dependent upon the I-thought. So, know the mind to be the ego. (So enquiry into the mind is the same as enquiry into the I-thought) (verse 18). Oh, Seeker! For the one who enquires thus "where from does this 'I' arise?", the I-notion drops. This is self-enquiry (verse 19)"

Ramana Maharishi concludes the entire *Vedhaantha vichaaraa*, in two steps: 'World depends on thoughts; thoughts depend on 'me'; 'I' depend on nothing and therefore, 'I' am the only ultimate reality".

That same idea is given here.

All of them ('thoughts' and 'objects') '*Nithyaam samvidham aasrithya siddhaayanthe*' - 'prove their existence depending on the eternal Consciousness'.

The word `siddhaayanthe', means `prove their existence'. `Siddhayanthe' is a denominative verb, formed from the noun `siddha:' | `siddham bhavanthi' is here presented as `siddhaayanthe' |

A denominative verb is a verb formed from a noun, similar to `penning' (as in `penning a letter'); `pen' is a noun, out of which the verb `penning' is formed. Another example is `tabling' (as in `tabling a motion').

Similarly, `siddham bhavanthi' is `siddhayanthe'|

And, all these depend on what?

- *Nithyaam samvidham aasrithya* – depending on the eternal Consciousness,
- *Samvidh* - Consciousness; *nithyaa* - eternal (adjective to *samvidh*); *aasrithya* –depending on.
- **अविक्रियां** – which Consciousness is changeless;

Thoughts are changing; objects are changing; their interactions are changing; all these changes are proved by the **non-changing** Consciousness principle.

And, by what is this Consciousness proved?

- स्वतसिद्धां – and whose existence is self -proved.

If Consciousness has to be `proved' by an external factor, then it will require another Consciousness to `prove' it; and that Consciousness will require yet another Consciousness etc. In that case, an `infinite regress' problem will arise.

Therefore, *Chaithanyam* is the ultimate Reality; and `that *Chaithanyam aham asmi*.'

And, therefore, `aham sathyam, jagan mithyaa'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 116 :

यस्मान्न कयाचिदपि युक्त्यात्मनः कारकत्वं क्रियात्वं पलत्वं चोपपद्यते
 तस्मादात्मवस्तुयाथात्म्यानवबोधमात्रोपादानत्वान्नभसीव रजोधूमतुषारनीहारनीलत्वाध्यासः
 यथोक्तात्मनि सर्वोऽयं क्रियाकारकपलात्मकसंसारोऽहंमत्वयत्नेच्छादिमिथ्याध्यास एवेति सिद्धमिममर्थमाह ।

On no logical consideration can it be proved that the Self is one with the factors of action, action itself and the results of action. Therefore, all this relative world of action, factors of action and the results thereof, the ego, the sense of `mine',

will, desire etc., resting, as it does on the ignorance of the real nature of the Self, is merely a false superimposition on the said Self, like the dust, smoke, mist, fog and blueness superimposed on the sky. This is explained:

A big introduction to verse 116. Of course, all these verses are 'winding up' of the second chapter / concluding of *anaathma mithyaathvam* topic.

- कदाचिदपि युक्त्या – By employing any type of argument ,
- न उपपद्यते - it cannot be proved,
- आत्मनः कारकत्वं क्रियात्वं फलत्वं च – that, the Self is one with the factors of action, action itself and the results of action.

'*Kayaachidhapi yukthya*' - 'by any type of reasoning you use'; '*Upapaadhanam*' – 'proving / establishing'; '*upapadyathe*' – 'proved'; '*aathmana:*' - 'for *aathma*'.

By employing any type of argument, one cannot prove *aathmaa* is one of the *thriputis*. *Aathmaa* can never be one of the *thriputi*; *thriputi* belongs to the *mithyaa anaathmaa* range only, whereas *aathmaa* is *thriputi vilakshana:* | Therefore, by any amount of logic, you cannot associate *thriputi* with *aathmaa*. Therefore, *aathmaa* does not have *kaarakathvam* or *kriyaathvam* or *palathvam*. The same can be said about *pramaathaa-pramaana-prameya-thriputi* and *buddhi-deha-ghataadhi-thriputi* also. They can also never be associated with *aathmaa* .

What would this mean? "I am never a *karthaa*; therefore never a *bokthaa*; therefore, 'I' do not have *sanchitha karmaa* and 'I' do not have *aagami karmaa*. Can you say that 'I' have only *praarabhdha karma*? When 'I' am not a *karthaa*, where is the question of *praarabhdhaa* also? *Praarabhdhaa* also belongs to *mithyaa thriputi* only. Therefore, 'I' am *punya-paapa atheetha:* and *thrividha karma atheetha:*" |

Therefore, to the question "when will 'I' get liberation?", the answer will be " 'I' am *nithya muktha svarooपा:*" |

Logically, *karthruthvam*, *kriyaa* and *sanchithaadhi karma palan* – none of these can be established in *aathmaa*. And, when such is the case, if one still claims "I have only some *praarabhdha* remaining; and I am waiting for *videha mukthi* at the end of *praarabhdhaa*, so that I will not be born again", such a claim is clearly a misconception. What is this misconception due to? Ans: What is impossible is made possible only by one factor and that factor is 'ignorance'.

- यस्मात् तस्मात् - **Therefore,**
- आत्मवस्तुयाथात्म्य अनवबोधमात्र उपादानत्वात् - only because of ignorance of the real nature of Self,

All these things (*kaarakathvam*, *kriyaathvam* and *palathvam* etc.) have come upon the *aathmaa*, only because of ignorance.

And, expectations such as "waiting for *mokshaa* to 'happen'" and "looking for the 'grace' from the kind *aachaaryaa* for *mokshaa* to 'come'" etc. are also because of ignorance only - *anavabodha maathra upaadhaanathvaath* |

'*Upaadhanam*' means '*kaaranam* / cause'; '*anavabodha maathra upaadhaanathvaath*' means 'only because of the cause of ignorance'.

Ignorance of what?

- Aathma vasthu yaathaathmyam – 'my' real nature.
- '*Aathma*' means 'I'; '*vasthu*' means 'reality'; '*yaathaathmyam*' means 'nature'.

"Because of the sheer ignorance of 'my' real nature, I am still successfully continuing in 'triangular' format, looking upon myself as the persecuted *jeeva*, looking upon the world as the persecutor and waiting for the grand 'escape' from this world, never to come back again". All these are only misconceptions and are caused only by solidified / crystallized ignorance.

An example is given for such misconceptions.

- नभसि रजोधूमतुषारनीहारनीलत्व अध्यास :इव – similar to dust, smoke, dew, mist and blue colour getting superimposed in the sky,

'*raja:*' means dirt / dust'; '*dhooma:*' means 'smoke'; '*thushaara:*' means 'dew'; '*neehaara:*' means 'mist' and '*neelathvam*' means 'blue colour'. *Nabhasi* – in the sky.

Dirt, smoke, dew, mist or blue colour etc. do not belong to the sky at all. *Aakaasaa* is *asangha:* and the *asangha aakaasaa* cannot have blueness, dirt, smoke etc. But, we do use the expressions, 'blue sky', 'dirty sky', 'smoky sky', 'cloudy sky' etc., wrongly associating blueness, dirt, smoke, cloud etc. with *aakaasaa*, even though *aakaasaa* is uncontaminated by any one of them.

- यथोक्त - in the same manner,

Upon 'me', the Consciousness, what do I do?

- अयं सर्वं क्रियाकारकपलात्मकसंसार – all this relative world of action, factors of action and the results thereof,
In 'me', the space-like Consciousness, the *mithyaa thriputi* is 'superimposed'.

How does this express itself?

- अहं ममत्व यत्र इच्छादि – in the forms of 'ego', sense of 'mine', will, desire etc.,

In the first level of 'expression', I am the *pramaatha*, *kartha*, and *bokthaa*; in the next level, I am wife / husband / father / grandfather etc. Once these levels of *adhyasaa* are done, many problems associated with them also will arise. The many problems are to be solved. Therefore, 'desires and efforts' (*yathna icchaadhyaa:*) result. *Yathna* means 'effort' or 'struggle'; *iccha* means 'desire'.

'Ego' gives rise to selfish desires. As one grows older, desires centered on oneself may go away; i.e., 'I-centric' desires may wane; but 'family-centric' / 'son/daughter – centric' desires increase. Because of these desires, *yathna* (efforts and struggles) etc. result.

All these struggles are:

- मिथ्या अध्यासः एव - are all merely false superimpositions
- आत्मनि – in 'me' (the space-like Consciousness)"

All these are because of 'ignorance' of the fact: "*aham thriputi vilakshana , thriputi aasraya bhootha aakaasa kalpa chaithanya roopa aathmaa asmi*". This claim, which **is** the rightful claim, is not made, because of ignorance.

- इति सिद्धम् - This fact has been established (in the second chapter);
- इमं अर्थं आह - and, that (fact) is condensed (in the following sloka).

"*Aham mamathva yathna icchaadh'*" is a big compound term. The *Aachaaryaa* has used this term in the 22nd verse in the *upakrama* (Page no. 54). In those verses (22nd etc.) the *Aachaaryaa* pointed out that '*ahamkaara-mamakaara'* is *samsaara kaaranam*; that,

'*Ahamkaara-mamakaara*' alone brings the 'triangular' format. The *Aachaaryaa* started with this warning and concludes here: "remove the *ahamkaara - mamakaara*. Reduce 'CLASP'. The 'triangular' format will disappear; the 'binary' format will automatically result".

"In 'binary' format, you need not seek liberation; you *are* liberated. In 'triangular' format, liberation is not possible; in 'binary' format *bondage* is not possible. *Moksha* is, thus, changing the format". That is said here.

Chapter II: Verse 116 –

अहमिथ्याभिशापेन दुःख्यात्मा तद्बुत्सया ।

इतः श्रुतिं तया नेतीत्युक्तः कैवयमास्थितः ॥ ११६ ॥

The Self, cursed by the ego, which is false, becomes miserable. Desiring to understand the truth, it approaches the *sruthi*. Being told by *sruthi*, 'not this, not this', it realizes freedom.

- आत्मा दुःखी (भवति) – Jeevathmaa is now sorrowful / disturbed / in samsaraa,

Because of what?

- अहं मिथ्या अभिशापेन – because of the curse of false identification with *ahamkaaraa*.

'*abhisaapa*.' means 'curse' ; '*mithyaa*' (in this context) should be understood to mean '*mithyaa abhimaanam*'.

'False identification' is the curse. False identification with what? With '*aham*'. '*Aham*' means '*ahamkaaraa*, the *karthaa - pramaatha*'.

Because of the curse in the form of false identification with the *karthaa-bokthaa-ahamkaaraa*, the *jeevathmaa* is now *dhu:khee* or *samsaari*.

He is now in 'triangular' format, persecuted by the world and by *praarabhd*.

The word '*dhukyaathmaa*' should be split as '*dhu:khee + aathmaa*'. *Aathmaa* is the subject and *dhu:khee* is the subjective complement. The verb '*bhavath*' is to be supplied, to complete the sentence.

This is the state of the *jeevathmaa*, when he is a *karmi*; even when he is a *karmayogi*, that is the state. He is in 'triangular' format during *karmi* stage and *karma yogi* stage.

But, when the *jeevaathmaa* goes to *Vedhaanthaa*, the *jnaana yoga* format, what happens?

- तद् बुभुत्सया – With the desire to know the real nature of the *jeevaathmaa*,

`Thadh' means *`aathmasvaroopam'*; *`Bubhuthsaa'* means *`desire to know'* / *Boddhum icchaa*.

With the desire to know the real nature of *jeevaathmaa* :

- श्रुतिं इत :- the *jeevaathmaa* goes to the *vedhaantha pramaanaa* / the *jnaana yoga saadhana*.

Here, the word *`sruthi:'* means *`veda antha pramaanaa'* and *`itha:'* means *`gatha:'* or *'is approached'*. *Vedha antha pramaanaa* is approached by the *jeevaathmaa*, who is now in triangular format.

The *veda antha pramaanam* negates the entire *thriputi prapancha* , by the statement *`nethi, nethi'*.

- तया युक्तः - Being told by *sruthi pramaanam*,
- नेति) नेति (इति - *'not this', 'not this'*,

By *nethi nethi vaakyam* of the *sruthi*, all the three *thriputis* are negated; and when all of them go away, what is left behind?

- कैवल्यं आस्थितः - (the *jeevaathmaa*) realizes freedom / the non-dual *aathmaa* alone remains as the only Reality.

Kaivalyam means non-duality / *Advaitam* alone; *aasthitha:* - remains as the nature.

What happens to the world? It should be carefully understood, that, world does **not** *'experientially'* disappear. The world will **not** disappear; but should be understood as *'as good as non-existent'*.

It is *mithyaa*; therefore, it becomes suddenly an entertainment, as in a movie or as in fiction; the worst problems also can become *'entertainment'*, when one reduces the world itself to fiction or a movie. Otherwise, one will never, never get *mokshaa*.

Sruthi pramaanam alone changes 'triangular' format to 'binary' format, because of which, 'I', the *aathmaa / sathyam* **alone** remain.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 117:

तस्यास्य मुमुक्षोः श्रोताद्वचसः स्वप्ननिमित्तोत्सारितनिद्रस्येवेयं निश्चितार्था प्रमा जायते।

In this aspirant after freedom, there arises from the words of the *sruthi*, true knowledge of settled import, as a man is awakened from sleep by what he sees in his dream:

- श्रोताद्वचसः - By the *sruthi* *vaakyam / vedhaantic* teaching,
- इयं निश्चितार्था प्रमा जायते – this clear understanding / knowledge arises,

'*Pramad*' mean 'knowledge'; '*nischithaarthaad*' means 'clear' / 'free from all doubts'.

A knowledge is a doubtless knowledge, only when the content of the knowledge is a fact for me.

"I am free" is a knowledge for me, when this freedom is a fact; and the freedom is a fact for me, when I stop '*expecting mokshaa*'. In other words, "dropping the expectation of *mokshaa*", indicates the clarity of knowledge.

The word '*iyam*' (in *iyam pramaa*) refers to the *pramaa* or 'knowledge' mentioned in the previous *sloka*, viz., *kaivalyam / "I am the non-dual aathmaa"*. Such a 'knowledge' is born.

To whom is such a 'knowledge' born? In whom does such a 'knowledge' arise?

- तस्य अस्य मुमुक्षोः - for this *mumukshu*, who approached *vedhaantha*.

Then the next question would arise. "If the entire world is *mithyaa*, what about the *vedhaantha pramaanam* and the *guru*? Are they *sathyam* or *mithyaa*?"

If such a question is raised, it has to be accepted, that, "if everything else, apart from *aathmaa* is *mithyaa*, the *saasthra pramaanam* also must be *mithyaa*". But, that will give rise to a further question: "how can a *mithyaa pramaanam* reveal the *sathya aathmaa*?"

In answer to this question, *Sureswaraacharya* gives an example: "when a dreamer gets a nightmarish dream, the very same nightmarish dream wakes him up; and, on waking up, the dreamer realizes that he only had a dream; he clearly knows that the dream is only

mithyaa, while he, the 'waker' is (comparatively) *sathyam*. The '*sathyam*-waker' is 'revealed' because of the nightmarish dream. This would show, that, a *mithyaa* nightmarish dream is capable of waking up a person to the (comparative) reality of the 'waker'. In the same way, *mithyaa saasthram* **can** 'wake up' a *pramaathaa* and reveal the fact that , 'I' am not a *pramaathaa*."

The Aachaaryaa says:

- स्वप्न निमित्त उत्सारित निद्रस्य इव - similar to a sleeping person renouncing sleep, because of a bad *mithyaa* dream.

Just as a person 'renounces' the sleep because of a *mithyaa* bad dream, in a similar fashion, a student (seeker) 'renounces' ignorance, because of (i.e.with the help of) *mithyaa saasthram*.

'Svapna nimittham uthsaarithaa nidhraa yasya sa:' – 'svapna nimittha uthsaaritha nidhra:' – meaning 'one who has woken up because of a (false) dream'.

Chapter II: Verse 117 –

नाहं न च ममात्मत्वात्सर्वदानात्मवर्जितः।

भानाविव तमोध्यासोऽपह्लवश्च तथा मयि ॥ ११७ ॥

I am not the ego, nothing is mine and I am bereft of all non-Self always. Like darkness ascribed to the sun, they are all superimposed on me. Even their negation is a superimposition on me.

After waking up from a nightmarish dream, a person initially says, with relief: "the dream problems are gone; the dream world is gone"; but, later, when he understands that the dream world did not really exist, he corrects his statement. He says : "I cannot say that 'the dream world is gone'; because, to say that 'the dream world is gone', is to 'accept' the existence of the dream world. But, since I know that there is, in fact, no dream world at all, I am now correcting my statement to 'there was no dream world at all for it to go away'".

To repeat: First, the person who has woken up from the dream says "dream world is gone"; later, he says, "there is no question of the 'going away' of the dream world, because it never really existed". In a similar manner, the *jnaani* first says "I am liberated, because the *samsaaraa* is gone"; and, later, he revises his conclusion: "I am not even liberated, because I never had the *samsaara*, for it to go away".

Thus, first, the *jnaani* negates *samsaaraa*; later, he negates *mokshaa* also.

- सर्वदा अनात्म वर्जितः - I am always free from anaathmaa,

And therefore,

- (मयि) (the word is supplied) - in me,
- अहं नास्ति – there is neither ahamkaaraa ;
- न च मम –there is no mamakaaraa also;

I am **always** free; therefore, I cannot say: '**now** I am *muktha:*' |

Why (cannot I say 'I am **now** free')?

- मम आत्मत्वात् - because, I am always the aathmaa, the absolutely free one.

Like what? An example is given:

The following example:

- भानौ तम अध्यासः इव - (This is) like superimposing the cover of darkness on the sun,

If and when we do not see the sun because of cloudy weather, we use the expression "the sun is covered by the cloud"; and later, when the cloud moves away, blown away by the wind, we say "now the covering has gone from the sun".

Thus, initially, we superimpose a cover upon the sun / we talk of 'covering' of the sun; later, we talk about 'dis-covering' of the sun. But, in reality, the sun was never covered by the cloud, because the sun is much larger than the cloud.

The apparent 'covering' belongs to the onlooker's eyes only; the 'covering' belonging to the onlooker's eye is 'superimposed' on the sun. In the same manner, the 'dis-covering' of the on-looker's eyes is also wrongly superimposed on the sun, and the claim 'the sun's cover is gone' is made.

- अपह्वयः च - and (super-imposing) the 'dis-covering' also (on the sun).

The 'covering' and 'non-covering' really belong only to the on-looker's eyes.

The beautiful verse "Ghanachchanaa dhruṣhti: ganachchannamartham yathaa manyathe nishthabham jaathi mooda: thathaa baddhavath baathi yo moodabuddhe: tha nithyopalabhdhisvropaham aathmaa" from Hasthaamalakeeyam, is relevant, in this context.

In 'me' there is no 'covering' also; no 'discovering' also.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 118 & Verse 118 – Chapter II:

सोऽयमेवंप्रतिपन्नस्वभावमात्मानं प्रतिपन्नोऽनुक्रोशति ।

यत्र त्वस्येति साटोपं कृत्स्नद्वैतनिषेधिनीम् ।

प्रोत्सारयन्तीं संसारमप्यश्रोषं न किं श्रुतिम् ॥ ११८ ॥

Realizing the nature of the Self thus, the aspirant laments about his previous ignorance : Why did I not listen to the *sruthi* before, which, with a flourish, as it were, proclaims 'Where the Self is all, what can one see and by what means?' (B.U.IV.v.15) and negates all duality and destroys bondage?

After claiming this *mokshaa*, the *jnaani* student, who has been studying *Vedhaantha* for a long time, is very, very happy; but, at the same time, he feels a regret also; and what is that regret?

He regrets: "I have been studying *Vedhaantha* for a long time and I have been repeatedly listening to the *samsaara nisheda sruthi*. But, how come I did not receive the 'teaching' as a fact until now? How come I postponed this liberation for so long? Why did I not receive the message in the first lesson itself – while studying the fundamental treatise *Thathva Bodha* itself?"

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* conveys in this verse and the preceding introductory portion:

- **एवं प्रतिपन्नस्वभावं आत्मानं प्रतिपन्नः** - The aspirant who has realized the nature of the Self thus,

The noun '*Prathipanna*.' means 'the student who has understood'; *aathmaanam* – the *aathmaa*.

What type of *aathmaa*?

Evam prathipanna svabhaavam - which has been understood in this manner,

What does 'in this manner' (*evam*) mean?

'As the sathya, advaita aathma'.

"*Evam prathipanna svabhaavam aathmaanam prathipanna:*" - "The seeker who has understood the *aathmaa*, which *aathmaa* has to be understood in this manner (i.e. as *sathya, advaita aathmaa*)"

- सः अयं अनुक्रोशति –such an aspirant regrets / laments :

What is the liberated aspirant's regret? "Why did I postpone this liberation for this much time, when I could have claimed it long ago and could have enjoyed the 'binary' format?" This is expressed in the verse.

- न अश्रौषं किं – "Why did I not listen to
- 'यत्र तु अस्य' इति श्रुतिम् - the well known sruthi vaakyam starting with '*yathra thu asya*' (which),

This sruthi vaakyam (in Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad – IV.v.15) runs: "*yathra thu asya sarvam aathma eva abhooth thath kena kam pasyathi thath kena kam jigreth etc. etc.*" meaning: "But, when to the knower of Brahman, everything has become the Self, then what should one see and through what, what should one smell and through what etc.etc."

This is a *vaakyam*, which negates the *thriputi samsaaraa*.

- साटोषं - loudly / grandly,
- क्रुत्स्नद्वैतनिषेधिनीम् – negates the entire thriputi or duality,
- संसारं प्रोत्सारयन्ती – and also destroys samsaara (bondage)?"

Swamiji points out that this analysis of the *Aachaaryaa* is true even about the students of current times. The current *Vedhaanthic* student also, very often, regrets: "I have been listening to this and similar exhortations, negating the *thriputi*, any number of times during my *vedhaanthic* studies – the period of *sravanam*. I have vigorously nodded my head also, in agreement with these statements. Did I not mean my concurrence from my innermost heart? Then, why have I not truly implemented the binary format? How come I do not claim 'liberation' at the time of my *sravanam* itself?"

Quite a number of students claim that they have 'understood' *vedhaantha*; but, tend to postpone 'liberation'.

'Samsaaram prothsaarayantheem' and 'krutsna dvaitha nishedhineem' are adjectives to 'sruthim'.

Sruthim mean sruthi vaakyam. What is that sruthi vaakyam referred to? The vaakyam "yathra thu asya etc. etc.", from the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad (IV.V.15).

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "How did I miss such a *sruthi vaakyam*, even though I have listened carefully?' is the regret of the student".

The *Aaachaaryaa* concludes:

Chapter II: Verse 119 –

इत्योमित्यवबुद्धात्मा निष्कलोऽकारकोऽक्रियः ।

विरक्त इव बुद्यादेरेकाकित्वमुपेयिवान् ॥ ११९ ॥

Thus affirming with the sacred syllable Om and comprehending the Self, the man of realization discards the mind etc., just as an ascetic renounces sense-pleasures, and abides without parts, factors of action and change, and attains absolute singleness of being.

- इति – Regretting the postponement of liberation in this manner, as said in the previous *sloka*, 'Ithi' here refers to 'purvaslokoktha prakaarene'
- अवबुद्धात्मा - this jnaani, who has clearly grasped 'I am the aathmaa'
- ॐ इति)उच्छार्य(- uttering the word 'omkhaaraa', (indicating the internalization of binary format , renouncing the triangular format for good)

The word '*ucchaarya*' is to be supplied. The uttering of '*Omkaaraa*' indicates the displacement of the triangular format by the binary format, for the rest of the life.

- निष्कलः अकारकः अक्रियः (तिष्ठति) - abides as the aathmaa which is free from (*karma vyavahaaara*) *thriputi*.

'*Nishkala*.' means '*thriputi rahitha*.'; '*akaaraka*.' means '*kaaraka rahitha*.'; therefore only '*nishkala*.' - 'free from division' and therefore only '*akriya*.' - 'free from *kriyaa* also'.

Where *kaarakam* is, there *kriyaa* is; when *kaarakaa* goes away, *kriyaa* also goes away.

`*Thishtathl* or `*avathistathe*' is understood.

Such a *jnaani* abides in the form of non-dual *aathmaa*.

- सः) एककित्त्वं उपेयिवान् - This person attains non – duality,

`Ekaakithvam' means `advaita bhaavam'; `upeyivaan' mean `attains'.

- बुद्ध्यादेः विरक्तः इव) विरक्तः - having detached from buddhi etc. Similar to an ascetic who has renounced sense- pleasures.

`*viraktha:*' - `having detached from'; `*buddhyaadh,* is referring to the other *thriputi* – `*buddhi dehaadhi gataadhaya:*'|

Having detached from all of them, he becomes a *vidvath sanyaasi*. |

Viraktha: should be a read a second time as `*viraktha: iva viraktha:*' |

Earlier, he was a *vividhishaa sanyaasi*; now, he has become a *vidvath sanyaasi*. As a *vividhishaa sanyaasi* he gave up the external family and as a *vidvath sanyaasi*, he gives up the internal `family' also.

Vividhishaa sanyaasam indicates `renunciation of external family'. *Vidvath sanyaasa* means `renunciation of internal family', where mind is the spouse, sense organs are the children, *praanaas* are the servants and body is the house.

The word `renunciation' need not scare the seeker; the word only indicates `*mamakaara thyaagham*' – `giving up the sense of ownership and controllership' (CLASP reduction).

As *vidvath sanyaasi*, the *jnaani* attains *advaita bhaavam*.

110. Summary of Chapter II (13-09-2008)

A Summary of the 2nd Chapter.

This is a big chapter, consisting of 119 verses.

The following summary does not follow the sequence of the verses or subject matter in the Text; instead, consists of brief discussions on each of the five topics that are covered by the *Aachaaryaa* in the chapter, since the five topics are found strewn all over the chapter.

The five topics are first enumerated below:

- I. Aathma anaathma viveka: | (Discriminating between aathmaa and anaathmaa)
- II. Anaathma mithyaathvam | (The 'unreal' nature of anaathmaa)
- III. Ajaanam samsaara kaaranam | (Ignorance is the cause of samsaara)
- IV. *Jnaanam eva moksha kaaranam* | ('Knowledge' alone leads to 'liberation')
- V. Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyaath eva jnaanam | ('Knowledge' arises only from the mahaa vaakyaas of the Vedas)

Topic I: Aathma anaathma viveka:

In this chapter, Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts that the body-mind complex or the *sthoala sookshma sareeram* also falls within *anaathmaa*, the objective universe.

The *Aachaaryaa* establishes his statement, by showing several similarities between the body and the world and also between the mind and the world. And, because of the similarities in their nature with those of *anaathmaa*, body and mind also belong to *anaathmaa*, the objective universe.

What are these similar features / *saadharmyaani* (as they are referred to, in Sanskrit) that we see between the body and the world? '*Saadharmyam*' means 'similarity of features' and '*saadharmyaan*' means 'similar / common features'.

Five similar features, between the body and the world, are pointed out by Sureswaraachaarya.

The first common feature is '*dhrusyathvam*', which means 'being an object of experience'. The world is an 'object of experience'; the body is also an 'object of experience'. Therefore, both are similar in this respect.

The second common feature is '*boudhikathvam*' or materiality. Both the body and the world are products of matter / *panchabhoothaani*. The world is material, born out of *pancha boothaas*; body is also material, born out of *pancha boothaas*, (as explained in the fundamental *Vedhaanthic* treatise '*Thathva Bodhaa*').

The third common feature is '*sagunathvam*' meaning 'being endowed with qualities'. Both body and world are endowed with attributes or individualistic characteristics. The body has got *pancha gunaas* – *sabda*, *sparsa*, *roopa*, *rasa* and *gandhaa*. World also has got the same *pancha gunaas*. Therefore, *sagunathvam* is the third common feature.

The fourth common feature is '*savikaarathvam*', meaning, 'being subject to change' ; world is subject to change; and , as is well known, body is also subject to several changes, as it gets older and older. *Savikaarathvam* is, thus, the fourth common feature.

Fifth common feature is '*aagamaapaayithvam*', or 'being subject to arrival and departure'. During *jaagrath avasthaa*, the world is experienced; in other words, the world 'arrives' or 'comes'; but, during *svapna* and *sushupthi*, the *jaagrath prapancha* disappears. During dream, *this* world is not available and the dreamer is in a different world altogether i.e. during *svapna*, *this* world is '*apaayee*', meaning 'disappearing'; and, of course, during *sushupthi* also, it is *apaayee*. The world is, thus, subject to 'appearance' and 'disappearance' / 'arrival and departure' or '*aagama apaayee*'. Similarly the physical body is also available only in *jaagrath avasthaa* ; in dream, the dreamer does not have his *jaagrath* body, but, transacts with a different body. During *sushupthi*, neither the *jaagrath* body nor the dream body is available. Thus, *prapancha: api aagamaapaayee* and *sareeram api aagamaapaayee*. *Aagamaapaayithvam* is the fifth common feature.

Thus, there are five common features between *jagath* and *sareeram*; and, because of this – viz. *dhrusyathvaath*, *boudhikathvaath*, *sagunathvaath*, *savikaarathvaath* and *aaagamaapaayithvaath* - Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes, that, *sareeram* is also *anaathmaa* - *prapanchavath* or *ghatavath*.

This can be extended to the mind also, because, the mind also fulfills all these five conditions.

Mind also has got *dhrusyathvam*; it is an object of experience, albeit an intimate object of experience; we are very, very closely watching all the violent eruptions of emotions, which belong to our minds; others may not know or read our emotions but, we are always aware of our own emotions, which we suffer or enjoy, depending on the type of emotions. The

mind, thus, being an 'object of experience', it has to be considered as subject to '*dhrusyathvam*', as the objective universe is.

The second feature is *boudhikathvam*. Mind is also a material entity, born out of the *pancha sookshma boothas*, again, as established in the treatise, *Thathva Bodha*.

The third feature, *sagunathvam*, is there for the mind also. Mind has got very many attributes ; happy / unhappy / disturbed etc. Not only such conditions , but, even *jaagrath*, *svapna* and *sushupthi*, are attributes of the mind. In *Viveka Choodamani*, *jaagrath*, *svapna* and *sushupthi* are equated to *sathvaguna* dominance, *rajoguna* dominance and *thamoguna* dominance respectively.

The mind is also *savikaaram*; it is subject to violent changes, some deliberately brought about and some happening in spite of the individual.

Finally the mind is also *aagamaapaayee* ; during *jaagrath* and *svapna*, mind is available ; and, during *sushupthi*, mind is resolved.

Therefore, i.e., because of these five common features – *dhrusyathvaath*, *baudhikathvaath*, *sagunathvaath*, *savikaarathvaath* and *aagamaapaayithvaath* – Sureswaraacharya concludes "mana: api anaathmaa, ghatavath / prapanchavath" - "mind is also anaathmaa like an external object or the external universe".

Sureswaraacharya does not stop with these conclusions that *sthoola sareeram* and *sookshma sareeram*, body, mind and thoughts, are all *anaathmaa*; he points out, that, even *ahamkaaraa* is also *anaathmaa*.

Ahamkaaraa, the individuality, is also *anaathmaa*, because of the same reasons - *dhrusyathvaath* / *boudhikathvaath* / *sagunathvaath* / *savikaarathvaath* and *aaagamaapaayithvaath*. During *sushupthi*, *ahamkaara* is not at all there; only in *jaagrath* and *svapna*, *ahamkaaraa* 'comes'. Therefore *sthoola sareeram*, *sookshma sareeram*, *antha: karanam*, *ahamkaara:*, *ahamkaara dharma* etc. - **all**, come under *anaathmaa*.

This, naturally, gives rise to a question: "what, then, is *aathmaa*?"

The *Achaaryaa* answers:

"We have concluded, that, based on the five features detailed, all things, including mind, body and *ahamkaara* are *anaathmaa*. And, we also know, that, *anaathmaa* being material or *boudikam* – born out of *pancha bhoothas* – *anaathmaa* has to be *jadam* in nature, since,

logically, any material product has to be *jadam*. Body, mind and *ahamkaaraa* also, therefore, being material, should logically be *jadam*. But, what is our experience? Body and mind *seem* to be sentient.

- Body and mind are 'experienced' as sentient, while, logically, they should be *jadam*.
- Sareeram *jadam* boudhikathvaath ghatavath ; mana: *jadam* boudhikathvaath gadavath; *ahamkaara*: *jada*: boudhikathvaath ghatavath. All of them should be *jadam* / inert. But, we 'experience' them to be sentient.

It follows, therefore, that, they must be borrowing sentiency from some 'lender'. There must be somebody, to lend *chaithanyam* to the body-mind complex, making them sentient. That 'lender' of *chaithanyam*, which converts the material, inert body-mind complex into a sentient entity, is called *aathmaa*.

That *Aathmaa* is *chaithanya svaroopam*, which blesses body and mind with sentiency".

And, what should be the nature of this *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* should certainly be different from *anaathmaa*; because, if *aathmaa* is similar to *anaathmaa*, *aathma* also will become *jadam*, requiring somebody else to lend it *chaithanyam*.

Therefore, *aathma* is *anaathma vilakshanam*. '*Vilakshanam*' means 'distinct / different in nature'.

If *aathma* is thus *anaathma vilakshanam*, its features, other than *chaithanyam* (as against *jadathvam* of *anaathmaa*), should also be different from the features of *anaathmaa*.

It was just seen that *anaathmaa* essentially has five features: *dhrusyathvam*, *boudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*.

Aathmaa being *anaathma vilakshanam*, *aathmaa* should have the opposite features; if *anaathmaa* is *dhrusyam*, *aathmaa* should be *adhruyam* – *aathmaa* is never an 'object of experience'; it is ever a non- experienced 'subject', never that can be objectified .

The second feature is '*aboudhikathvam*'. "'I' am non-material Consciousness".

The third feature of *aathmaa* : the third feature of *anaathmaa* being *sagunathvam*, *aathmaa* is *agunaa* or *nirgunaa* - 'free from all attributes'. Attributes belong to material *anaathmaa*, while non-material *aathmaa* must be and is *nirgunam*.

Fourth feature of *aathmaa* is '*nirvikaarathvam*'- 'not subject to any change / changeless'. The 'Consciousness' is '*kootastha chaithanyam*', as described by Sureswaraachaaryaa. Swami Vidyaaranya also uses the word '*kootastha:*' in his *Panchadasi* – Chapter VIII. *Aathmaa* is *avikaara:* - *kootastha:* |

Finally, *aathmaa* is *anaagamaapaayi*. It is the 'witness' of 'arrivals and departures' but, is, itself, not subject to 'arrival and departure'.

Thus, 'I' am the *aathma chaithanyam*, different from *anaathmaa* world , different from *anaathmaa* body , different from *anaathmaa* mind , different from *anaathmaa ahamkaara:* and different from *anaathmaa* emotions also.

This is the first topic of *aathma – anaathma - viveka:* /

Topic II: Anaathma mithyaathvam:

This is a very important topic.

After differentiating 'Consciousness' and 'Matter', which is the first lesson of *Vedhaantha*, the second powerful lesson is "matter is *mithyaa*".

'Matter' has a lower order of reality; it does not have an existence of its own ; it has got an existence 'borrowed' from 'Me', the *aathmaa* . 'I' alone lend existence to the world and 'I' alone empower the world to exist in front of 'Me'. And, this dependent nature of the world is called *anaathma mithyaathvam*.

"Aham sathyam jagan mithyaa" is the second lesson of *Vedhaantha*.

On this aspect, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives three main arguments. What are they?

Argument 1: Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* can be divided into a *thriputi*, consisting of *pramaathaa* , *pramaanam* and *prameyam*; in other words, *anaathmaa* exists in the form of the *thriputi - pramaatha* , *pramaanam* and *prameyam*.

How does one prove this? Because in *sushupthi*, when *thriputi* is resolved, the entire *anaathmaa* is also resolved. That's why *sushupthi* is called *nirvikalpa avasthaa*, in *Thathva Bodha*, by defining *sushupthi* as '*nirvikalpaka roopam*'.

Anaathmaa exists in the form of *thriputi – pramaathaa* , the knower, *pramaanam*, the instruments / sense organs and *prameyam* , the object of experience.

And, Sureswaraachaarya asserts that, none of these three members of the *thriputi* can ever prove its existence without the support of the other two; i.e., they are all mutually dependent for their existence.

The following examples are given for the mutual dependence of *pramaanam* and *prameyam*:

- It is common knowledge, that forms and colours cannot be proved without the eyes. This fact will not be disputed by any one. But, what is generally overlooked is that, the reverse is also true. Eyes also can never be proved, if forms and colours are not there. That is why, in total darkness, one, sometimes, wonders whether one's eyes are functioning at all.
- In the same manner, the *sabda prameyam* can be proved only by the *pramaanam* 'ears'; and, conversely, getting up very early in the morning, sometimes, during extreme cold weathers, one doubts whether one's ears are functioning at all and gets one's doubts cleared, only after hearing an external noise.

Goudapaadhaachaaryaa points out to this fact in his *Maandookya Kaarika* – “*ubhe anyonya dhrusyaa:*” | *Pramaanam's* existence is dependent on *prameyam* ; *prameyam's* existence is dependent on *pramaanam*. And, the existence of both of them depends on *pramaathaa*.

In the same manner, *Pramaathaa* can also never prove his existence, without *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. When the world is resolved in *sushupthi*, *pramaathaa* is also resolved. In meditation also, when all thoughts are removed, one tends to doze off; because, if there are no thoughts at all, when there is neither the object nor the thoughts, how can one be awake? If one eliminates all the thoughts, one ends up in artificial *sushupthi* called blankness. This shows that *pramaathaa's* existence depends on *pramaanam* and *prameyam*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya concludes that the three members of the *anaathma thriputi* are mutually dependent. From that, it is clear, that, they – the *thriputi* - do not have an existence of their own.

This fact, that, since the *thriputi* does not have an existence of its own, leads to a further conclusion, that, it 'borrows' its existence from *aathmaa* which is outside the *thriputi*.

“*Naantha: prajnyam na bahishprajnyam na ubhayatha:prajnyam na pragjnaanaghanam na prajnyam na aprajnyam*” – “ (*Thuriyaa*) is not the outward Consciousness, not the inward Consciousness, not the Consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of Consciousness, not

the all-knowing Consciousness and not unconscious" runs *manthraa* 7, of the *Maandookya Upanishad*.

The Thuriyaa / the aathmaa, is neither viswa pramaathaa nor thyjasa pramaathaa nor praangnya pramaathaa . "Pramaathru - pramaana - prameya - thripaadha vilakshana: - chathushpaadh aathmaa thureeya:" |

"*Anaathmaa*, the *thriputi*, does not have an existence of its own because of mutual dependence and 'borrows' its existence from *aathmaa*" is, thus, the first argument.

Sureswaraachaaryaa makes an incidental note also. All the transactions, whether they are *jnaanam* (knowledge) transactions / *jnaanendriya vyavahaaras* or action transactions / *karmendriya vyavahaaraas*, depend on *thriputi*. 'Subject - object - instrument' *thriputi* is required for all the *jnaana* and *karma vyavahaaraas*; and, therefore, all the *vyavahaaraas* take place only in *thriputi anathmaa*. "*Aathmaa thriputi vilakshanathvaath adhrushtam – avyavahaaryam*". *Aaathmaa* is beyond all transactions. It is the medium of Consciousness, in which all transactions take place ; but, is itself not a participant in any transaction.

In this aspect, it is similar to 'space' in which all transactions take place, but, which itself does not participate in any transaction. So also 'light'. All transactions take place in the medium of 'light'; but, light itself is not a participant in any transaction. Consciousness is a medium, in which all material transactions take place. But, Consciousness itself is not a participant in any transaction. *Vedhaantha* uses two words to convey this – *asangham* and *avyavahaaryam*.

The first argument to prove the *mithyaathvam* of *anaathmaa* is, thus, 'mutual dependence'. This argument is very much relied upon in the *Madhu Brahmanam* of *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (II. v). In the *Bhrigu Valli* of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* also, this 'mutual dependence' argument is given, as '*sareera-sareeri- sambhandhaa*' and '*anna-annaadha-sambhandha*' etc.

The second argument of Sureswaraachaarya (to prove the *mithyaathvam* of *anaathmaa*): The *Aachaaryaa* says "matter / *anaathmaa* / *thriputi* cannot exist as identical with *chaithanyam* or as separate from *chaithanyam*." - "*Bhinna roopena vaa abhinna roopena anaathmana: satthaam saadhayithum naiva sakhyathe*".

Matter cannot be identical with Consciousness, because of their totally different natures, *dhrusyathvam*, *boudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam* being features of matter / *anaathmaa* and *adhrusyathvam*, *aboudhikathvam*, *nirgunathvam*, *nirvikaarathvam* and *anagamaapaayithvam* being features of Consciousness / *aathmaa*.

"*Yushmadh asmath prathyaya gocharayo: thama: prakaasavath viruddhas svabhaavayo:*" (from Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa's *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam* to *Brahma Soothraas*) - "the natures of '*asmat (aathmaa)*' and '*yushmath (anaathmaa)*' being totally different like 'darkness' and 'light'", Consciousness and Matter cannot be identical.

And, matter cannot exist as separate from Consciousness, because, once you separate matter from Consciousness, its very existence cannot be proved; obviously, because, matter being *jadam*, it cannot claim "I am matter, and I do not have Consciousness". Once matter goes outside the bounds of Consciousness, it can never prove its own existence.

Therefore, "*bhinna roopena vaa, abhinna roopena vaa*" *anaathmaa* cannot prove its existence. Therefore, its existence is only 'seeming' existence, which is 'lent' by *aathmaa*. The second argument is, thus, "*bhinna roopena vaa abhinna roopena vaa saththam saadhayithum na sakhyathe*"

The third argument is 'support of *Sruthi pramaanaas*'. If *anaathmaa* / matter, really has an existence of its own, the *Upanishad pramaanam* would never have negated this universe. Whereas, in all the *Upanishads*, consistently and systematically, the *Upanishads* say "plurality is not there; duality is not there ; *aakaasa: naasthi; vaayu: naasthi ; na bhoomirapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo me asthi na chaambaram cha; sareeram naasthi ; mana: naasthi ; punyam naasthi; paapam naasthi*" etc. They further say "the world is not at all born ; *ajaayamaana: /* without really being born, it 'seems' to be born". If the world is negated thus, it has got only 'seeming' existence, which is called *mithyaa*.

Therefore, because of *sruthi pramaana bhaadhyathvam* also '*anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*'.

It should be remembered, that, what is 'existent' *cannot* be negated, because, it *is* existent ; what is 'non-existent' *need not* be negated, because it is not existent; and, therefore, what can be negated is, what is 'seemingly existing' alone.

Thasmaath jagath sath na bhavathi ; asath na bhavathi ; sadasath vilakshanam bhavathi.

In *Jaayantheya Githa* is the eloquent statement "*dvaya: avidhyamana: api avabhaath*" – "Even though the dualistic world is really non-existent, it seems to be existent". It should be noted that, these are the words of *Bhaagavatha Puraanaa* , (*Skandhaa XI – Chapter II – Verse 38*), not of *Sankara*, the *Advaitin*.

'*Anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*' is the second topic, established by the *Achaaryaa*, using the above three arguments.

Topic III: Ajaanam samsaara kaaranam :

Ignorance of the facts " 'I' am the higher order of reality, the *Sathyam*, and whatever I experience, viz., body, mind, thoughts, *ahamkaaraa*, the world - *sarvam dhruyam* - are all of the lower order of reality. I can use them all, as sources of entertainment and I can happily enjoy their 'experience', *if* I remember that 'I am not a participant in the *vyavahaaraas* and therefore, I am not affected by any event that happens in *anaathmaa* " is the cause of all problems in life / *samsaaraa*.

In Swamiji's 'five capsules of *Vedhaantha*', the 4th capsule of *Vedhaantha* is to be recollected in this context, which is " 'I' am not affected by any event that happens in the material world or in the material body-mind complex, because 'I' am *asangha aathmaa* – the non-participant and the unaffected".

If one diligently remembers this fact, one does not have problems. If, on the other hand, one forgets this fact, one gives 'reality' to *anaathmaa* ; and, when *anaathmaa* is raised to a level equal to 'me', inevitably, *anaathmaa* is 'empowered' to disturb 'me'.

This is very similar to the common phenomenon of a dream - an individual 'creating' a dream , 'entering' the dream and after entering the dream, 'lending reality' to the dream; the moment the dream is 'lent reality', it is capable of disturbing the 'dreamer', not only during the dream , but, for a brief period even after waking up, at times even suffering the physical symptoms such as palpitation , perspiring etc. , because of the mental disturbance caused by the 'false' dream.

Ironically, " / create the dream, / lend existence to the dream, / 'empower' the dream and then / get disturbed".

Sureswaraacharya says "ignorance' is the cause for lending 'reality' to *anaathmaa* ".

This 'lending reality' is called *adhyaasa*: | '*Ajnaana janya adhyaasa*.' is 'empowering the world' (to disturb me).

The fifth capsule in the 'five capsules of *Vedhaantha*', viz., "When I forget my real nature, life is converted into struggle; when I remember my *asangha* non-participant nature, life becomes an entertainment" is also very relevant here.

"Ignorance / *adhyaasaa* is the cause of *samsaara*" is the third topic of this chapter.

Topic IV: Jnaanam eva moksha kaaranam:

Sureswaraacharya points out, that, only *Jnaanam* and *adhyaasa nivrutthi:* are the permanent solutions for *samsaaraa*. *Parihaaraas* (even those prescribed in the *Karma Kaandaa* of the *Vedas*) are only temporary solutions to the problems faced in *samsaaraa*.

The permanent solutions are only '*aathma jnaanam*' and '*adhyaasa nivrutthi:*'.

What does '*adhyaasa nivrutthi:*' signify? By '*adhyaasa nivrutthi:*', the world does not disappear. The *Vedhaanthic* seeker does not aim for 'disappearance' of the universe. By giving 'reality' to the world, he had wrongly 'empowered' it to cause disturbances; and by *ajnaana nivrutthi:*, this wrong 'empowerment' is sought to be removed, by withdrawing 'reality' from the universe. This is similar to continuing in a dream, with the knowledge that it is a dream, though, of course, it is not possible. But, 'continuation of the dream, with the knowledge that it is a dream created by the waker- me' is the nearest example that can be given for *jeevan mukthi*.

"This *Jnaanam* and *jagan mithyaathva nischaya:* are the only permanent solutions to *samsaaraa*" is the fourth topic.

"*Ajnaana adhyaasau samsaara kaaranam*" is the third topic and "*ajnaana adhyaasa nivrutthi:* or *jnaana jaganmithyaathva nischaya praapthi: moksha kaaranam* " is the fourth topic.

Topic V: Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyaath eva jnaanam :

The *Aachaaryaa* contends, that, this *jnaanam* can be obtained only by *Vedhaanta maahaavaakya pramaanam*, coming from the mouth of a competent *Aachaaryaa*.

Verse 13, Sec. 2, Chapter I, of Kathopanishad runs: "Ethathsruthvaa samparigrahya marthya: pravruhya dharmyam anum etham aapya, sa modhathe modhaneeyagum hi labdhvaa vivruthagum sadhma nachikethasam manye" – " Having listened to this, the mortal human being clearly grasps this subtle aathmaa, separates it from the body and claims it. Having obtained the source of joy, he rejoices indeed. I consider the abode of Brahman to be open to Nachikthas". In the context of this verse, Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa, in his Bhashyam, beautifully adds "**aachaarya prasaadhaath** sruthvaa".

What is this *sravanam*? The *sravanam* is that of the *Mahaavaakyaas* of the *Vedaas*.

'Pancha kosa vilakshana aathmaa aham brahma asmi' ithi mahaavaakya sravanaath jnaana praapthi: |

Why do the *Advaita Acharyaas* insist on *mahaavaakya sravanam*? Sureswaraacharya answers: "All the other instruments of knowledge / *prathyakshaadhi pramaanani* are *baahya vishayaani* / *anaathma vishyaani*."

All *pramaanams*/ instruments of knowledge other than *sruthipraamanam* are dealing only with *anaathmaa*. Even the most advanced science is capable of studying only 'Matter', the *anaathmaa*. They do not have the resources to study or throw light on *Aathmaa*. There are recent reports that latest experiments are being conducted to study proton, which proton is also only matter or *anaathmaa*. Science can study only Matter and, at best, cosmology. No *pramaanam*, other than *sruthi*, can study or throw light on Consciousness. In fact, even the *veda poorva bhaaghaa* is dealing only with *anaathmaa*. Rituals are *anaathmaa* ; *svarga* is *anaathmaa* ; even *Vaikunta* is *anaathmaa* ; *Kailaasa* is also *anaathmaa*.

All pramaanams are studying only *anaathmaa*; *veda antha bhaaghaa* (*mahaavaakyam* especially) **alone** deals with *aathmaa*. "Ithadhaathmyam idhagum sarvam thathsathyam sa aathmaa thathvamasi svethaketho" – "That which is the subtle essence, all this has got That as the Self. That is Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That, Svetaketu" – declares the Chandhogya Upanishad (VI. 16. 3).

"I' am the non-participating medium for all the play / drama to go on".

"*Viswam dharpana dhruyamaana nagareethulyam nijaanthargatham*" – "(The Self alone plays as) the universe of names and forms, like a city seen in a mirror" declares *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* (verse 1).

This *mahaavaakya vichaara* has to take place in a systematic manner.

'Systematic study' means that, the seeker has to spend a lot of time dealing with '*thvam*' (the *jeevaathmaa*), '*thadh*' (the *Pramaathmaa*) and '*asl*' (the *jeevaathma-paramaathma-aiykyam*).

Several portions of Vedhaanthic study - Sareerathraya viveka, avasthaa thraya viveka, pancha kosa viveka, dhruk dhruya viveka etc. – are there, dealing with *thvam padha jeevathmaa*.

The seeker also requires an elaborate study on *thadh padha* - an analysis of *paramaathmaa* – especially cosmology, or *srushti vichaaraa*.

But, if we stop with these studies, the result will be only *svami dhaasa bhaavaa*.

If the seeker stops with the study of 'thath' and 'thvam' only, he will say "I am eternal dhaasaa and Paramaathmaa is eternal swami." He will end up with visidhtaadvaitam or dvaitham.

Therefore, an *Advaita Vedhaanthic* student should not stop with the study of *thath* and *thvam* alone. He will have to go to the 'as/' portion, of the *mahaavaakyam`thathvamas/`*.

Dvaitam is the first step and is important. The second step, *Visidhtaadvaitam* is also important. But, 'as/' is the most important component of *mahaavaakyam*.

What does the word 'as/' convey? That, "You, the *jeevaathmaa*, are not the *dhaasaa* of *Paramaathmaa*; but you, the *jeevaathmaa*, **are** *Paramaathmaa*".

The differences are only in superficial *anaathamaa*. In *aathamaa*, there is no difference at all. Thus, '*jeevaathma – paramaathma - aiykya jnaanam/`*, conveyed by the word 'as/' is most important. For that also, we require a diligent enquiry. The *Vedhaanthic* technical terms – *vaachyaartha / lakshyaartha/ jahathi lakshanaa / ajahathi lakshanaa* etc. - require elaborate analysis.

And through that study, the seeker has to get '*aham sathyam jagan mithyaad`* knowledge.

The *mithyaathva darsanam`jagan mithyaad`* of the universe is also a very, very important knowledge. '*Aham Brahma asmi*' knowledge, by itself, is insufficient. *Jagan mithyaathva nischayam* is very, very important, because, in *jagath-sathyathva-vaadhaa*, liberation is never possible. If the *jagath* is *sathyam*, liberation is never possible, because, once the world is real, '*Law of Karma*' becomes the most powerful chain that will shackle everyone. Nobody can escape that. *Anirmokshaprasanghaa* will be the problem.

In fact, an advanced *Vedhaanthic* student should know that, in *Jagathsathyathvavaadhaa*, '*Law of Karma*' binds not only the *jeeva*; it will bind *Isvara* also.

Even *Isvara* will be bound by the '*Law of Karma*'. How?

To explain: *Isvara* also has got some tasks; He is *srushtikartha, sthithi kartha, laya kartha* and *karma pala dhathaa*. These are the four roles of *Bhagavaan*, from which roles, *Bhagavaan* can never escape. He has to do these four tasks eternally. While *Bhagavaan* **has** to do these four tasks, if the questions "has He got freedom in His actions? Can He create the world as He likes?" are raised, the answer will be "No, even *Bhagavaan* cannot create or run the world as He likes. He has to create and administer the world only as dictated by the '*Law of Karma*'". Therefore, against the wish of the Lord – even though He does not like it –

He is forced to create sufferings in the world. Even though *Bhagavaan* is compassionate, *Bhagavaan* is forced to create sufferings in the world. At any given time, sufferings are there, all over, created by *Bhagavaan* Himself, forced by the 'Law of Karma'. Against His own wishes, *Bhagavaan* has also to distribute sufferings to the *jeevaraasis*, again dictated by the 'Law of Karma'. If only *Bhagavaan* had the choice, He would have avoided creation and distribution of sufferings, because all *jeevas* are His children; but, He is Himself bound by the 'Law of Karma', which tells Him "You are *karmapaladhaatha*; distribute sufferings".

Bhagavaan has to do this eternally ; and, above all, being *sarvagnya*;, He has to know all the sufferings . He cannot close His eyes to the sufferings; being *sarvagnya*;, He has to 'watch' all the sufferings, all the time. The *alpagnya* mortals are, comparatively more fortunate - being blissfully ignorant of *all* the sufferings; they are exposed only to *limited* sufferings. But, *Bhagavaan* has to watch all the sufferings, all the time, without rest or respite. *Bhagavaan* has to create sufferings, distribute sufferings and watch the sufferings.

But, in spite of all these, if *Bhagavaan* is free, it is only because, *Bhagavaan* knows 'Creation' is *mithyaa* and sufferings are *mithyaa*. If creation is *sathyam*, *Bhagavaan* will never have peace of mind.

Therefore, *Bhagavaan* says: "I am happy, because, for Me, the Creation is *mithyaa* and entertainment" and exhorts mankind "therefore, you should also, like Me, see the Creation as *mithyaa*".

"*Thasya karthaaram api maam viddhi akarthaaram avyayam*"- "Though its (division in society) author, know Me to be a non-doer and changeless" (BG. Ch. IV. Verse 13).

"Only *mithyaathva jnaanam* liberates Me" *Bhagavaan* says "and it is the *mithyaathva jnaanam* that can liberate you also".

111. Chapter III- Verses 1 (20-09-2008)

The 2nd chapter of Naishkarmya Siddhi was completed in the earlier session (on 13th September 2008).

In the 2nd chapter, Sureswaraachaarya had comprehensively discussed *aathma anaathma viveka* and also *anaathma mithyaathvam*.

Anaathma mithyaathvam means that the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is of a lower order of reality and therefore, is not as real as *aathmaa*. To express it in a slightly different manner, this *anaathma prapanchaa* is false or unreal, in comparison to *aathmaa*, the Absolute Reality.

This unreality of the universe is established by the *Advathin*, citing different reasons. Three reasons were discussed in the 2nd chapter. And, the most important reason given, was, that, the *Upanishads* negate this universe. Whatever is negated by the *Saasthraas* cannot be real, because what is real can never be negated.

Saasthraas stress another important point, though it was not discussed in the Summary of the 2nd chapter, which important point is, that, the *saasthraas* say "In the wake of knowledge, there will be no *anaathmaa* at all; there is only *aathmaa*".

"*Yasmin sarvaani boothani aathmaiva abooth vijaanatha: thathra ko moha: ka: soha: ekathvam anupasyatha:*" – "When all beings are realized as one's *aathman*, to that seer of oneness, there is no delusion or sorrow; he, verily, lives transcending delusion and sorrow" – declares *Isvaasya Upanishad* (verse 7).

The wise person looks at everything as *aathmaa* and in the vision of the wise person, there is no *anaathmaa* at all. "*Idham sarvam yadayam aathmaa*" – "All these are the Self "asserts *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (II.iv.6) also.

And, the student has to derive important corollaries from these *Upanishadic* statements, which corollaries are extremely important for the *Advaitin*.

When the *Upanishads* thus say "in the vision of wise person, everything is *aathmaa*; there is no *anaathmaa* at all", they indirectly mean "knowledge negates *anaathmad*".

If knowledge has to negate *anaathmaa*, i.e. if, in the 'wake of knowledge', *anaathmaa* is negated, it is possible only under one condition: "*anaathmaa* must be born out of

ignorance". To repeat in other words: "Only if *anaathmaa* is a product of ignorance, knowledge will destroy ignorance as well as the product of ignorance".

From the *sruthi*, we come to know that *anaathmaa* is unreal, it is a product of ignorance and it is negatable by knowledge. And, therefore, if the entire *anaathmaa* is to be negated and 'ignorance', the cause of *anaathmaa*, also has to be negated, then one has to gain knowledge.

In short, 'knowledge removes ignorance and the ignorance-produced *anaathmaad*'. This is the basic thesis of *Advaitam*.

Knowledge negates ignorance directly and by way of negating ignorance, it also negates whatever is born of ignorance; and, *anaathmaa* being a product of ignorance, *anaathmaa* is also negated.

Whatever is a product of ignorance is called unreal or *adhyasa*: | Therefore, "*adhyasaa* and *ajnaanaad*", we should note, "are negated by *jnaanam*". This is the essence of *Vedhaanthaa*.

Towards this alone, the well-known example of 'the rope-ignorance producing the unreal snake' is given. The 'rope-ignorance' is *ajnaana* and the 'unreal snake' is *adhyasa*: | Both 'rope-ignorance' (*ajnaanaa*) and the 'unreal snake' (*adhyasaa*), are negated simultaneously by one knowledge viz., 'rope-knowledge'.

This fact, that, '*jnaanam* removes *ajnaanam* **and** *ajnaana-janya adhyasaa*' is the thesis of *Vedhaanthaa*.

In the above example, the 'unreal snake' is created by 'rope-ignorance'. In the same manner, the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* is also caused by 'ignorance'.

This gives rise to the question "what ignorance creates the entire *anaathma adhyasa*?" | *Vedhaanthaa* answers: "*moolaavidhyaa* is the special ignorance, which is the producer of the entire false universe".

Mithyaa adhyasaa is created by a special ignorance, to which *Vedhaanthaa* gives the name '*moolaa avidhyaa*'.

And, what is the uniqueness of this *moolaa avidhyaa*? Answer: It is not a 'small' ignorance located in the mind. But, it is a 'bigger' ignorance, which is the producer of the mind itself.

Moolaa avidhyaa is not a small ignorance located in the individual mind, but is a *mahaa* ignorance, which is the creator of the mind and not only the mind, but, along with the mind, the entire cosmos also. *Both* the mind and the cosmos are projections caused by *moolaa avidhyaa*.

To repeat : It should be carefully understood, that, the world is not the projection of the mind ; but, the entire world, *including* the mind is a projection caused by *moolaavidhyaa* - which is otherwise called *maaya, prakruthi:, avyaktham, avyaakrutham, yoga nidhrraa, mahaa sushupthi:* etc.

These different words are used in *Vedhaantha*, to denote this 'ignorance' ; but, in this context (in Chapter III of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*) the word '*moolaavidhyaa*' - 'basic or fundamental ignorance' is to be used.

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa will be pointing out in this chapter, that, this *moolaavidhyaa* is destroyed by a special knowledge.

Ordinary or commonplace knowledge destroys ordinary or commonplace ignorance. The *special* ignorance, '*moolaavidhyaa*', can be destroyed only by a *special* knowledge; and that knowledge can be given only by *Vedhaantha maahaa vaakya vichaara:* |

The third chapter deals with the subject of *maha vaakyartha vichaara* ; and Sureswaraachaarya points out, in this chapter, that, the knowledge generated by *maha vaakya artha vichaaraa* alone will be the destroyer of *moolaavidhyaa*.

Through the destruction of *moolaavidhyaa*, *maha vaakya artha vichaaraa* will falsify the entire *anaathma prapanchaa*, consisting of three types of *thriputi* (already discussed in the earlier chapter) listed below:

- (1) kaaraka-kriyaa-palaroopa thriputi, which is responsible for the entire karma vyavahaaraa
- (2) pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi, which is responsible for all jnaana vyavahaara and
- (3) *buddhi-deha-ghataadhaya thriputi* - the body, the mind and the world (indicated by the word '*ghataadhaya:*') - which is responsible for *samsaara vyavahaara*.

All these are falsified; even body and mind are falsified.

Vedhaantha is not aimed at improving the mind; but, aimed at falsification of the mind itself, establishing, that, whatever that happens in the mind *anaathmaa*, cannot touch the

'real' *aathmaa*. This extraordinary wisdom, which destroys *moolaavidhyaa* and falsifies the *anaathmaa* is to be gained thorough *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. This is the subject matter of the *thrutheeya adhyaayaa* (Chapter III) – the biggest chapter in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, consisting of 126 verses.

And, since this important fact, viz., "*mahaavaakya vichaaraa* destroys this *moolaavidhyaa* and consequently negates the *samsaaraa* itself ", is to be established, Sureswaraachaaryaa first discusses *moolaavidhyaa* elaborately in the introductory portion (of the chapter) .

The introduction is *moolaavidhyaa vichaaraa*, while the chapter is *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, which produces the knowledge that destroys *moolaavidhyaa*.

When the subject of *moolaavidhyaa vichaara:* is discussed, the question is "what type of enquiry is required with regard to *moolaavidhyaa*?"

Four aspects are to be highlighted, during this enquiry into *moolaavidhyaa*.

But, even before entering that topic of *moolaavidhyaa vichaara:*, even in general, the student has to note a few important principles, about *any* type of ignorance – not only *moolaavidhyaa*.

Principle (1):

Ignorance is always associated with a sentient entity; i.e. 'ignorance' can never exist by itself; it must always be located in a sentient being; in other words, only a sentient being can be said to be ignorant. That 'ignorant' sentient being is called 'locus' of ignorance.

To express this in another manner: if and when one talks about ignorance, the immediate question raised is "**who** is ignorant?", because, without an 'ignorant' sentient entity, there cannot be any talk of ignorance at all. Ignorance always requires a locus. In Sanskrit, this 'locus' of ignorance is called '*aasraya*.' |

Avidhyaa requires an *aasraya:* |

Principle (2):

One can never talk about ignorance, without talking about the 'object of ignorance' also.

"Ignorance of **what**?" will be the question along with " 'who' is ignorant?"

If a seeker of knowledge approaches a teacher and says "I am ignorant; I want knowledge; please teach me", the teacher can start teaching, only if he knows "what the student is

ignorant of / i.e., on what topic does the student want knowledge", of course, only if the teacher himself is versed on the subject of ignorance / the topic on which the knowledge is sought.

Before starting any 'teaching', the subject matter should be clear. This shows, that, ignorance must always be of a specified object or subject ; that object/ subject of ignorance is called *vishaya:* | Thus, '*ajnaanam* requires a *vishaya:*' is the 2nd principle./

It was concluded above, that, one cannot talk about 'ignorance', without talking about the locus (*aasraya:*) and the object of ignorance (*vishaya:*); that, in short, *Ajnaanam* must have an *aasraya:* and a *vishaya:*|

This is true about 'knowledge' also; *jnaanam* also must have a locus and an object. The 'locus of knowledge' also is called *aasraya:* and the 'object of knowledge' also is called *vishaya:* |

And, **Principle (3):**

Jnaanam can destroy *ajnaanam* only if the locus and the object of *jnaanam* and *ajnaanam* are identical / are the same.

This statement may appear complicated; but, actually, is a very simple fact.

To give an example: "Assume that Rama is ignorant of Physics; naturally, his ignorance of Physics will go away with the knowledge of Physics. But, only 'Physics knowledge' can destroy 'Physics Ignorance' – not 'Chemistry knowledge' or knowledge of any subject other than Physics. Therefore, condition no. 1 is, 'knowledge' will destroy 'ignorance' only when the 'object of knowledge' and the 'object of ignorance' are one and the same. This can be expressed as '*Samaana vishayathvam* is the condition for *jnaana ajnaana virodha:*' | *Jnaanam* and *ajnaanam* are inimical, which means *jnaanam* will destroy *ajnaanam*. But, this will happen only when the *vishayaas* are identical.

"In the same manner, the 'locus' also should be the same. To continue the above example, if Rama's 'ignorance of Physics' should go away, it is only Rama who should acquire the 'knowledge of Physics' to have his 'ignorance of Physics' destroyed. Anybody else studying Physics for any length of time, on behalf of Rama, will not help Rama to destroy his ignorance of Physics." This shows that the locus of 'ignorance' and corresponding 'knowledge' should be the same.

Jnaanam and ajnaanam are bhaadhya-bhaadhakam, only when they have got samaana aasraya and samaana vishaya.

Having noted these three principles, the text is entered into.

In the Introductory portion of the 3rd Chapter, Sureswaraachaarya first asks: "what is the *aasraya*: (locus) of *moolaavidhyaa*?" and, later, the second question "what is the *vishaya*: (object) of *moolaavidhyaa*?"

And, he himself answers the questions; i.e. the *Aacharyaa* does a *vikalpa* (the word '*vikalpa*' meaning "raising questions and answering the same").

In the second chapter, the *Aachaaryaa* had elaborately categorized the entire cosmos into *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. There are two only two things – *aathmaa*, the Consciousness principle and *anaathmaa*, the Matter principle. Body is included in *anaathmaa* / mind is included in *anaathmaa* / world is included in *anaathmaa* / even God is included in *anaathmaa*.

Interestingly, if somebody raises this question "in what category does God fall?", it cannot be answered straightaway; there has to be a return question : "how do *you* look upon God?" As long as God is looked upon as an object, different from 'me', as an object of worship / as an object of meditation / as an object of *Puja*, then God also will come under *anaathmaa*. If, on the other hand, the answer is "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham* etc.," then there is the option of including God in *aathmaa*, 'I', the subject.

In a lighter vein, Swamiji goes on: "Which is better? Including God in *aathmaa*, the subject or in *anaathmaa*, the object?"

"If you ask God Himself, 'in what category would you like to come under?' , God will plead 'kindly do not put me in *anaathmaa* category'. Why? Because the entire *anaathmaa* is unreal, that can be falsified through knowledge. *Bhagavaan* would not want to get negated in the wake of knowledge. Hence, *Bhagavaan* Himself will say 'Temporarily you can keep me in *anaathmaa* category (for the sake of worship or *Puja*) ; but, sooner than later, please put me in *aathmaa* category, so that I can be real' . *Bhagavaan* would like to be real, rather than be *anaathmaa* that can be dismissed / negated".

Kenopanishad says "*Na idham yadh idham upaasathe*" - "This deity which people meditate upon is not *Brahman* (I. 5), clearly conveying "an object of *Upaasanaa* is not Reality." What a powerful statement? This is *Upanishadic* statement – not of *Sankaraachaaryaa*, the *Advaithin*. Therefore, the objectified Gad also will come under *anaathmaa*.

To revert to the text: The 2nd chapter has categorized everything into these two - *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*- only.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa is raising the question to himself: "Is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*, *aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*?" His first question is "Is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*, *anaathmaa*? Then, his second question is "Is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* *aathmaa*?"

As earlier pointed out, *Moolaavidhyaa* should have a *vishaya*, an object also.

So the third question is "Is the *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* *anaathmaa*?" The 4th question can be guessed: "Is the *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* *aathmaa*?"

"Moolaavidhyaa aasraya: anaathmaa? Moolavidhyaa aasraya: aathmaa? Moolaavidhyaavishaya: aanaathmaa ? Moolaavidhyaavishaya: aathmaa?" are the four topics which the Aachaaryaa is going to enquire into.

(At this juncture, Swamiji quotes an anecdote in a lighter vein: "Swami *Chinmayananda* used to tell a humorous story of an experience that can be had in a village : 'A man and wife, engaged in trade , vending some items required by the villagers, would move around together carrying the items. The husband would walk a few steps ahead, with the wife following him, conversing with each other. The tired wife would suddenly stop for chewing betel, and seat herself under a tree, for a brief rest, chewing betel. Her husband, walking ahead, without realizing that his wife had stopped, would continue talking and because of the load on his head would not turn around also. Only after some time, he would realize that his wife had stopped for a rest and he had been talking to no one in particular'. After telling this story, Swami *Chinmayaananda* would jokingly remark 'A similar situation may happen in the case of a *guru* and his *sishyaa* also. The *guru* may continue his teaching on and on, while the *sishyaa* might have 'dropped' the *guru* somewhere on the way' ".)

Swamiji, in the same light vein, wonders whether his students are following the trend of his teaching, in the immediate context.)

What is going to be the *siddhaantha*? The *siddhaantha* is very important in *advaitam*. What is that important *siddhaantha*?

Ans : "Aathmaa alone is the *aasrayaa* and *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* . Aathmaa eva moolaavidhyaayaa: aasraya: | Aathmaa eva mollaavidhyaayaa: vishaya: api | Aasrayathva vishayathvam – both belong to aathmaa only".

There is a very, very famous verse in *Samkshepa saareerakam*, a profound text written by *Sarvajnaathma Muni:*, who was a very scholarly disciple of Sureswaraachaaryaa, in which, he says "*aasrayathva vishayathva baaghinee nirvibhaaga chithireva kevalaa poorva siddhathamaso paschima naasayo bhavathi naapi gochara:*" | This *sloka* is based on this introduction (that is being discussed) of Sureswaraachaaryaa.

In this Introductory passage, Sureswaraachaaryaa is going to say "*anaathmaa* cannot be *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* nor *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhya*. *Aathmaa* alone is *assrayaa* and *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*". Sureswaraachaaryaa is going to establish this doctrine, by giving several arguments.

And, after having established this, Sureswaraachaaryaa is going to say, at the end of the Introductory portion, "this *moolaavidhyaa*, for which *aathmaa* is both *aasrayaa* and *vishayaa* – *aathma aasrayaka aathma vishayaka moolaavidhyaa* - can be destroyed by only *that* knowledge for which *aathmaa* is both the *aasrayaa* and *vishayaa*. That knowledge alone will destroy *moolaavidhyaa*; and that knowledge can be gained only from *mahaa vaaya vichaaraa* |" and exhort "Therefore, let us all enter into *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*". Thus, the *Aachaaryaa* uses *moolaavidhyaa vichaara:* as the 'appetizer' for *mahaavaakya vichaara:* |

To enter the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 1 – Chapter III (Part):

सर्वोऽयं प्रमितिप्रमाणप्रमेयप्रमात्रुलक्षण आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तो मिथ्याध्यास एवेति बहुश उपपत्तिभिरतिष्ठपम् ।

It has been established through elaborate reasoning, that all this empirical world, from *Brahman* down to the lowest species, consisting of knowledge, means of knowledge, objects of knowledge and the subjects thereof, is merely a false superimposition.

To begin with, the *Aachaaryaa* summarizes what he had discussed in the 2nd chapter, pointing out, that, it was established that there are two only two things in the entire cosmos – *aathmaa*, the Consciousness principle and *anaathmaa*, the Matter principle; he refers to this, so that, he can raise the question "is *moolaavidhyaa* located in *aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*?" For raising this question alone, Sureswaraachaaryaa reminds "The whole thing (cosmos) has been classified into two, in the earlier chapter".

Therefore, if a question "what are all the things in the world?" is raised, the answer need not be a detailed list of all the objects in creation ; the answer could and should simply be "there is *aathmaa* and there is *anaathmaa*".

The Aaachaaryaa says:

- इति अतिष्ठपम् - It has been established, that,

Athishtipam is a rare usage, with the following interesting sidelines:

In Sanskrit, the past tense itself is of three varieties –

- (1) to-day's past - from sunrise till the moment – called, *adhyathana bhootha kaalam*
- (2) the past from one's date of birth to yesterday – called, *anadhyathana bhootha kaalam*, and
- (3) the remote past – before one's birth to *anaadhi kaalam* - called *paroksha bhootha kaalam*.

And, in the *adhyathana bhootha kaalam* itself, there are seven varieties. *Athishtipam* is the third variety - it is called 'duplicative *lung*', and means, 'I established or 'it has been established'.

What has been established?

- आब्रह्मस्तम्बपर्यन्तो सर्वः अयं - "the entire universe beginning from Brahma, the Creator, to the smallest insect / insignificant living being – (which universe is the object of Consciousness),

Sarva: – the entire *anaathma prapancha:* / universe; *ayam* – (in this context) implies 'which is the object of Consciousness'.

- प्रमिति प्रमाण प्रमेय प्रमात्रु लक्षण :- which can be classified into 'knower', 'known', 'knowing instrument' and 'knowledge',

All these put together, *anaathma prapancha:*, can be translated as 'Matter', in English.

- मिथ्या अध्यासः एव - is merely a false projection",

What a powerful statement! *Advaita* dismisses the entire 'Matter' as unreal.

Using puns, Swamiji conveys in a lighter vein: "'Matter does not matter' is a very important doctrine, which doctrine **does** matter, in *Advaita*".

The 'false projection' is caused by *moolaavidhya*. The 'projection' is not a mental projection, because, mind also is one of the projected materials.

- उपपत्तिभिः बहुशः - using varieties of reasonings.

Bahusa: - in manifold ways; *upapatthibhi*: - by reasonings.

In the summary of the 2nd chapter (in the earlier class), three reasonings were given. The most powerful argument given, is "Veda itself negates matter and declares 'Chaithanyam alone *is*. Matter does *not* exist at all. The seeming vibration of Consciousness is *appearing* as illusory matter' ". A typical example of Veda negating matter is the '*Alaatha saanthi prakaranam*' of *Maandookya Kaarikaa* (4th Chapter).

The seeming vibrations of Consciousness alone *appear* as the tangible matter; if a thorough probe is undertaken, it can be concluded, that 'Matter is not there at all'.

Thus, *anaathmaa* is one 'thing'. What is the second 'thing'?

(Sambhandha gadhyam) further to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

आत्मा च जन्मादिषड्भावविकारवर्जितः कूटस्थबोध एवेति स्फुटीकृतम्।

The Self, it has been clarified, is eternal Consciousness devoid of changes of being, like origin.

And, what is the second entity? "If everything experienced is unreal, then what is real? "will be the question.

If *everything* is considered unreal, it will become *soonyavaadhaa*, which *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* does not accept.

Then, what is the answer, according to *Advaita*? It is: "There is only one thing other than all the experienced entities, which is that non-experienced / non-experiencable object, the *chaithanyam* entity, in which medium alone all experiences are taking place. And, that *chaithanyam*, which is never an object of experience, is 'myself'".

And, when the word 'myself' is used, it should not be imagined to mean a localized entity. 'Myself' means a non-localized Consciousness medium, in which all the transactions are taking place; just as light is the medium, in which all transactions take place. And, also, just as 'light' is not a participant in any transaction i.e. 'light' is a non-participant medium, in a similar manner, 'I' am the non-participant medium of Consciousness, in which all transactions are taking place.

The *Aachaaryaa* continues:

- आत्मा च - "Whereas, the Self
- कूटस्थबोधः - is the Changeless Consciousness,

kootastha – nirvikhaara; bhodha: - (in this context) means chaithanyam.

What type of *Chaithanyam*?

- जन्मादि षड्भाव विकारवर्जितः एव – free from the six types of modifications like janma etc.,"

The six modifications are well known – "asthi, jaayathe, vardhathe, viparinamathe, apaksheeyathe, vinasayathi", as listed in Thathva Bodha.

That chaithanyam is aathmaa.

That is why, earlier (while making a reference to the *Vedic* statements) care was taken to say "the **seeming** vibrations of *aathmaa*"; the use of the adjective '*seeming*' is significant, because, *aathmaa* being changeless, it can never have any motion also. Therefore, one should never simply say 'vibrations' of Consciousness, i.e. without using the adjective '*seeming*' for the vibrations, because Consciousness is never subject to vibrations, being all-pervading and changeless. Just as space cannot have any vibration, Consciousness also, cannot have any vibrations. The 'seeming vibrations' of Consciousness is creating the delusion called this world, exactly like dream.

- इति स्फुटीकृतम् – This (fact) was also clearly established (in the 2nd Chapter).

In the 2nd chapter, *anaathmaa* was discussed as unreal and *aathmaa* was discussed as the only Reality. Then why the 3rd chapter at all, if the teaching is over?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

तयोश्च मिथ्याध्यासकूटस्थात्मनोर्नान्तरेणाजान् संबन्धोऽन्यत्र चोदनापरिप्रापितात् यथा" इयमेवर्गग्निः साम " इति।

Except in cases where a scriptural injunction identifies one thing for another for a special purpose, the relation between two items like the false superimposition and eternal consciousness is impossible without a basic ignorance.

'I', the *aathmaa*, the Conscious principle and *anaathmaa*, the Matter principle belong to two orders of reality. One (*anaathmaa*) is *mithyaa adhyaasa*: | The word '*mithyaa*' is crucial and means 'lower order of reality', also generally called *vyaavahaarika sathyam* – 'empirical functioning reality'. The other (*aathmaa*) is *paaramaarthikam* or absolute Reality. Thus, the orders of reality, between the two, are different. Since the orders of reality are different, no relationship is possible between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. *Sathyam* cannot have any relationship with *mithyaa*, just as the 'waker', who is of a higher order of reality, can never strike a relationship with any member in his dream.

Swamiji, in a lighter vein, gives the example of how an anxious mother looking for a spouse for her son / daughter, comes across in her dream a suitable daughter-in-law/ son-in-law and even if it be the most ideal match, how could a relationship be struck with the 'dream person'?

Relationship is possible only between two members of the same order of reality. Body and mind can and do have relationship, because they belong to the same order of reality - *vyaavahaarika sathyam*; that's why, when body is affected, the mind *is* affected. In fact, nobody can stop the mind getting affected when the body gets affected, with any amount of effort, because of this fact, that, they belong to the same order of reality. Mind can never be made to be 'un-connected' with the body; whatever happens to the body, **will** influence the mind. Probably, one can marginally decrease the influence; but, can never be totally rid of the influence. In the same manner, the body also is influenced by the mind, psychosomatic disorders proving this fact. Relationship between mind and body cannot be avoided.

What *Vedhaanthaa* wants to say is: "'I', (not the mind – but, 'I', the *aathmaa*, the *chaitanyam*) and the body-mind complex, which belongs to *anaathmaa*, cannot have any *sambhandaa* at all. 'I' am *asangha*: - *asanghoham*. 'I' am non-participant in any of the transactions of *anaathmaa*. Therefore, 'I' am not going to be influenced by the events of *anaathmaa*. 'Non-participant' means *akarthaa* and 'non-influenced' means *abokthaa*."

This is the corollary the seeker gets, when the seeker firmly knows that *aathmaa* is *sathyam* and *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*. One should realize that 'I' am ever free and relationless. I do not participate in anything and I am not influenced by anything.

And, when? Ans: Ever. "Naiva kinchith karomi ithi yuktho manyathe thathvavith pasyan srunvan sprusan jighran asnan gacchan svapan svasan pralapan visrjan gruhnana unmishan nimishaanapi" – "The disciplined knower of the Truth understands 'I do not do anything at

all', even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening the eye and closing the eye" declares Lord Krishna, in the Bhagavadh Githa (Verses 8 & 9 - Chapter V.)

The body-mind complex has a relationship with the world and nobody can stop their relationship. But 'I' am 'out of bounds'. This is the truth.

But, unfortunately, most people do not seem to claim this truth even after several years of *Vedhaanthic* study. If the guru asks "are you *muktha*: now?", the *sishtyaa* will hesitate to accept his state of liberation and may even blame *praarabhdhaa* for preventing him from being a *muktha*: | This is because of the unfortunate fact that he relates to *anaathmaa* and judges himself based on the conditions of miserable *anaathmaa*.

This tendency to base one's judgment on *anaathmaa* indicates that one relates oneself to *anaathmaa* – the first relationship, being with the mind and the body. And when one's mind is turbulent, one says "I am not liberated, because my mind is turbulent". This statement only shows that one has committed the fundamental mistake of connecting oneself with one's mind. This is called *moolaavidhyaa*.

112. Chapter III- Verses 1 (27-09-2008)

In this introduction (to chapter 3), Sureswaraacharya is discussing *moolaavidhya*, which is the cause of the entire universe, which universe consists of *karmavyavahaara thriputi* and *jnaanavyavahaara thriputi*.

The *Advaita aacharyaas* assert, that, *moolaavidhya* is the cause for / Creator of the entire universe, because of two reasons.

The first reason is that the *Upanishads* negate the entire universe as 'not *factually* existent , but only *seemingly* existent'; whatever is negated as a non-fact has to be only *mithyaa vasthu* ; and, whatever is *mithyaa*, should be caused by *avidhya* only. This is the logical reasoning.

To express the same in other words: "*Sruthi* negates the world; therefore, world is *mithyaa*; what is *mithyaa*, can be created **only** by *ajnaanam*; therefore, *moolaavidhya* is the cause of the *dvaithaprapancha*." This is one argument.

The second argument: The *Upanishads* assert that, when a person attains *aathma jnaanam*, then, in his vision, there is no *anaathmaa* at all, other than *aathmaa*.

As an example, the *Upanishadic vaakyam* "*sarvaani boothaani aathmaa eva abooth vijaanatha*." is considered. In this *vaakyam*, every word is extremely important. The word '*vijaanatha*.' means 'for a wise person' and '*sarvaani boothaani aathmaa eva abooth*' means 'everything is *aathma*'. The *vaakyam*, therefore, means, 'For a wise person, there is no *anaathmaa* at all'.

When this statement, viz., 'A wise person does not have *anaathma*', is made, what does one derive from the statement? The statement indirectly means that '*anaathmaa* is a product of ignorance'.

In further clarification: a wise person is one who has 'destroyed' ignorance; the above statement, therefore, in effect, conveys, that 'when ignorance is destroyed, *anaathmaa* is negated'; which, in turn, implies '*anaathmaa* is a product of ignorance'. Therefore also (i.e., because of such statements also) we come to know that *moolaavidhya* is the cause of the entire *anaathma prapancha*.

Now, Sureswaraacharya wants to discuss, as to what is the locus of this *moolaavidhya* and also what is the object of *moolaavidhya*, because (as discussed already) ignorance

requires a sentient locus and ignorance always requires an object also. That is going to be the discussion, for which the *Aachaaryaa* is preparing the ground.

Reverting to the text, the third line of the 'Introductory' *gadyam* to the 3rd chapter:

- तयोः - Between those two things, (which were discussed in the 2nd chapter),

What were those two things? One was *mithyaa adhyaasa:*, the false superimposition, otherwise called *jada anaathmaa*. The second component was *kootastha aathmaa*, the changeless, sentient *aathmaa*.

- मिथ्या अध्यास कूटस्थ अत्मनोः - viz. the *jada anaathmaa* and the *chethana aathmaa*,
- संबन्धः न एव भवति(- a relationship is never possible,
- अज्ञानं अन्तरेण – without *moolaavidhya*, the basic ignorance ,

In the normal course, *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* cannot have any relationship. What is the reason? Not one, but, several reasons can be given, out of which two are important.

The first reason: *aathmaa* is of the higher order of reality and *anaathmaa* is of the lower order. Two things belonging to different orders of reality cannot have any relationship / *sambhandhaa*.

The second reason: The Upanishad itself clearly says 'aathmaa asanghasvaroopa:'| In its *svayamjyothi brahmanam*, *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* repeatedly asserts 'asangho hi ayam purusha:' | 'asangha:' means 'without relationship'. How can the *asangha aathmaa* have relationship with *anaathmaa*? Therefore, relationship is not possible between *aathmaa* and *anaathma*.

But, even though relationship is, thus, logically and also according to scriptures, not possible, we do experience a relationship between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. How do we experience it? i.e., how is the 'relationship' expressed? An instance : when one claims "I am a male (or a female)", 'I', the *aathmaa*, has associated 'myself' with the body *anaathmaa*, because it is only the body which has a gender, whereas *aathmaa* does not have any gender. Without 'body association', one can never talk about *purushathvam* or *sthreethvam*. Therefore, when one claims "I am *purusha: / sthree* etc.", it shows the *deha/anaathma sambhandhaa* with 'myself' / the *aathmaa*.

One more instance of the false relationship: Even after a long and thorough study of *Vedhaantha*, many students have got *vipareetha bhaavanaa* problems, which is height of ignorance; the *vipareetha bhaavanaa* belongs to *antha:karanam*, the mind; but, the student is wrongly associating himself with the *antha: karanam* and manages to successfully postpone liberation, saying " I am an ordinary student; I have got several *viparaatha bhaavanaas* to cross over". This is another instance of *aathma-anaathma sambhandha*: |

Thus, logically, *aathma-anaathma sambhandha* is not possible; but, experientially *aathma-anaathma sambhandha* is available. How is *that* incongruity explained?

Sureswaraachaarya answers: "Where something is logically impossible, but, when experientially it is available, in all such cases, the culprit is 'ignorance'. Wherever something is logically impossible and it is experientially *made* possible - the 'impossible' is made 'possible', only by *avidhya*".

Therefore, the *aachaaryaa* says '*ajnaanam antharena*' meaning 'without *moolaavidhya*, the basic ignorance'.

'*Antharena*' means 'without'; '*ajnaanam*' means '*moolaavidhya*'; *na* means 'this relationship is never possible'.

No relationship is possible between 'me' and the body, without *ajnaanam*.

Adhyaasa Bhashyam of *Brahma soothraas* starts with this impossible relationship between 'me' and anything in creation. The *ajnaani samsaari* has created a deep relationship with a number of people and objects and, then, also has a problem in withdrawing the relationship. Direct relationship is with *sareeram* and more powerful relationship is with family – *sareera sambhandhaa* and family *sambhandhaa*.

Both these illogical relationships are now so strong, that, in spite of the *guru* repeatedly drilling the student, "you are the *asangha aathmaa / nithya muktha aathmaa*" and the student nodding his head vigorously as though in complete understanding and total agreement, in actual practice, when a family problem arises, he forgets the *guru's* teachings and 'suffers' the problem, failing to claim his *Mokshaa* state.

Vedhaantha asks: "Where is 'family' possible for you? *aathmaa* is natural *sanyaasi* ; therefore, you are all *sanyastha aathmaas*. Where do you have the problem?"

But, if the seeker still has the problem, to whom does this glory of creating the problem belong?

The *Aachaaryaa* answers: *Antharena ajnaanam sambhandha: na* - Without ignorance, relationship is not possible.

- अन्यत्र - except in another situation,

Now, Sureswaraachaarya says there *is* an exception to the general rule, 'illogical connections can be brought about only by ignorance'.

"Illogical connections can be brought about only by ignorance" was his earlier statement. Now, he makes an exception. He says "other than ignorance, there is another situation also, where illogical relationships can be brought about".

What is that situation / occasion? The *Aachaaryaa* answers, that, all the *upaasanaas* are also illogical relationships, but, with an important difference; they are deliberately brought about by the *upaasakaa*, at the time of the practice of *upaasanaa*.

How does he say so? Because, in every *upaasanaa*, the *Upaasakaa* takes an inert (*achethanam*) object as *aalambanam*, and superimposes a deity (which is *chethanam* or live) on the *aalambanam*. For instance, he makes a conical image, using turmeric powder and commences his *Pooja* with the well known incantation '*asmin haridhraa bhimbe sumukam aavaahayaam!*'. Whether turmeric powder, or *saaligraamaa* or *siva linghaa* – all the *aalambanams* for *upaasanaa* are *jada roopam*. On the *achethanam*, *chethana* is never possible. But, what does the *Upaasakaa* do, at the time of *Pooja*? He is bringing in, an impossible relationship; he deliberately superimposes a *chethana* deity - *Vinaayaka / Vishnu / Siva* etc. – on the *jada / achethana aalambanam* of turmeric or *saaligraamaa* or *siva linghaa*.

Not only that – later, the *Upaasakaa* offers food also to the *aalambanam*; claiming that the deity has got hunger, he offers food to the inert stone or metal. During this action also, *achethanam* and *chethanam* are connected.

But, here, i.e., during *Upaasanaa*, when, admittedly an illogical relationship is created, the cause for this illogical relationship is not 'ignorance'. Then, what is the cause? *Saasthra vidhi* is the cause.

Thus, illogical relationships can be brought about by two causes; one cause is 'ignorance' and the second is '*saasthric* injunction'. 'Ignorance-created illogical relationship' is called '*adhyasa:*' | The other type of relationship – *vidhi janitha sambhandhaa* - results during *upaasanaa*.

In the case of *aathma-anaathma sambhandhaa*, which one is the cause? Is it *Vidhi* or *ajnaanam*? (In this context, the word '*vidhi*' does not mean 'fate', but, means '*saasthric* injunction'). Sureswaraacharya's answer: In the case of *aathma-anaathma sambhandhaa*, *vidhi* is not the cause; *ajnaanam* **alone** is the cause.

How does one know? How can one assert that the cause is only *ajnaanam* and not *saasthravidhi*? Obviously because, even before studying *saasthraas*, the individual has associated oneself (*aathmaa*) with the body (*anaathmaa*).

In the case of *aathma-anaathma* association, it is not a deliberate association, caused by *saasthric* injunction, but one caused by *ajnaanam* only.

Incidentally, all these are very elaborately discussed by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in his *Githa Bhaashyam*, in the context of the popular verse '*sarvadharmaan parithyajya maamekam saranam vraja*'; and, also, in his *Brahma soothra bhaashyam*, when he comments on the *thaththu samanvaya soothram*. *Sankaracharya* revels in this topic.

Sureswaraacharya also says, "in the case of *aathma-anaathmaa- sambhandhaa*, *ajnaanam* alone is the cause of the *sambhandhaa*, though there is an exception".

anyathra - except on a different occasion, (viz., *Upaasanaas* where an illogical relationship is brought about by *vedic* injunctions),

And, Sureswaraacharya gives examples of the occasion, where *Vedic* injunction is the cause for 'mixing' the impossible. What are those examples?

- यथा - when (the visualizations),
- "इयं एव र्ग् अग्निः साम इति - "this (earth) surely is Rk; fire is saama" etc., (are brought about),

This quotation is taken from *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* (I.vi. 1); in this *manthraa*, the *Upanishad* is prescribing an *Upaasanaa*; the *Upaasanaa* enjoins the *Upaasakaa* to 'visualize upon a *rik manthra* the *prithvi thathvam* or the earth principle'. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* writes in his relevant commentary "*richi prithivi dhrushti: kaaryaa*" – "upon a *rik manthraa*, one has to visualize the entire *prithvi thathvam*".

Here, the *Upaasakaa* is to 'connect' a *manthraa* and *prithvi*. *Prithvi* is 'huge'; and, in comparison, a *manthraa* is small. The 'visualization of the huge *prithvi* on a small *manthraa*'

is, therefore, illogical. But, still the *Upaasakaa* makes the 'connection' or 'association' between the two, by *upaasanaa*. On what authority?

- चोदनापरिप्रापितात् - because of the instruction of Vedic injunctions.

Chodhanaa – Vedic injunction; *paripraapithaath* – because of instructions.

Because of the instruction of the *veda*, the impossible pair – *rik* and *bhoomi* – are 'connected', by the *upaasakaa*.

What is the second example?

'*Agni: saama*' - Upon a *saama manthraa*, one has to visualize the *agni thathvam* - the *agni* element. A *manthraa* and fire can never be associated or be equal; *manthraa* is not 'hot'; *agni* is hot; but, even though they do not have any relationship, this *upaasakaa* brings them together and sees a *saama manthraa* as *agni*. Why does he do that? Not because of ignorance, but, because of Vedic injunction / *chodhanaa paripraapithaath*.

Anyathra sambhandha: bhavathi chodhanaa paripraapithaath – in other cases, (illogical) relationships are caused, because of the instruction of Vedic injunctions.

Anyathra - in other cases.

But, in the case of *aathma-anaathma-sambhandhaa*, the 'connection' or 'relationship' is not because of *veda vidhi*. Then, how does this 'relationship' result? *Moolaavidhyaa* is the culprit.

And, what are the consequences? As long as *moolaavidhyaa* continues, the *anaathma sambhandhaa* will also continue; as long as *anaathma sambhandhaa* continues, one will be a *jeeva*; as long as one is a *jeeva*, the 'real' world will continue; and as long as the 'real' world is there, *samsaaraa* cannot be solved.

(As mentioned in an earlier context, if the world is deemed 'real', even *Bhagavaan* will become a *samsaari*. How? Explained thus: No doubt, it is *Bhagavaan* Who creates the sufferings and also distributes the sufferings according to the law of Karma; but, not stopping with creating and distributing the sufferings, while a *jeeva* is exposed only to a portion of the sufferings created by *Bhagavaan*, *Bhagavaan*, being omniscient, will have to be aware of *all* the sufferings of *all* the beings in *all* the fourteen *lokaas*. And, because of this, if world and sufferings are 'real', *Bhagavaan* Himself, being also compassionate, can never have peace of mind.)

As long as one is a *jeeva*, world will be 'real' and sufferings will be 'real'; therefore, *jeevathvam* should go away; triangular (*jeeva – Isvara – jagath*) format has to be discarded. The seeker has to come to *aathmathvam*; that is possible only when the seeker dissociates from family / from his own body / from his mind/ from all the turbulences of the mind. This dissociation or *asangathvam* **alone** is the solution. That (*asangathvam*) will come only when *ajnaanam* is removed.

The *Advaita Vedhaanthin* challenges: "Try to get *mokshaa* by any other method. Let me see". In fact, his challenge is even to *Bhagavaan*: "Oh Lord, even You can be free, only if You falsify the universe; otherwise, You also will never have peace of mind, because You are ever aware of Your devotees undergoing sufferings".

"Therefore, the only solution is *Naishkarmya Siddhi*" declares Sureswaraacharya.

Further *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 1:

तच्चाज्ञानम् स्वात्माननिमित्तं न संभवतीति कस्यचित्कस्मिंश्चित्विषये भवतीत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् ।

That ignorance cannot be a self-existent principle and therefore, it must be admitted that it belongs to some subject of knowledge and is concerning some object of knowledge.

Here alone, Sureswaraacharya introduces the *aasrayaa* and *vishayaa*. He says "*ajnaanam* can never exist independently - any type of ignorance, including *moolaavidhyaa*".

This introduction is, of course, the discussion of *moolaavidhyaa* – not any other worldly ignorance. The *Aachaaryaa* is talking about *moolaavidhyaa*, the creator of the mind itself.

But, whether it is *moolaavidhyaa* or *kaaryaavidhya* - (other types of ignorance , viz., ignorance of worldly matters are called *kaaryaavidhyaa*) - any ignorance depends on two factors to survive. This was discussed in the previous sessions also.

The two factors are: (1) 'Ignorance of what?' and (2) 'Ignorance in which person'? A sentient being alone can be ignorant; i.e., a sentient 'locus' is required; and also an 'object' is required. The locus is called *aasrayaa* and the object is called *vishaya*:. Without these two, one can never talk about ignorance.

A simple example from mundane experiences: When an individual seeks to join a college for further studies, the basic questions asked of the individual, are (i) 'the name and details of the applicant' ("who wants ignorance removed?") and (2) 'which course does the applicant want to study?' ("which particular ignorance, do you want to be removed?"). The name of

the applicant indicates the *aasrayaa* and the course of study opted for, indicates the *vishaayaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, making a threadbare, thorough and systematic analysis, says *moolaavidhyaa* also must have an *aasrayaa* and a *vishayaa*.

- तत् च अत्रानं - That *moolaavidhyaa*
- न सम्भवति - is never possible / can never exist
- स्वात्ममात्रनिमित्तं - depending on itself ;

In this context, the word *svaathmaa* does not indicate the *sacchidhaananda aathma*; it is used, in this context, as a reflective pronoun.

Aathmaa is self dependent or independent, whereas *ajnaanam* is never self-dependent and therefore cannot exist depending on itself and therefore :

- कस्यचित् कस्मिंश्चित् विषये) एव (भवति - (*moolaavidhyaa*) is possible (only) for a particular individual and should be of some particular object;

'*Kasyachith*' means that 'ignorance should belong to someone / some sentient entity', who becomes the locus or *aasrayaa* of the *moolaavidhyaa* i.e., '*kasyachith*' refers to *aasrayaa* .

'*Kasmimschith vishaye*' means 'about some object or other' / 'with regard to some object or other'.

- इति अभ्युपगन्तव्यं - everyone will have to accept this fact (that *moolaavidhyaa* requires *aasrayaa* and *vishayaa*).

The next step is to find out as to what is the *aasrayaa* and what is the *vishayaa* of the *moolaavidhyaa*.

Further *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 1:

इह च पदार्थद्वयं निर्दारितमात्मानात्मा च ।

We have determined that there are two categories, the Self and the non-Self.

- Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Our job is made simpler, based on the 2nd chapter; because, in the 2nd chapter, we have divided the entire cosmos into two basic principles. Instead of

enumerating all the various objects and individuals – which are both infinite in number - we have reduced the entire cosmos into two basic things, Consciousness and Matter – *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*; this means that our search need be confined to only the two of them. *Moolaavidhyaa assrayaa* will have to be chosen out of these two only; and so also *moolaavidhyaa vishayaa*".

In other words, "Is *aathmaa* the *moolaavidhyaa aasraya-vishayaa*? Or is *anaathmaa* the *moolaavidhyaa aasraya- vishayaa*?" are the only two questions to be answered.

- ईह च - In this *Vedantic field*
- पदार्थद्वयं निर्धारितम् - we have arrived at two basic entities,

'*Nirdhaaritham*' means 'have been arrived at'.

Where? Ans: In the 2nd chapter. The subject of the entire 2nd chapter was *aathma-anaathma-vivekaa* .

And, what are those two entities?

- आत्मा अनात्मा च - the Self and the non-Self.

In the following portions, the *Aachaaryaa* discusses *anaathmaa* first and rules out the possibility of *anaathmaa* being *aasrayaa* or *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. He first asks the question "is *anaathmaa moolaavidhyaa aasrayaa*? " and then the second question "is *anaathmaa* the *moolaavidhyaa vishayaa*?". He negates both possibilities and establishes that *anaathmaa* is neither *aasrayaa* nor *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*.

Thereafter, he takes up the discussion on *aathmaa* and proves that *aathmaa* is the *moolaavidhyaa aasrayaa* and *aathmaa* is the *moolaavidhyaa vishayaa* also. In short, "Aathmaasrithaa aathmavishayakaa moolaavidhyaa".

The first topic (of the four topics enumerated in the last paragraph):

Further *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 1:

तत्र अनात्मनस्तावत् न अजानेन अभिसंबन्धः।

Of the two, it is evident that the non-Self cannot be the locus of ignorance.

- तत्र - Among those two padhaarthaas,
- तावत् - firstly / basically / evidently,
- अनात्मनः अज्ञानेन न अभिसंबन्धः - anaathmaa cannot be related to *moolaavidhyaa*, as its *aasrayaa*.

The language used by the *Aaachaaryaa*, to drive home his message, is rather devious. Instead of directly stating "*anaathmaa* is not the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*", he says: "*anaathmaa* cannot be / is not related to *moolaavidhyaa*, as its *aasrayaa*", which, in effect, means "*anaathmaa* is not the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*". In *Tharka saasthraa* language, the same simple message will be stated as: "*anaathmaa* and *moolaavidhya* cannot have *aasraya-aasrayee-sambhandha*:"

- अनात्मनः - For anaathma,
- न अभिसंबन्धः - there is no relationship
- अज्ञानेन - with moolaavidhyaa.

And, why? Sureswaraachaaryaa gives four arguments to support this statement.

Argument 1:

Further (*sambhandha gadhyam*) to Verse 1:

तस्य हि स्वरूपमेवाज्ञानं न हि स्वतोऽज्ञानस्याज्ञानं घटते ।

Its very nature is ignorance and surely there could be no additional ignorance in a locus which is itself of the nature of ignorance.

What is the first argument?

The *Aachaaryaa* says "the entire *anaathmaa* (i.e. 'matter') itself, is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*. *Moolaavidhyaa* is *kaaranam*; *anaathmaa* is *kaaryam*. And, we know the general rule that any product will have its essential nature as its cause only. Cause alone is the *svaroopam* of the effect – just as gold is the essential nature of all ornaments and wood is the essential nature of all furniture. Since, *moolaavidhyaa* is *kaaranam* and *anaathmaa* is *kaaryam*, *moolaavidhyaa* alone must be the essential nature of *anaathmaa*. Therefore, *anaathmaa* is essentially *moolaavidhyaa* only, just as the 'snake' (in the *rajju sarpa* example) is nothing but 'condensed ignorance' alone, since it is ignorance alone which is projecting the snake on the rope. Therefore, any projection has its nature as ignorance. That's why when the ignorance is negated, projection also goes away. All projections have

ignorance as their essential nature. And, therefore" the *Aachaaryaa* argues "*anaathmaa* being *ajnaana janyam*, is *ajnaana svaroopam* / essentially *ajnaanam*. Since *anaathmaa* itself is, thus, essentially *ajnaanam*, how can it be said that *anaathmaa* is the locus of *ajnaanam*, which is equivalent to saying *ajnaanam* itself is the locus of *ajnaanam*?"

Obviously, *ajnaanam* cannot be 'located' in *ajnaanam* itself, just as 'clay' is not located in the 'pot' and 'gold' is not located in the 'ornament', whereas it is the other way about – 'pot' is nothing but essentially 'clay' only and in the same manner, there is no 'ornament' other than 'gold' (clay is the *aasrayaa* for pot and gold is the *aasrayaa* for ornaments.)

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa argues "*anaathmaa* being *ajnaanam* itself, how can *ajnaanam* be located in *ajnaanam*?".

- तस्य हि - Evidently, for the *anaathmaa*,
- स्वरूपं एव - the very nature is
- अज्ञानं - *ajnaanam* / *moolaavidhyaa*;

Why do we say so? Sureswaraachaaryaa does not give the logic here. He only says "*ajnaanam* is the *svaroopam* of *anaathmaa*". He does not explain why. The student has to supply the reason: "because *anaathmaa* is a product of *ajnaanam* and a product will always have its cause as its nature ".

The *Aachaaryaa* proceeds with the argument:

- स्वतः अज्ञानस्य अज्ञानं न हि घटते - and 'ajnaanam itself having Ajnaanam' is not possible .

"*Ajnaanam* cannot have *ajnaanam*" means "*ajnaanam* cannot be located in *ajnaaam*" / In this statement, one '*ajnaanam*' refers to *anaathmaa* and the other '*ajnaanam*' means *moolaavidhyaa*. In other words, *anaathma roopa ajnaanam* cannot be the locus of *moolaavidhyaa roopa ajnaanam*. They, being cause and effect, are essentially one and therefore, cannot have *aasraya-aasrayee- sambhandha*.

Na ghatathe – na sambhavathi / not possible; Svatha: - by itself.

This is the first argument. What is the second argument?

Further (*sambhandha gadhyam*) to Verse 1:

संभवदप्यजानस्वभावेऽजानं किं अतिशयं जनयेत्।

Even if this were possible, what new feature could this further ignorance add to the original ignorance?

The second argument is *abhyupethya vaadha*: - which means a 'hypothetical argument', temporarily accepting the *poorva pakshin's* contention, that, *moolaavidhyaa* is located in *anaathmaa* . '*Moolaavidhyaa* cannot be located in *anaathmaad* **is** the fact. But, hypothetically, for the sake of argument, let us assume that *moolaavidhyaa* is located in *anaathmaa* . Sureswaraacharya says that even if it is accepted, that acceptance will not be of any consequence. Acceptance of 'ignorance for / of *anaathmaad*' is of no consequence ; no positive or negative benefit will result, which, means, that, by that discussion nobody will get any benefit.

Why is it so? Sureswaraacharya argues that the entire *anaathmaa* is *jadam* – it is insentient entity. Making a statement that an insentient entity has got ignorance (for instance, saying 'the clip on the table is ignorant of the presence of people around it') is not going to make any difference at all, based on the following reasoning.

Ignorance has got threefold functions and it cannot perform any one of them, by locating in insentient matter.

What are the three functions?

First function of ignorance is 'obstructing knowledge', which is called *aavaranam* / obstruction / covering / concealing / thwarting etc. (*jnaana nivaarakathvam*)

The second function of ignorance is 'creation / generation / production of doubts' – *samsaya janakathvam*.

The third function is *viparyaya janakathvam* – 'creating errors'.

What is the difference between 'doubt' and 'error'?

In 'doubt', there is no conclusion. 'Doubtful' means 'being non-conclusive'. In the well-known *rajju-sarpaa* example, the rope is seen by the individual in 'doubt', who asks, "Is it a snake or is it a garland or is it a crack on the floor? etc." Such vacillation is called 'doubt'.

Whereas, in 'error', there is no vacillation; the individual is definite (certain) – but, is erroneously definite (certain). The individual, when in 'error', swears that 'this (the rope) is snake and snake alone'. Such 'error' is also produced by *ajnaanam*.

But, ignorance cannot perform any of these three functions.(jnaana nivaarakathvam or samsaya janakathvam or viparyaya janakathvam) on insentient matter. For example, if you say 'this clip has got ignorance', ignorance cannot 'obstruct' knowledge, because the clip can never attain knowledge. Only if the clip is capable of attaining knowledge, there is the possibility of ignorance 'obstructing' the knowledge. In the same manner, the clip cannot have 'doubts' or 'errors' also. Therefore, 'ajnaanam being located in achethana vasthu' is of no consequence.

Thus, the argument is: *Ajnaanam* being located in an insentient locus is of no consequence, because, its presence or its absence will not make any difference.

Therefore Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- संभवत् अपि - Even if ajnaanam is located / possible (in anaathma),

'In *anaathmaa*' is to be supplied. And, there can, of course, be no doubt that *anaathmaa* is *achethanam*.

- किं अतिशयं जनयेत् - what difference will it make (to the anaathmaa) ?

Athisayam – difference / consequence / addition.

If ignorance is deemed to be located in *anaathmaa*, which *anaathmaa* is of the nature of *moolaavidhyaa* and which *anaathmaa* is also of *jadasvaroopam*, it is not even worth discussing and therefore, you cannot accept that *ajnaanam* is located in *anaathmaa*. This is the second argument.

113. Chapter III- Verses 1 (04-10-2008)

In this introduction to the 3rd chapter, Sureswaraacharya is discussing *moolaa avidhyaa*, otherwise known as 'primal ignorance', which is the same as *maayaa* or *prakruthi*.

Religions talk of 'Creations' and a 'Creator-God'. *Sanaathana Dharmaa* also does. And, in *Sanaathana Dharmaa*, when we talk about 'Creations from / by God', at that time, the *Advaithin* defines the Creator / *Isvara*, as '*Brahman + maayaad*'. *Brahman* being *chaithanyam*, '*chiathanyam + maayaad*' is the Creator, *Isvara*. And, at this stage, we talk about *srushti* as starting from someone else called *Isvara*.

But, later, in *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*, we should gradually change that mindset. Instead of looking at the Creation as a product from someone else, we have to shift the mindset gradually to see that ultimately Creation is not from someone else, but, it is from 'me' only.

'Creation-from-*Isvara*' concept should gradually change to 'creation-from-myself' concept. Then alone *mahaavaakyam* will be effective. The *Upanishadic manthraas*, such as, '*Mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathistitham*' etc., must become absolute facts for the serious student of *Vedhaanthaa*; this is important, because, during the early stages of a religious life, when Creation is talked about, the tendency is to conceive of a Creator, sitting beyond the clouds, in *Vaikunta* or *Kailasa* and 'throwing down the fourteen *lokaas* ; and, understandably it is difficult to change the concept, all of a sudden. But, the concept *must* be gradually changed by effort. Instead of seeing the Creation as generated by someone outside, I should learn to look at the Creation as 'my' own product.

When in the initial stages of teaching, we say "world is born out of *Isvara*", the Creator, *Isvara*, is '*chaithanyam + maayaad*', as already mentioned. And , now, in the advanced texts of *Vedhaanthaa*, we say "the world is born out of myself", which is '*chaithanyam + moolaa avidhyaad*' ; instead of *maayaa*, we change the word to *moolaa avidhyaa* . We start with '*chaithanyam + mayaad*' and later move to '*chaithanyam + moolaa avidhyaad*', as the cause of this Creation.

And the only difference is: When we use the word *maayaa* associated with *Isvara*, we talk about only the *vikshepa sakthi*; *aavarana sakthi* is not talked about, because, in the context of *Isvara*, *aavarana sakthi* should not be brought in.

But, when we start saying that Creation is from ourselves or the Self, the word *maayaa* should be changed to *moolaa avidhyaa*, because, here, not only *vikshepa sakthi*, but, the

aavarana sakthi is also operational. Therefore, we change the word to *moolaa avidhyaa*, to denote the inclusion of *aavarana sakthi* also.

But, for all practical purposes, *maayaa* = *prakruthi* = *moolaa avidhyaa*, which is the cause of the whole creation. And, *maayaa* and Creation are both *mithyaa* only – negatable by knowledge. Similarly, *moolaa avidhyaa* and Creation are also both negatable by knowledge. As far as the *mithyaa* status is concerned, there is no difference between *maayaa* and *moolaa avidhyaa*. *Maayaa* is also negatable by *chaithanya jnaanam*. *Moolaa avidhyaa* is also negatable by the *jnaanam* of *chaithanyam*.

When the seeker thus shifts from *maayaa* to *moolaa avidhyaa*, he learns to see that “‘I’, the Self, am the projector of the entire universe”. Just as sleep is responsible for the projection / creation of the *svapna–thriputi*, *moolaa avidhyaa* (the philosophical sleep) is responsible / cause for the projection of the *jaagrath thriputi*.

‘I’, myself, through *moolaavidhyaa* project this universe. (The term, ‘I’, means the *chaithanyam*.) With the help of *moolaavidhyaa*, ‘I’ project this universe, become an individual and as an individual, through sleep, I project the dream-*thriputi* and become a dream individual. Through *moolaavidhyaa*, I have become a waker / *jaagrath* individual and through dream or *nidhraa*, I become a dream individual. Thus, both *jaagrath prapanchaa* and *svapna prapanchaa* are ‘my’ own projections, ‘I’, being the *chaithanya adhishtaanam*.

This is the message that Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to present. He does not want to say that *Isvara* created the world. He wants to say “‘you’ have created the world”.

Once you talk about *moolaavidhyaa*, the primal ignorance, the questions “what is the object of ignorance?” and, “what is the locus of ignorance?” will arise. These topics of ‘object’ and ‘locus’ do not arise, in the context of the use of the word *maayaa*; i.e. there is no need or scope for discussing the ‘object’ of *maayaa* or the ‘locus’ of *maayaa*.

But, when ‘*avidhyaa*’ is talked about, naturally the questions “what is the object and what is the locus (of *avidhyaa*)?” will arise

To answer these, Sureswaraachaaryaa employs what is called the *vikalpa* method, (the term ‘*vikalpa*’ meaning ‘option’ or ‘alternative’); in this method, first you do the *vikalpa* (i.e. look at the various options) and then discuss the various possibilities one by one and also rule them out one by one; and, whatever is left behind, without getting ruled out, will be, *paarishesha nyaayena*, the ‘culprit’.

And, the *Aachaaryaa* had said "our search (for the 'object' and the 'locus' of *avidhyaa*) is within only two entities – *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*".

Of these two possibilities, the *Aachaarya* is taking *anaathmaa* first, for enquiry. His first question is : "Is *anaathmaa* the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*?" and later, his second question will be : "Is *anaathmaa* the *vishayaa* of the *moolaavidhyaa*?" After dismissing both possibilities, he moves on to the questions: "Is *aathmaa* the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*?" and "Is *aathmaa* the *vishayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*?"

Of these four questions, we are now discussing the first question: "Is *anaathmaa* the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*?"

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa answers "*anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa*" and gives four reasons in support of his averment.

Of these four reasons, two have already been discussed (in the earlier class).

Reasoning (1) was as follows :

Step (1): *Anaathmaa* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*. Why does one say so?

Because, *Anaathmaa* is negatable by knowledge. But, again, how does one know *this*? Because of *Sruthi*, which says "for the wise person *aathmaa* **alone** is; *anaathmaa* does not exist 'factually', though 'experienced', **for a wise person**". This is *Upanishadic* statement ; from this statement, that, 'a wise person does not have *anaathmaa*' , it follows, that, 'wisdom' should have negated *anaathmaa*; and, if, thus, 'wisdom' negates *anaathmaa*, obviously, *anaathmaa* must be a product of ignorance (the opposite of wisdom) or *avidhyaa*.

Having recognized this fact, that, '*Anaathmaa* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*', the student should go to step (2) below. \

Step (2): If the entire *anathmaa* is, thus, a *product* of ignorance, then *anaathmaa* must be of the *nature* of ignorance. This is based on the law, 'a product born out of a cause will have the nature of the cause'. This law "any product should have the essential nature of the cause", is exemplified by 'clay pots', which have the nature of the clay, which is their cause. In the same manner, the entire *anaathmaa* being *ajnaana kaaranam*, must be *ajnaana svaroopam*. To express it logically, in Sanskrit: "*Anaathmaa ajnaasvaroopam: ajnaana kaaryathvaath; yathaa mrudhkaarya bootha: ghata: mrudhroopa: bhavathi, thathaa ajnaanakaarya bootha: anaathmaa, ajnaanaroopam: bhavathi.*"

Step 3: And, therefore, since *anaathmaa* is essentially *ajnaanam* itself, *anaathmaa* cannot be the locus of *ajnaanam*. If it is claimed that *anaathmaa* is the locus of *ajnaanam*, it will amount to saying "*ajnaanam* is the locus of *ajnaanam*", which is called *aathmaaasraya doshaa*, in *tharka sasthan* language.

Thus, the first argument is "*anathamana: ajnaana svaroopathvaath ajnaam eva ajnaasya aasraya: bhavithum na arhathi*". (As indicated earlier, this was covered in the last class).

Reasoning (2): "*sambhavadhapi ajnaanasvabhaave ajnaanam kimathisayam janayeth*". What does this statement mean? (It means:) "Even if, for argument's sake, hypothetically, we say '*anaathmaa* is the locus of *ajnaanam*', then, that conclusion will have no consequence".

Therefore, entertaining such a concept, viz., '*anaathmaa* is the locus of *ajnaanam*' does not have any philosophical significance at all.

But, why is it, that, this concept, that, "*anaathmaa* is the locus of *ajnaanam*" (even if true) will not have any consequence / does not make any difference ?

(Explanation:) The job of ignorance is threefold:

- (1) obstructing knowledge (*jnaana prathibhandha*);
- (2) generating doubt (*samsaya uthpaathi*:) and
- (3) generating error (*viparyaya uthpatthi*:).

These are the three functions of ignorance; but, ignorance can do these three functions, only if it is located in a sentient being. In an insentient *anaathmaa*, there is no scope for knowledge itself; when there is not even scope for knowledge, why should or how could ignorance 'obstruct' knowledge?

(A simple example is given to make this clear:) If an individual is moving on the road, there is scope for somebody stopping the individual's movement ; but, if the individual is not moving at all, where is the scope of anybody 'stopping' his movement ?

In the same manner, **in an insentient entity**, in which, there is no scope for knowledge at all, *ajnaanam* cannot obstruct knowledge; and consequently, it cannot generate doubt or error also. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks "*sambhavadhapi ajnaanasvabhaave ajnaanam kim athisayam janayeth*"

- संभवदपि - Even if this happens i.e. even if *ajnaanam* is present in *anaathmaa*,

The term '*Sambhavath'* qualifies '*ajnaanam'*; i.e. it is '*viseshanam'* to *ajnaanam* ; and '*api'* means 'even if', indicating 'purely hypothetical'.

- अज्ञानं किं अतिशयं जनयेत् - what consequence would that (further) ajnaanam generate,
- अज्ञानस्वभावे - to the original ajnaanam (viz., anaathmaa).

Athisaya: - (in this context) means 'consequential effect'.

The second argument continues i.e., the above statement is further explained.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 :

न च तत्र ज्ञानप्राप्तिरस्ति येन तत्प्रतिषेधात्मकमज्ञानं स्यात् ।

The non-Self could never acquire knowledge and only if the possibility of knowledge is there, could there be ignorance of the nature of the privation of knowledge.

This is the explanation of '*kim athisayam janayeth'*. The word '*kim'* is not *prasnaarthe* but *aaksehpaarthe* - i.e., it is not a question, but, only a statement of objection. Though the literal meaning of '*kim athisayam janayeth'*, is "what consequence will ignorance generate in inert matter?", it is not a question. It is an averment "no consequence can it generate".

- तत्र - In that inert / insentient anaathmaa,
- ज्ञानप्राप्तिः न अस्ति - there is no scope for the acquisition of knowledge,
- येन - only because of which viz., 'scope for acquisition of knowledge',
- तत्प्रतिषेधात्मकम् अज्ञानं स्यात् - there can be meaning for the presence of ignorance.

Only if there is scope for 'acquisition of knowledge', there is scope also for 'ignorance stopping acquisition of knowledge'. Since there is no scope for 'acquisition of knowledge', in the matter of *anaathma*, there is no scope for 'ignorance stopping acquisition of knowledge' also.

'*Syaath'* means 'there would have been'. *Thath prathishedhaathmakam ajnaanam syaath* means 'there would have been the function of ignorance, in the form of obstructing the possible arrival of knowledge'.

When there is no possibility of 'knowledge' itself, there can be no scope for its 'obstruction'.

Thus, the second argument says "ajnaanam, even if present in 'matter', is not worth talking about, because its presence or absence in 'matter', does not make any difference at all". By having a debate as to whether a table (or any other inert entity) has ignorance or not and someone winning the debate, no benefit is to be gained.

The third argument follows.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1:

अनात्मनश्च अज्ञानप्रसूतत्वात् । न हि पूर्वसिद्धं सत् ततः लब्ध आत्मलाभस्य सेत्स्यत आश्रयस्य आश्रयी संभवति।

Further the non-Self is itself a product of ignorance. What exists already cannot be dependent on what is brought into being by itself.

This is the third argument. To establish what? The statement that "Ajnaanam cannot be located in anaathmaa." In this context, the term 'ajnaanam' does not mean 'rope ignorance' or any such other ignorance. It denotes 'moolaavidhyaa', which means 'primal ignorance'.

"Moolaavidhyaa cannot be located in anaathmaa" is the averment made by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

This third argument, in support of that averment, is the main and most important argument; the other three arguments (1,2 and 4) are supportive arguments. This third argument is easy to understand also.

The third argument runs on the following lines: "It has been shown that anaathmaa is a product of moolaavidhyaa; conversely, moolaavidhyaa (ajnaanam) is the cause of anaathmaa. Naturally, 'cause' must always precede the birth of 'effect'. Therefore, in this case also, the cause - 'moolaavidhyaa' must necessarily exist even before the birth of the effect - anaathmaa. When moolaavidhyaa is, thus, present as the cause, **before** the production of anaathmaa and anaathmaa is **not even existent**, how can that non-existent anaathmaa be the support (aasrayaa) of the already existent moolaavidhyaa?"

'Claiming Anaathmaa as the aasrayaa of moolaa vidhyaa' is similar to a person declaring immediately after his / her marriage "from to-day, I shall be regularly getting money from my son, for my livelihood". Would not such a statement be absurd, since, the 'son' is yet to be born and obviously the not-yet born son cannot be the supporter of the parent, who is already existent?

In the same manner, *moolaavidhyaa*, the parent of *anaathmaa*, but, which has not yet produced the *anaathmaa*, would require an *aasrayaa*, even before the production of *anaathmaa*, and how can the not-yet born *anaathmaa* take the role of *aasrayaa* of the already existent *moolaavidhyaa*?

Mind has not come into existence ; and, when mind itself is not there, obviously, there is no question of existence of *chidhaabhaasaa* . World is not there; mind is not there, *chidhaabhaasa* is not there . But, even before their emergence, *moolaavidhyaa* exists. What can be the *aasraya*, for that *moolaavidhyaa*? Certainly not the mind / nor the world/ nor even *chidhaabhaasa* – the constituents of *anaathmaa*. Then the *aasrayaa* must be something other than *anaathmaa*.

And, what is there, other than *anaathmaa*? Only *aathmaa* is there.

It should be remembered, that, even *Isvara*, as an 'object of worship' should be included in the world / the totality of creation. What is being discussed now, is that *moolaavidhyaa* existing even before the plurality of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* arose. Even before the emergence of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara* plurality, *moolaavidhyaa* exists and is, in fact, the cause of the plurality. So, *moolaavidhya* cannot be located even in *Isvara*, because *Isvara* Himself is to arrive only when plurality arrives.

Therefore, *moolaavidhyaa* has to be located in something other than *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*; and, other than these three, there is only *aathmaa*, the *chaithanyam*. That *aathmachaitanyam* alone, after the generation of the mind, becomes *jeeva*; that *aathmachaitanyam* alone, after the generation of the world, becomes *jagath*. *Jeeva-jagath-Isvara* will arrive later; and, as their cause, *moolaavidhyaa* is already there. Therefore, it cannot be located in any *anaathmaa*.

If it is recognized that, *Isvara* is *aathmaa* / that, *Isvara* is *nirguna chaithanyam*, then, there is no problem. Under that condition, it can be claimed that '*moolaavidhyaa* is located in *Isvara*'. But, as long as *Isvara* is something / somebody else, He also will become *anaathmaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

[anaathmana: ajnaanena na abhisambhandha: - ajnaanam cannot have (aasraya-aasrayee) relationship with anaathmaa,]

- प्रसूतत्वात् च - also, because the very birth

- अनात्मनः - of the anaathmaa
- अज्ञान(स्य) - (is from) moolaavidhyaa.

Prasootham- born out of

Anaathmaa is born out of *moolaavidhyaa*. *Moolaavidhyaa* existed even before the birth of *anaathmaa*, because it is *moolaavidhyaa*, which is actually the cause / Creator of *anaathmaa* itself. Therefore, even before the birth of *anaathmaa*, how can *moolaavidhyaa* be located in *anaathmaa*? And, therefore, it has to be located only in *aathmaa*.

'Anaathmana: cha ajnaana janyathvaath' is the samkshepa hethu: (reason given in brief).

This is being explained in the following sentence, which is a tough sentence, the construction of which is complex. The subject is itself subtle and complex. The *Aachaaryaa* uses a sentence which is also complex; mischievously, he has also left out the 'subject', in the sentence.

- (अज्ञानं) पूर्वसिद्धम् सत् - Ajnaanam / moolaavidhyaa, being existent even before the birth / arrival of *anaathmaa*,
Ajnaanam / moolaavidhyaa is the 'subject' (left out by the *Aachaaryaa*), to be supplied.
- आश्रयी न सम्भवति - cannot become the 'supported',
Moolaavidhyaa being existent even before the arrival of *anaathmaa*, cannot be the 'supported'. Of what?
- आश्रयसय) अनात्मनः (- of an anaathmaa aasrayaaa,
'*Aasrayasya*' is an adjective to '*anaathmana:*', which word also has been left out by Sureswaraachaaryaa and has to be supplied.
- सेत्स्यतः - which anaathmaa is 'going' to be born later,

'*Sethsyatha:*' is derived from the root '*sidh*' and means 'of the to-be born'. This is also an adjective to '*anaathmana:*'.

Being existent even before the birth of *anaathmaa*, the *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be 'supported' by an *anaathmaa* to be born later.

- ततः लब्धः आत्मलाभस्य - and which (anaathmaa) itself is going to attain its existence from *moolaavidhya*.

The compound term '*Thatholabhdhaathmalabhasya*' is another adjective to '*anaathmana*'.

In this sentence, there are, thus, three adjectives to the term '*anaathmana*', which term itself is not in the sentence and has to be supplied. The three adjectives are

- (1) '*thatholabhdhaathmalabhasya*' - 'which borrows existence from *avidhya*'
- (2) '*sethsyatha*' - 'which is going to come later' and
- (3) '*aasrayasya*' - 'which is (wrongly presumed to be) the support of *ajnaanam*'.

In effect, the sentence means "that *anaathmaa* which is going to be born later and which is going to get its very existence from *avidhya* later - that 'future' *anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa* for the already 'present' *moolaavidhya*".

This is the third and most important argument: " *Anaathmaa* is not yet born. How can that *anaathmaa* be the *aasrayaa* of the *ajnaanam*?"

For the word '*ajnaanam*', the adjective is '*poorva siddham*'.

'*Poorva siddham ajnaanam*' means '*ajnaanam* which is existing even before the birth (of *anaathmaa*)'. For that *ajnaanam*, how can the *anaathmaa* be the *aasrayaa*?

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1:

तदनपेक्षस्य च तस्य निस्स्वभावत्वात् ।

The non-Self has no nature of its own, independent of ignorance.

This is the fourth and final argument.

It was said earlier, that, " '*Anaathmaa*', the 'matter', which includes the mind also (it should be remembered, that, mind is also matter) and '*moolaavidhya*', the 'primal ignorance', cannot have 'supporter-supported relationship'. The statement only means that "*anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa* of *ajnaanam*", which axiom only is expressed in the technical language "*anaathmaa* and *ajnaanam* cannot have '*aasraya-aasrayee-sambhandha*' - 'supporter-supported relationship' ".

But, why?

The explanation implicit in the sentence, viz., तदनपेक्षस्य च तस्य निस्स्वभावत्वात्, *is*. “To talk about any relationship, there should be two or more things. But, *ajnaanam* and *anaathmaa* cannot be counted as two separate things, because, *ajnaanam* alone is ‘appearing’ as *anaathmaa*. *Anaathmaa* is nothing but *ajnaanam* itself. Therefore, there is no *anaathmaa*, **separate** from *ajnaanam*, to be the supporter of *ajnaanam*”.

In fact, this fourth argument is almost the same as the first argument.

Based on a similar reasoning only, it can never be said that ‘pot’ is the supporter of ‘clay’ ; pot and clay can never have ‘supporter-supported’ relationship, because ‘pot’ does not have a status separate from clay . ‘Pot’ and ‘clay’ are two names for one and the same substance. When there is, thus, no second entity, where is the question of ‘supporter-supported’ relationship? A ‘relationship’ cannot exist when there is only one substance .

In the same manner as ‘pot’ and ‘clay’, *ajnaanam* and *anaathmaa* are two names, for one and the same substance, viz., ‘matter’. *Ajnaanam* is one name of ‘matter’, though the concept is mind boggling. ‘Ignorance’ is one name of ‘matter’ and *anaathmaa* is another name of ‘matter’. Both the words, *ajnaanam* and *anaathmaa*, refer to one and the same substance. Then, where is the question of ‘*aasrayee-aasraya- sambhandha*:’?

- तस्य - For the *anaathmaa* , (‘*thasya*’, here, means ‘*anaathmana*:’)

- तदनपेक्षस्य - when separated from *ajnaanam*,

The pronoun ‘*Thadh*’ refers to ‘*ajnaanam*’; *thadh anapekshasya – ajnaanam anapekshasya*. (The pronouns used by the *Aachaaryaa* have to be carefully understood).

- निस्स्वभावत्वात् - (*soonyathvaath*) there is no existence..

Anaathmaa, the ‘product’, if and when separated from *ajnaanam*, which is its cause and essential nature, does not exist at all. It is not an entity separate from *ajnaanam*. Only if it is countable as a separate and second entity, one can say, that, the two entities have got an *aasraya-aasrayee-sambhandha*: | Once *ajnaanam* is removed, *anaathmaa* is ‘zero’, just as when clay is removed, pot is ‘zero’. Thus, when essentially, there is only one substance, where is the question of ‘two entities being related’?

[An interesting ‘aside’ :

This leads us to the mind-boggling concept of *Vedhaantha*, that, “the entire matter is nothing but ‘condensed ignorance’”. The *pancha bhoothaas*, such as, *aakaasaa*, *vaayu* etc.,

all the galaxies, anything that you name / *samastha dhrusya prapancha*: - all the 'matter' is nothing, but 'condensed ignorance'; and, in the wake of knowledge, they are as good as 'non-existent'. Matter is '**experienced but non-existent**'.

Then, if all these do not exist, what **is** there? *Vedhaantha* says "You, the Observer of the 'matter' **alone** exist"; and what is that 'you'? Not the body; nor the mind; body is also non-existent matter, mind is also non-existent matter.

Then, "who are 'you'? Or who am 'I'?" 'I' am the *chaithanyam*, which is not 'matter', which is the only non-material entity, and which was, which is and which ever will be.

Is this ignorance good or bad? The *vikshepa sakthi* of ignorance is, in fact, very good, because, because of that *sakthi* only, the 'drama' of the world goes on.

If one really analyses what is *videha mukthi*, one will find that, in *videha mukthi*, there is no creation, no *jeeva*, no mind; only Brahman will be there, which also cannot claim "'I' am Brahman"; there will be no variety / no entertainment. So, from one perspective, *vikshepa sakthi* is a 'blessing' and is not to be cursed.

Only *aavarana sakthi* is deadly, which *aavarana sakthi* has to be removed by a systematic *Vedhaanthic* study and a thorough understanding of *Vedhaantha*; and after removal of *aavarana sakthi*, *vikshepa sakthi maathra sahitha ajnaanam* is a blessing ; because, the seeker will look at the universe as a product of *vikshepa sakthi maathra sahitha* ignorance and therefore as *mithyaa* ; and also learn to let the *mithyaa* world continue, without 'negating' it.

The fifth capsule of *Vedhaantha* (as enunciated by *Swamiji*), viz., "For a person who remembers 'my' real nature, life is an entertainment. The moment 'my' real nature is forgotten, life becomes a struggle" is relevant in this context.

For such a person, who forgets 'my' true nature, body becomes real, mind becomes real, the family becomes real and 'liberation' gets postponed.

'Ignorance' is partially good and partially bad ; once *aavarana sakthi* is removed, that *moolaavidhya (aavarana sakthi rahitha moolaavidhyaa)* is called *maayaa*; the only difference is, that, we (the *jeevaas*) have to convert *moolaavidhyaa* into *maayaa*, by removing *aavarana sakthi*; whereas, in the case of *Isvara*, *moolaavidhyaa* is always *maayaa*.

The *jeevaa* is also *chaithanyam* plus *moolaavidhyaa*; *Bhagavaan* is also *chaithanyam* plus *moolaavidhyaa*. But, in the *jeevaa's* case, *aavarana sakthi* is part of the *moolaavidhyaa* and

the jeevaa has to get it removed by saasthra vicharaa, while, in the case of Bhagavaan, aavarana sakthi is ever absent.

Lord Krishna says in the Baghavadh Githa (Verse 6 – Ch. IV) : “Ajopi san avyayaathmaa (api san) bhoothaanaam isvaraopi san prakruthim svaam adhishtaaya sambhavaami aathmaa maayayaa” – “ Even though I have neither birth nor death, and even though I am the Lord of all beings, I come into being through My own Maayaa, by resorting to My Prakruthi”.

He also makes a statement (verse 13 – Ch. IV): “*karthaaram api maam viddhi akarthaaram*” – “Though I am the Creator, know Me as a ‘non-doer’ ”, meaning, “I am *seemingly* a *karthaa*; but, *in reality*, not a *karthaa*”.

A true ‘*jnaani*’ also can make this claim.

When Rama cried because of the loss of Seetha, Rama knew that his crying was also a drama. When Rama, an *avtar* of *Bhagavaan*, could cry, we, the lesser mortals need not stop ‘crying’; but, like Rama, even in the most trying circumstances, we should undergo the ordeals with the additional wisdom “ all these (sufferings) are of a lower order, but ‘I’ am of a higher order”.]

Thus, four arguments to establish that, “*anaathmaa* is not the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhya*” were given by Sureswraachaaryaa. With this, the first topic is over.

The next topic will be the enquiry “Can *anaathmaa* be the ‘object’ of ignorance?” The *Aaachaaryaa* deals with this topic in one sentence; he says “because of the same four reasons given to establish that, ‘*anaathma* cannot be the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhya*’, *anaathmaa* cannot also be the ‘object’ of *moolaavidhya*”.

114. Chapter III- Verses 1 (11-10-2008)

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

एतेभ्यः एव हेतुभ्यः नानान्त्वविषयमज्ञानं संभवतीति ग्राह्यम् ।

These very same reasons go to show that the ignorance is not about the non-Self.

Sureswaraachaarya is discussing the nature of moolaavidhyaa, which alone is the cause of the entire Creation, including the individual minds also.

When the subject of 'ignorance' (*moolaavidhyaa*) is dealt with, the discussion has to necessarily include the topics –

- (i) the 'locus' of ignorance and
- (ii) the 'object' of ignorance.

Based on that, Sureswaraachaaryaa discusses four questions:

1. Is *anaathmaa* the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*?
2. Is *anaathmaa* the object of *moolaavidhyaa*?
3. Is *aathmaa* the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*? and finally,
4. Is *aathmaa* the object of *moolaavidhyaa*?

Of these four *vikaplaas* or divisions, discussion on the first question, viz., "Is *anaathmaa* the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*?" has been completed. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa has established that *anaathmaa* cannot be the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*. In support, he gave four reasons, which have also been discussed.

Out of these four reasons or arguments, the third argument is the most powerful and also relatively easier than the other arguments. It is proposed, therefore, to recollect the third argument, so that it can be used for the discussion on the next topic also.

What is that third argument? Sureswaraachaaryaa had presented it as follows: "*anaathmaa* itself is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*. And, since *anaathmaa* is the product (*kaaryam*) and *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause (*kaaranam*), *moolaavidhyaa* must have existed even before the production of *anaathmaa*. (By the word 'production', what is meant, is 'manifestation'). And, if *moolaavidhyaa* existed even before the manifestation of *anaathmaa*, then *moolaavidhyaa* must have had some other locus before the manifestation of *anaathmaa*. And, it cannot also

be said '*moolaavidhyaa* does not at all have a locus', because *moolaavidhyaa* is also one form of *avidhyaa* (ignorance) and any type of *avidhyaa* should have a locus. Therefore, before the production of *anaathmaa*, *moolaavidhyaa* should have had an *aasrayam*, which *aasrayam* should have been something other than *anaathmaa*. Since there are only two entities in the entire Creation (*aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*), and *anaathmaa* is not yet produced or manifested, *moolaavidhyaa* should have been located in the only other available entity, viz., *aathmaa*. Therefore, we say, "*anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayam* of *moolaavidhyaa* and the *aasryam* of *moolaavidhyaa* should be *aathmaa* only".

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* is entering the second topic.

- एतेभ्यः एव हेतुभ्यः - Because of the above mentioned four reasons only,
- न अनान्तमविषयम् अज्ञानं संभवति इति ग्राह्यम् - it is understood that *anaathmaa* cannot be the 'object' of ignorance.

With '*nisvaabhaavathvaath*', the first topic, viz., '*anaathmaa* is not the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*' is over and from '*ethebhya: eva hethubhya:*', Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering the second topic.

What is the second topic? Ans: "*anaathmaa* cannot be the 'object' of ignorance also".

The compound word '*naanaathmavishayam*' has to be split very carefully. It should not be split as '*naanaa aathma vishayam*'; but, as '*na anaathma vishayam* |

Further, the emphasis is on the word '*vishayam* |

"*anaathmaa vishaya: yasya moola ajnaasya*" is '*na anaathma vishayam ajnaanam* |

"*na anaathma vishayam ajnaanam sambhavathi* " means "There cannot be a *moolaavidhyaa* for which *anaathmaa* is an object" or in Tamil "**அனாத்மாவை விஷயமாகக் கொண்ட மூல அவித்யை இருக்க முடியாது**".

This is the second topic.

And, what are the supporting arguments for this statement? Sureswaraachaaryaa says "whatever reasons I gave for the first topic, can be extended for this also."

It is not necessary to detail, once again, all the four reasons; but, the third argument, which, is the most powerful argument in this case also, has to be studied, of course, slightly modified in the context of 'object', instead of 'locus'.

The argument (in this context of 'object') will run as follows: "*anaathmaa* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa*; therefore, even before the production of *anaathmaa*, *moolaavidhyaa* must be there. And, that means, there must be a time, when the *anaathmaa* was not there, there must have been only two things, viz., (1) *moolaavidhyaa*, which is *anaadhi* and also (2) *aathmaa*, which is also *anaadhi*. *Moolaavidhyaa* means 'ignorance'. During that time, before the creation of *anaathmaa*, the ignorance must be about something. That 'object' of ignorance cannot be *anaathmaa*, because *anaathmaa* is not yet born. Therefore, the ignorance should be about the only thing existent at that time, which existent thing is *aathmaa* only. Therefore, before the creation of *anaathmaa*, if ignorance existed, that ignorance must be of *aathmaa* alone. In a nutshell, *aathmaa* alone must be the 'object' of ignorance also, apart from being the 'locus' of ignorance".

The *Aachaaryaa* covers the second topic with the terse and brief statement "*ethebhya: eva hethubhya: anaathmavishyam ajnaanam na sambhavathi ithi graahyam*" - "These very same reasons go to show that the ignorance is not about the non-Self".

With this, the second topic is also over.

'*Anaathmaa* is not the 'locus' of ignorance' is topic 1; 'nor is it the 'object' of ignorance' is topic 2.

Sambhanda gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

एवं तावन्नानात्मनोऽजानित्वं नापि तद्विषयमजानम् ।

Therefore, the subject of ignorance is not the non-Self; nor is ignorance about the non-Self.

This is the consolidation of the first two topics, before entering the third topic. Sureswaraachaaryaa first says: "*evam thaavath ajnaaithvam na anaathmana:*", meaning "therefore, ignorance does not belong to *anaathmaa*", in other words, "*anaathmaa* cannot be an *ajnaan*", which, in effect, would mean "*anaathmaa* cannot be the *assrayaa* of *ajnaanam*".

This is similar to the statement "Raama is *ajnaani* / Raama is ignorant" meaning "Raama is the *aasrayaa* (locus) of *ajnaanam* (ignorance)",

Locus of ignorance is 'the ignorant entity'. "Anathmaa cannot be ignorant entity" means "anaathmaa cannot be the 'locus' of ignorance".

The Aachaaryaa says:

- एवं तावत् - Thus, in this manner,
- अनात्मनः न अज्ञानित्वं - ignorance does not belong to anaathmaa / anaathmaa cannot be 'the ignorant' / anaathmaa cannot be the locus of ignorance;

This can be extended to say that 'mind can never be 'the ignorant''. Why? Because, mind is also anaathmaa and since anaathmaa cannot be 'the ignorant', mind being anaathmaa, mind can never be called 'ignorant', according to Vedhaanthaa. Still, it is mistakenly believed that "'ignorance' belongs to the mind".

A nice example is usually given by Vedhaanthic aachaaryaas for this wrong perception; when somebody says "pot is holding water", Vedhaanthaa questions the statement and points out "It is a wrong statement. It is only 'space' which can hold things; space alone can accommodate things; therefore, when you say 'pot is holding water', you only mean 'pot-enclosed space is holding water'. Similarly, when you say 'mind is ignorant', it is not the mind that is ignorant; it is the 'mind-enclosed Consciousness' alone, which is the locus of ignorance".

Though, thus, it is not the mind that is ignorant, but, the 'mind-enclosed Consciousness' which is ignorant, without thinking deeply, we say 'mind is ignorant'; i.e., it appears to us, that mind is the locus of ignorance and mind being anaathmaa, we tend to believe that 'anaathmaa is aasrayaa of ajnaanam'. This is an absolute misconception, as the above example of 'pot / space / water' would show.

"Mind is ignorant" means "mind-enclosed chaithanyam is the locus of ignorance". Mind cannot be ignorant. Why? Because it is jadam.

Anaathmana: na ajnaaithvam – ignorance does not belong to anaathmaa /anaathmaa cannot be ajnaani / anaathmaa cannot be the locus of ignorance.

Similarly, न अपि तद्विषयं अज्ञानं - and also ajnaanam cannot be about anaathmaa.

In this sentence, 'ajnaanam' is the subject; 'Thath' refers to anaathmaa, 'thadhvishayam' is the subjective compliment. Thadhvishayam – anaathma vishayam.

The sentence "*Ajnaanam thadvishayam na (bhavathi)*" means "*ajnaanam* cannot be 'object' of ignorance".

This statement "*na anaathmana: ajnaanithvam naapi thadvishayam ajnaanam*", can be expressed in Tamil as, "அனாத்மாவை ஆஸ்ரயமாகக் கொண்ட அஞ்ஞானமும் இருக்க முடியாது; விஷயமாகக் கொண்ட அஞ்ஞானமும் இருக்க முடியாது (அல்லது) அனாத்மா அஞ்ஞானத்திற்கு ஆஸ்ரயமாகவும் இருக்க முடியாது; விஷயமாகவும் இருக்க முடியாது".

Thus, *anaathmaa* is neither the 'locus' nor an 'object' of ignorance.

With this, the consolidation of the first two topics is over.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering the third and fourth topics.

What are the third and fourth topics?

Is *aathmaa* the *aasryaa* of ignorance? And, is *aathmaa* the *vishayaa* of ignorance?

What is to be the conclusion? Ans: "Yes, it is; *aathmaa* alone is the *aasryaa* and *aathmaa* alone is the *vishayaa* also of *ajnaanam*".

What is the argument (in support of these conclusions)?

The argument is very simple. Sureswaraachaaryaa says "if *anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasryaa* or *vishayaa* of *ajnaanam*, the only other entity left out, viz., '*aathmaa*' alone has to be both *aasryaa* and *vishayaa* by *paarishesha nyaaya*: |"

'*Paarishesha nyaaya*.' means 'theory of elimination'; and, in this context, will be applied as follows: "If, out of the only two existing entities, *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, *anaathmaa* is excluded from being the *aasryaa* and *vishayaa* of *ajnaanam*, *aathmaa* alone (being the only other entity) has to be both".

This is going to be said in the following portion.

(Sambhandha gadhyam) further to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

पारिशेष्यादात्मन एवास्त्वजानं तस्याजोस्मित्यनुभवदर्शनात् ।

By the principle of elimination, (it can be concluded, that) ignorance takes place in the Self and in it, occurs experience in the form, 'I am ignorant'.

- पारिशेष्यात् - By the law of elimination,

'*Paarisheshya nyaayaad*' is a type of argument, translated as 'argument of elimination'.

Having excluded/ eliminated the *anaathmaa*,

- आत्मनः एव - only for the aathmaa,
- अज्ञानं अस्तु - ajnaanam is possible,

'*Aathmana: eva ajnaanam asthu*' means '*Aathmaa* alone can be the locus of ignorance'.

The compound word '*astvajnaanam*' has to be split and understood as '*ajnaanam asthu*'.

And, this is proved by our own experience also. Whenever a person says "I am ignorant of the Self / I have got self-ignorance; therefore, I want to know the *aathmaad*", what is the meaning of the word 'I'? It can be only the "*aathmaa*, which is enclosed within the body-mind complex". That 'I' alone is being referred to, when it is said "I am ignorant". In this statement, the word 'I' cannot mean the mind, because, mind being *jadam*, it cannot be ignorant nor knowledgeable. The example given earlier, viz., "the statement 'pot is holding water' actually means 'the pot enclosed space is holding water'", should be recollected. When the statement "I am ignorant" is made, the word 'I' cannot and does not refer to the *sthoola sareeram* or *sookshma sareeram* or *kaarana sareeraram*, but only to the *chaithanyam*, which is enclosed in the *sareerathrayam*. That *chaithanyam* alone is the locus of ignorance.

During *jaagrath avasthaa*, ignorance is located in the Consciousness enclosed in three *sareerams* – *sthoola*, *sookshma* and *kaarana sareerams*; in *svapna avasthaa*, ignorance is located in Consciousness enclosed in two *sareerams*, viz., *sookshma* and *kaarana sareerams* ; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, ignorance is located in Consciousness enclosed by *kaarana sareeram*. This ignorance alone is called *moolaavidhyaa* also.

Not only in all the three *avasthaas*, ignorance is located in Consciousness (enclosed in either three *sareerams* or in two *sareerams* or in one *sareeram*) , during *pralayam* also, ignorance is located in Consciousness enclosed by *kaarana sareeram*; this is because, even during *pralayam*, while *sthoola sareeram* and *sookshma sareeram* are absent, *kaarana sareeram* is there. *Kaarana sareeram* is there in all the *avasthaas* and in *pralayam* also.

Therefore, it can be said, that, *moolaavidhyaa* is located in the Consciousness enclosed in the *kaarana sareeram*. In fact, *kaarana sareeram* itself is called *moolaavidhyaa*.

How does one prove this? That presence of *moolaavidhyaa*, located in 'Me', the Consciousness, which is enclosed in the *sareeram*, that alone is experienced by me, as "I am ignorant". That "I am ignorant" experience, reveals the *moolaavidhyaa* which is located in the Consciousness enclosed in *sareerathrayam*.

Ignorance continues in *sushupthi* also. What is the proof? After waking up from sleep, one says "*sukham aham asvaapsam na kinchith avedisham*" - "during the blissful sleep I had, I did not know anything". That means 'ignorance' continues in *sushupthi* also. That ignorance is *moolaa avidhyaa* only.

And, that's why, while defining *sushupthi* in the treatise *Thathva Bodha*, it was said "*anaadhi avidhyaa roopam sathsvaroopa ajnaanam*", in which definition, *sathsvaroopa ajnaanam* means *moolaa avidhyaa* alone. Thus, in fact, *moolaa avidhyaa*, has been already defined in *Thathva Bodha*. But, *Thathva Bodha* did not go into details, as it is a primary text of *Vedhaanthaa*, and, if it goes into details of *moolaa avidhyaa* at that stage, a beginner of *Vedhaanthic* study may get confused as to whether the subject of his study is *Brahman* or *moolaa avidhyaa*.

Even in *sushupthi*, *moolaavidhyaa* is experienced. There is only one difference. In *jaagarth avathaa*, in addition to *moolaavidhyaa*, there is awareness of other forms of ignorance, such as ignorance of material sciences like Physics, Chemistry etc., called *sthoola avidhyaa* or *aparaa avidhya*; while, in *sushupthi avasthaa* the other forms of ignorance are not relevant.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya adds:

- तस्य अनुभव दर्शनात् - (also) because of the clear experience of *moolaa avidhyaa*
- अत्र: (अहं) अस्मि इति - in the form, "I am ignorant" .

In this sentence, the word '*thasya*' means '*moola ajnaasya*'.

And, the word '*aham*' refers to the 'sentient Conscious being'; the *aathmaa* alone is the meaning of the word 'I'. Therefore, whenever you say "I am ignorant", you are proving, that, "I, the *chaitanyam*, am the locus of 'ignorance'".

The experience of *moolaa avidhyaa* is evident for every human being. And how is it experienced? Ans: In the form "*Aham ajna: asm*", / "I am ignorant".

Expressed in the language of arithmetic,

'I am ignorant' = 'I am the locus of ignorance'.

'I' = 'aathmaa' .

Therefore, *aathmaa* is the 'locus' of ignorance.

The *Aachaaryaa* gives more arguments in support of this contention.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 –Chapter III:

"सोऽहं भगवो मन्त्रविदेवास्मि । नात्मवित् । "इति श्रुते :।

Sruthi has the passage "Blessed one, I know the hymns; but, I do not know the Self."
(*Chaandoghya Upanishad* VII.i.3)

This is proved by *surthi pramaanam* also. The previous sentence was on *prathyaksha pramaanam* as proof for the contention "*moolaavidhya* is in 'me', the *aathmaa*".

And, what type of *prathyaksha* ? Ans: Not '*Indriya prathyaksham*'. It is what is called the '*saakshi prathyaksha pramanaam*', asserting "I am the direct witness of the fact, that 'I' am ignorant of my real nature".

The *Aachaaryaa* now gives *sruthi pramanaam*, from the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (*Bhooma Vidhyaa* - 7th Chapter), a statement of Sage Naarada.

What does Naarada say?

Naarada approaches and addresses Sanathkumara, who is supposed to be an *avatara* of Lord Subrahmanya. In the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* itself, there is a statement at the end, "*tham skandha ithyaachakshathe*", conveying the message, "Sanathkumara is *skanda*: / Lord Subrahmanya."

Naarada approaches Sanath Kumara and says "O Venerable Sir! I have learnt a number of sciences, including the *Vedas*". Then, he gives a long list of the sciences he had studied and mastered; and continues: "But, I do not know that one thing, which alone can make a difference in my life. I have *aparaa vidhyaa*, which is as good as *avidhyaa*. But, I do not have *paraa vidhyaa*".

- इति श्रुते: - *Sruthi* has the passage:

- भगवः - "O Venerable Sir!
- सोऽहं मन्त्रविदेवास्मि - I (such as I am) merely know the subjects textually;

Naarada uses the word `soham` instead of `aham`, since he is universally well known, being a *thriloka sanchaari*, which itself is a rare capability.

- न आत्मवित् – but, I am not the knower of aathmaa.”

In this statement, "aham na aathmavith" means "I am ignorant of aathmaa".

Again expressing this in arithmetical language:

"I am ignorant of aathmaa" = "I am the locus of self-ignorance."

"I" = the aathmaa.

Therefore, it follows, that, aathma is the locus of ignorance.

Thus, *Chaandoghya Upanishad* is quoted as a *pramaanam*, by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

(An aside: There are two popular commentaries for *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. One is `Chandrikā` by Jnaanothamaachaarya, a terse and beautiful commentary. The other is `Klesa apahaarinī`, the name literally meaning 'the reliever of pain', since `klesam` means pain and `apahaarinī` means 'reliever'. This is a lucid commentary by one Sachchidhaanendra Saraswathi Swamighal, written with the intention (as the name of the commentary implies) of making the study of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, (which study is admittedly an intellectual strain) easier and less stressful.

One of these commentators adds an important note in this context: "That 'I' am the locus of 'self ignorance' is accepted not only by the *Advaithin*; all the other systems of philosophy also accept the 'self ignorance' located in one's Self. *Saankhyaa*, *Nyaayaa*, *Poorva Mimaamsaa* and even *Visishtaadvaithaa* – all these philosophies accept "I am ignorant of myself".

What is the proof for this statement?

The explanation is as follows:

All humans make the claim "I am a human being". The very claim "I am a human being" reveals self-ignorance.

Why? When you claim that you are a human being, it means that you are mistaking your body as yourself; but, 'that you are not the body, but, someone other than the body' is accepted by all the six *darsanaas* and by *Visishtaa Advaita*, another school of *Vedhaantha darsanaa*. All these philosophers agree that your present physical body will be 'dropped' later and your *sookshma sareeram* will have to 'travel' and acquire a fresh body. All six philosophies talk about the 'travel' of the *sookshma sareeram* – the *punar janma* of the *jeevaathmaa*, which itself makes it clear that all six philosophies accept that 'I' am different from 'my' body. There may be differences between the philosophies on whether the *aathmaa* is *nithya*:, *sarvagatha*:, *eka*: etc. But, uniformly, all these six *darsanaas* agree that 'I' am different from 'my' body and therefore, as a corollary should also agree, that the claim 'I am a human being' is a misconception. But, this misconception is common. If this misconception should come, there must be the ignorance of the fact, "I am someone different from the body"; that means I am ignorant of the Self; and, that means, 'I', the *aathmaa*, is the locus of ignorance.

Also, all the philosophies *must* be in agreement on this, as, otherwise they should not be teaching about *aathmaa*; the very fact that they are teaching about *aathmaa*, indicates that 'Self-ignorance' is accepted by other philosophers also.

"Therefore, '*aathmaa* is the locus of ignorance' is accepted by all philosophies" is the conclusion of the commentator.)

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

न चात्मनोऽजानस्वरूपता तस्य चैतन्यमात्रस्वाभाव्यात् । अतिशयश्च संभवति । जानविपरिलोपो जानप्राप्तेश्च संभवति अस्य जानकारित्वात् ।

The Self is not of the nature of ignorance, for its essence is pure consciousness. Ignorance can make a difference to it. There is a possibility of attaining knowledge in the Self, for it is ultimately the source of knowledge.

While negating *anaathmaa* as locus of ignorance, Sureswaraachaaryaa gave four reasons, because of which reasons, he asserted, that, *anaathmaa* cannot be the locus of ignorance. He established that, if *anaathmaa* is considered as the locus of ignorance, four logical problems or fallacies will result. And, concluded that, because of the possibility of the four logical fallacies, *anaathmaa* cannot be the locus of ignorance.

Now, in this portion, the *Aachaaryaa* recounts all those four logical fallacies discussed earlier in the context of mistaking *anaathmaa* as the locus of ignorance; and says that those four

logical fallacies will *not* result, if, on the other hand, *aathmaa* is understood to be the locus of ignorance.

To establish this contention viz., that the four problems which were mentioned in the context of *anaathmaa* being considered the locus of ignorance will not be there in the case of *aathmaa* being the locus of ignorance, the *Aachaaryaa* is bringing in the four problems one by one and points out that each particular problem is not there, if *aathmaa* is understood to be the locus of ignorance.

What was the first problem i.e., his first argument?

The *Aachaaryaa* had said that *anaathmaa* itself is of the nature of ignorance and therefore *anaathmaa* cannot be the locus of ignorance. Now, he points out that, this problem is not there, in the context of *aathmaa*, because *aathmaa* is **not** of the nature of ignorance.

- आत्मनः अज्ञानस्वरूपता न अस्ति - Aathmaa is not of the nature of ignorance,
- तस्य चैतन्यमात्रं स्वाभाव्यात् - because, its very essence is pure consciousness.

Thasya – aathmana:; svaabhaavyam – svaroopam.

Unlike *anaathmaa*, which is of the nature of ignorance, *aathmaa* is **not** of the nature of ignorance. On the other hand, *Aathmaa* is of the very nature of *jnaanam – jnaanasvaroopam* – as declared by *Thaithriya Upanishad (Brahma Valli)* - "sathyam **jnaanam** anantham brahma".

If *Aathmaa* had been *ajnaanasvaroopam*, similar to *anaathmaa*, it could also not have been the locus of *moolaa avidhyaa*; but, the fact that it is itself *jnaanasvaroopam*, the first logical fallacy referred to in the context of *anaathmaa*, will not result.

The *Aachaaryaa* moves on to the second fallacy discussed earlier. What was the second logical fallacy discussed?

Ans: Since *anaathmaa* is *jadam*, even if ignorance is located in *anaathmaa*, a *jadavasthu*, ignorance cannot do any of its functions in a *jadavasthu*.

What are the functions of ignorance? Ignorance can obstruct knowledge; ignorance can create doubt; ignorance can create error. In other words, (i) obstruction of knowledge (ii) creation of doubt and (iii) creation of error are the functions of ignorance.

If ignorance is located in the *jada anaathmaa*, obviously, it cannot do any of the above functions. Therefore, there is no meaning in ignorance being located in *jada anaathmaa*.

This was Sureswaraachaaryaa's second argument.

Now, Sureswaraachaarya points out, that, ignorance, in contrast, **can be** located in *aathmaa*, a sentient entity, because ignorance **can** do the three-fold functions being located in 'Me', the sentient *aathmaa*.

Expressing the same in other words, ignorance **is** possible in *aathmaa*, the sentient entity, since being located in a sentient entity, 'ignorance' can do all the three functions, which, in fact, it does.

'Obstruction of the knowledge' is 'obstruction of the fact that "'I' am *aathmaa*"; 'doubt' is created, in the form of the question, "Who am 'I'?" The very fact that such an enquiry is made, indicates that there is 'doubt'. Otherwise, why an enquiry at all? Also 'errors' galore have been created – such as 'I' am *kartha* / 'I' am *boktha* / 'I' am *pramaathaa* etc., none of which, in reality, 'I' am.

Thus, ignorance can be located in *aathmaa* and it can do all the three functions. Therefore, the second problem is also averted.

- अतिशयश्च संभवति - Ignorance can make a difference to *aathmaa* / Ignorance can bring about consequences by doing its functions.

Athisaya: can be translated as கை வரிசை in Tamil; and the statement '*Athisayas cha sambhavathi*' indicates 'bringing about the three-fold consequences'.

அஞ்ஞானம் தன்னுடைய கை வரிசையை நன்றாகக் காட்டுகிறது, by being located in *aathmaa*.

Ignorance located in the *aathmaa* can show its **கை வரிசை** ('power'), by its three-fold functions.

What are the three-fold functions? Sureswaraachaaryaa gives only one, as a sample.

- ज्ञानविपरिलोपः (संभवति (- Obstruction of self-knowledge takes place in *aathmaa*;

If *ajnaanam* had not been there, as even as we are born, like Vamadeva, all of us will be declaring "aham nithya suddha, muktha, buddha aathmaa asmī" | Since this does not happen, it is obvious that, there is obstruction of *jnaanam*.

Viparilopa: means prathibhandha: |

'Obstruction of *jnaanam*' is the first consequence of ignorance.

The sentence can be read in two ways: one, as a single sentence, as, "athisaya: jnaana viparilopa: cha (sambhavathy)" - meaning "consequence and obstruction of knowledge are possible"; or also as two sentences, as, "athisaya: (sambhavathy)" and "jnaana viparilopa: cha (sambhavathy)" - meaning "Consequence is possible ; obstruction of self-knowledge is also possible".

Not only that; because of the obstruction of self-knowledge alone, later, by removing the obstruction, the 'acquisition' of knowledge is also possible. The 'obstruction' of self-knowledge is possible because of self-ignorance being located in 'me', and because of this reason only, by removal of 'obstruction', later, the 'acquisition' of self-knowledge is also possible for 'me', the *aathmaa* (alone).

If ignorance were located in a *jada vasthu*, acquisition of knowledge would not be possible; it will be possible only in the *chethana aathmaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says

- ज्ञानप्राप्तेश्च संभवः - and (future) 'acquisition' of knowledge is also possible, in *aathmaa*,

If *anaathmaa* were 'ignorant', *anaathmaa* can never claim 'aham brahma asmī'. Assuming that *anaathmaa* becomes 'wiser' (this is not possible, because *anaathmaa* is *jadam* – but, if, for argument's sake, it is assumed so) , what will be its 'wisdom'? It can still never claim "aham brahma asmī"; it can only claim "aham miserable anaathmaa asmī" | "Aham Brahma asmī" wisdom can be gained only by *aathmaa*.

A note should be added here. Exactly like the statement "pot is holding the water" meaning "pot-enclosed space is holding water", in the same manner, when it is said "the mind gets wisdom by the study of *Vedhaanthaa*", *Vedhaanthaa* points out "it is not the mind that has acquired wisdom; it is the mind-enclosed Consciousness **alone** which has acquired the wisdom 'aham brahma asmī". In short, 'ignorance' is also located in the mind-enclosed Consciousness and 'wisdom' also is located in mind-enclosed Consciousness only.

And, therefore, the *Achaaryaa* says:

- तस्य ज्ञानकारित्वात् - because of its capacity to produce / receive knowledge.

'Thasya' means 'aathmanasya'.

Aathmaa alone is the receiver of the knowledge, even though it appears that the mind is the receiver of the knowledge. Mind cannot receive knowledge, because it is *jadam* – *jadathvaath*. Whenever it is said 'mind receives knowledge', it means 'mind-enclosed 'I' (*aathmaa*) am receiving the knowledge'. Therefore, *aathmaa* is called *jnaanakaari* – receiver or producer of *jnaana*.

And, therefore, *aathmaa* can be the *aasrayaa* of *ajnaanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1- Chapter III:

न चाज्ञानकार्यत्वं कूटस्थात्मस्वाभाव्यात् । अज्ञानानपेक्षस्य चात्मनः स्वत एव स्वरूपसिद्धेर्युक्तमात्मन एवाजत्वम् ।

The Self, being of the nature of unchanging awareness, is no product of ignorance. Independent of ignorance, the Self has an intrinsic nature of its own. For all these reasons, it is tenable to hold that the Self is the locus of ignorance.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa moves on to the next argument.

He says that the third logical fallacy, which was pointed out in the case of *anaathmaa* being *aasraya*, will also not be there, in the case of *aathmaa* being the *aasrayaa* of ignorance.

What was the third argument? Ans: *Anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*, because *anaathmaa* itself was produced later.

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* points out that this problem is not there for *aathmaa*, because, *aathmaa* is eternal and the eternal *aathmaa* can be the *aasraya* for the beginningless *moolaa avidhyaa*.

Care should be taken to say 'beginningless' *moolaa avidhyaa* and **not** eternal *moolaa avidhyaa*; because if the word 'eternal' is used as an adjective of *moolaa avidhyaa*, *moksha* can never be achieved.

Anaadhi aathmaa can be the locus of the *anaadhi moolaavidhyaa*, whereas, *anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa*, because *anaathmaa* is to be born later.

Avidhyaa is also *anaadhi*; *aathmaa* is also *anaadhi*; both being *anaadhi*, *anaadhi avidhyaa* is located in *anaadhi aathmaa* from *anaadhi* time. There is no problem with this.

115. Chapter III- Verses 1 (01-11-2008)

In his important introduction to the 3rd chapter, Sureswaraacharya discusses four topics associated with *moolaavidhyaa*, which *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause of the entire creation.

(It should be carefully noted, that, the word *moolaavidhyaa* is to be split as 'moola + avidhyaad' and not as *moolaa* + *vidhyaa*.)

And, of these four topics regarding *moolaavidhyaa*, two topics have been already covered, in which the *Aacharya* had said that *anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* (as the first topic) and that *anaathmaa* cannot be the *vishayaa* or object of *moolaavidhyaa* also (as the second topic); "*anaathmaa* is not the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*, nor is *anaathmaa* the object of *moolaavidhyaa*" was elaborately established by the *Aacharya*.

Now, Sureswaraacharya has come to the third topic, from the sentence beginning with 'Paarisheshyaath' (Paarisheshyaath aathmana: eva asthu ajnaanam thasya "ajnyosmi" ithi anubhavadharsanaath | "Soham bhagava: manthraavidhevassmi | naathmavith" ithi sruthe: |), the third topic being "aathmaa alone is the *aasrayaa* or locus of *moolaavidhyaa*".

When it is said that *aathmaa* is the locus, it should be understood that, it is the *chith* or *chaithanyam*, which is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. The word 'aathmaad' should not be understood to mean *chidhaabhaasa*: | *Chidhaabhaasaa* can never be said to be the locus; *chith* alone is to be understood to be the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*. Why is it so? Ans: Because, *chidhaabhassa* is only a 'reflection' of *chith*, the Consciousness, and a mere 'reflection' cannot support anything.

'Reflection' itself requires the support of a 'reflecting medium'. In other words, any reflection is only a *supported* entity and not a *supportive* entity. Therefore, 'Reflected Consciousness' cannot be the support of anything.

Chidhaabhaasa can never be the support or *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*; only *chith* is the support or *aasrayaa* of everything; *chith* is the support of *moolaavidhyaa* also; *chith* is the support of the products of *moolaavidhyaa*, the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* also. Both *moolaavidhyaa* and *anaathma prapanchaa* are located in – are supported by - *chith*, the *aathmaa*.

Moolaavidhyaa is also *mithyaa*; the *moolaavidhyaa* product, *anaathma prapanchaa* also is *mithyaa*. The entire *mithyaa moolaavidhyaa* and the entire *mithyaa anaathma prapanchaa* - both of them - are located in the *sathyam chith*, the *aathmaa*.

This may give rise to a question. Sureswaraacharya does not discuss the question in this portion, presumably because he assumes that, the student will know the answer.

The question is "how can *chith* be the support of everything, when *chith* is defined to be devoid of all divisions? *Chith* is a *sajaatheeya – vijaatheeya – svagatha – bedha - rahitha vasthu*, because of which reason nothing can be there in the *chith vasthu*. Then, how can it be said that *moolaavidhyaa* and *anaathmaa* are in the *chith*?"

Suppose such a question is raised, how is it answered?

The explanation will be in the following lines: In *Vedhaantha*, one should be very, very careful and alert in making any statement. "*Karanam thaapiyaal maranam*" is a *Malayalam* saying, an apt quotation, in this context. If the statement "nothing is there in the *chith*" is made, it is granted, that the statement is not correct. The sentence has to be modified and stated as "nothing is **really** there in the *chith*". The adverb '**really**' is very important ; "nothing is there in the *chith*" should be corrected as "nothing is **really** there in the *chith* ; however, everything is **apparently / seemingly / vyaavahaarically / empirically** is there in the *chith* and in the *chith* only".

Making the statement "nothing is there; everything is there", without the adverbs 'really' and 'apparently', is, of course, a contradiction in terms; but, obviously, there is no contradiction in the statement "nothing is there **really**; but, everything is there **apparently**". The famous *sloka* in the 9th Chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, "*mathsthaani sarva boothaani; na cha mathsthaani boothaani*" – actually meaning "Everything is **apparently** in Me alone; but, nothing is **really** there in Me" is relevant in this context.

'Everything' means '*moolaavidhyaa* and its product *anaathma prapancha*'.

"Therefore, i.e. by the logic of 'elimination' / *paarishesha nyaayaath*" Sureswaraacharya concludes "*moolaavidhyaa* is located in *aathmaa* only (in the Original Consciousness – *chith* and not in the Reflected Consciousness – *Chidhaabhaasaa*)."

In support of this (that, *moolaavidhyaa* is located in *aathmaa* **alone**), Sureswaraacharya gave two arguments – one is *saakshi prathyaksha anubhava pramaanam* and another is *sruthi pramaanam*.

What is the *saakshi prathyaksha anubhava pramaanam*? Sureswaraacharya said "*aham ajnya: asmi ithi anubhav darsanaath*". All of us have the *anubhava* / common experience: "I am ignorant". This 'ignorance *anubhava*' is there, even when the mind is active and even

after the resolution of the mind, viz., in *sushupthi avastha*, when, in fact, one has the experience of total ignorance.

This "I am ignorant" is proof that ignorance is located in the sentient 'me' – the sentient *aathmaa*. Obviously, *anaathmaa* cannot ever say "I am ignorant"; only *aathmaa*, the sentient entity, is the 'holder' of the ignorance. Whenever one says "I am ignorant", it is 'I', the Consciousness, which is the holder of ignorance.

But, at the same time, it should be remembered, that, to say "I am ignorant", one requires the mind. It is the mind that facilitates the expression. Mind facilitates the expression, but, the mind is not the locus of ignorance.

To assimilate this, one should remember the example cited earlier, viz. : If a statement "pot is holding water" is made, in reality, it is not the pot which is the 'holder' of water; pot is only a 'facilitator', in enclosing the space, which space alone is the holder of water.

In other words, if an analysis is made of the two statements, "pot holds water" and "pot enclosed space is holding water", *superficially* the pot is the holder, while, *really* the 'pot enclosed space' is the holder.

In the same manner, from a *superficial* perspective, mind is the holder of ignorance; but, from a *real* or true perspective, it is the mind-enclosed *chith* (not mind reflected *chidhaabhaasaa*), which is called *upahitha chaithanyam*, *avachchinna chaithanyam* and *saakshi chaithanyam* - the Original Consciousness - which alone is the holder of *moolaavidhyaa*. This fact alone is conveyed by the statement "I am ignorant".

The *Aaachaaryaa* proceeds to point out, that, not only do we thus have *saakshi prathyaksha anubhava* for this fact, that, *moolaavidhyaa* is located in the sentient 'I', but, the fact is also supported by the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad Vaakyam*, given out by Naarada, in *Bhooma Vidhyaa*, "*soham bhagava: manthravith eva asmi na aathmavith*" – "I am not the knower of *aathmaa*".

When Naarada makes this statement, it indicates *aathma avidhyaa* is in Naarada, who is a sentient entity. Not Naarada, the *anaathmaa*, but Naarada, the *aathmaa*, is the locus of *aathma avidhyaa*.

Thus, by two *pramaanams*, Sureswaraachaaryaa established that *moolaavidhyaa* is located in *aathmaa*. And, thereafter, he is defending this statement, by a series of statements beginning with '*na cha aathmana:*' (introduced in the previous session).

The portion reads: "na cha aathmanojnaanasvaroopathaa thasya chaithanyamaathrasvaabhaavyaath | athisayas cha sambhavathi | jnaanaviparilopa: jnaanapraptescha sambhava: | thasya jnaanakaarithvaath | na cha ajnaanakaaryathvam kootastha aathmasvaabhaavyaath ajnaana anapekshasya cha aathmana: svatha eva svaroopasiddhe: yuktham aathmana eva ajnathvam |"

This is the portion defending the view that "*aathmaa* can be the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*". What exactly is the *Aachaaryaa* doing here? Previously, from "*thasya hi svaroopam eva ajnaanam*" (in the 7th line of the introduction) up to "*thadanapakeshasya cha thasya nissvabhaavathvaath*", (in the 11th line), Sureswaraachaaryaa had mentioned that there are several logical problems, if *anaathmaa* is taken as the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. He had given a series of logical problems / fallacies resulting from taking / assuming *anaathmaa* as the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. Now, in this portion, what the *Aachaaryaa* does, is to point out, that, those logical problems are **not** there, if *aathmaa* is taken / understood as the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*.

Those illogical problems mentioned there (i.e. if *anaathmaa* is assumed as the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*) will not arise, if *aathmaa* is taken as *moolaavidhyaa aasrayaa*.

The *Aachaaryaa* could have shortened the text, by merely saying "those logical problems, mentioned in the earlier context, are not there now" and closed the topic; instead, he chooses to enumerate each one of the logical problems mentioned earlier; and in the same order, goes through each logical problem and says that, that problem is not there, when *aathmaa* is taken as the *aasrayaa*.

The first argument: "*na cha aathmana: ajnaanasvaroopathaa thasya chaithanya maathra svaabhaavyaath*" / By this statement, Sureswaraachaaryaa is referring to the first logical problem he had talked of, if *anaathmaa* were to be the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. He had said that, *anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa*, because it is *jadam*. "In contrast" the *Aachaaryaa* points out now: "*aathmaa can* be the *aasrayaa*, because it is the *chethana thathvam*".

Then follows the second argument: "*athisayascha sambhavathi | jnaanaviparilopa: jnanaprapthescha sambhava: thasya jnaanakaarithvaath*" / Earlier, Sureswaraachaaryaa had said, that, when *ajnaanam* is located in *anaathmaa*, the *ajnaanam* cannot bring about any consequence in *anaathmaa*, since *anaathmaa* is *jadam* and ignorance can be of no consequence when located in a *jada vasthu*; now, he points out, that, ignorance can be of some consequence, when it is located in the *chethana vasthu* – *aathmaa*; he says "*athisayascha sambhava:*" – "there *can be* consequences".

And, what are the consequences? "*jnaanaviparilopa:*" – which means " 'Covering' of the knowledge", which 'covering' or 'concealing', *moola avidhyaa* can do, when located in the sentient *aathmaa*. This is one consequence.

Then the next sentence is "*jnaanapraapthe:scha sambhava: thasya jnaanakaarithvaath*". When ignorance is located in *anaathmaa*, *anaathmaa* cannot also negate that ignorance, by gaining knowledge. Why? Again, because *anaathmaa* is *jadam* - insentient. Whereas, when ignorance is located in *aathmaa*, a sentient entity, then, it *can* gain knowledge and *can* negate ignorance. Discussion of ignorance is possible, only when it is negatable by knowledge. In other words, only where knowledge is possible, there alone we can discuss the problem of ignorance. In *anaathmaa* locus, the discussion of ignorance also is useless; the discussion of knowledge also is useless. In *aathmaa* alone, both are possible, *aathmaa* being a sentient entity. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says *jnaanapraapthi:* also is possible only in a sentient entity i.e. *aathmaa*. This is the second consequence.

And, of course, in this context, an important fact should be noted: When it is said that *aathmaa* alone can gain knowledge, of course, it can do so, only with the support of the 'mind' instrument. Just as 'space' can hold water only with the help of the enclosure 'pot', similarly, *aathmaa* alone holds the knowledge with the support of the enclosure called the 'mind'.

"*Aathmaa*' alone can have the possibilities of 'covering' of knowledge and of 'gaining' knowledge" is, thus, the second discussion / the second statement negating the second logical problem.

The third argument follows. The *Aachaaryaa* says "na cha ajnaana kaaryathvam kootastha aathma svaabhaavyaath|"

This is the most important argument. Even if the other three arguments are not remembered, the student cannot afford to forget this important argument.

Earlier, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* had pointed out that, *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be located in *anaathmaa*, because *anaathmaa* itself is to be produced only later, **by** *moolaavidhyaa* and obviously, a 'later-arriving' *anaathmaa* cannot be the supporter of a 'formerly existing' *moolaavidhyaa*.

"On the other hand, the 'formerly existing' *moolaavidhyaa* **can** be supported by *aathmaa*, since *aathmaa* is existing **all the time**. 'Formerly existing *anaadhi* *moolaavidhyaa* can be supported by '*anaadhi* *aathmaa* **alone**. *Anaadhi* *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be supported by *saadhi* *aathmaa*' is this very eloquent argument of the *Aachaaryaa*.

- न च अज्ञान कार्यत्वं - Aathmaa is not a product of moolaavidhyaa,
- कूटस्थ आत्म स्वाभाव्यात् - because of the ever existing nature of aathmaa.

Here, kootastha aathmaa refers to nithya aathma.

Aathmaa is anaadhi; anaadhi chith **can** support anaadhi moolaavidhyaa, whereas, saadhi anaathmaa **cannot** support anaadhi moolavidhya.

Then comes the final discussion / argument: "Ajnaana anapekshasya cha aathmana: svatha: eva svaroopo siddhe: yuktham aathmana eva ajnathvam|"

This is also a very beautiful and important argument.

The argument is this: *Moolaavidhyaa* and *anaathmaa* cannot have 'supporter-supported' relationship. What is the reason? *Anaathmaa* being a product of *moolaavidhyaa*, *anaathmaa* is essentially *moolaavidhyaa* only – just as a 'pot' being a product of 'clay', the pot is essentially nothing but clay only, in another name and form.

Moolaavidhyaa is the *kaaranam*; *anaathmaa* is the *kaaryam*; the *kaaranam* and *kaaryam* are essentially one and the same substance only. When both of them are one and the same substance, how can there be 'supporter-supported' relationship between them? In the example of 'clay' and 'pot', it can never be said, that, 'clay' is the supporter of 'pot'; because, clay and pot are not two entities, to have 'supporter-supported' relationship. In the same manner, *moolaavidhyaa* and *anaathmaa* are not two separate substances, to have 'supporter-supported' relationship.

Something *different* from *moolaavidhyaa* alone should be the supporter of *moolaavidhyaa* and that 'something different' can only be *aathmaa*.

Aathmaa alone is the support of both *moolaavidhyaa* and *anaathmaa*.

- अज्ञान अनपेक्षस्य च आत्मनः - Since, aathmaa is not dependent on ajnaanam / is not a product of *ajnaanam*,

Ajnaana anapeksham – not dependent on ajnaanam (adjective to aathmaa)

- स्वतः एव स्वरूपसिद्धेः - but, has a separate existence of its own,

That *aathmaa* exists separately to serve as the locus of *moolaavidhya*. Therefore,

- युक्तं - it is logically plausible and possible,
- आत्मनः एव अज्ञत्वम् - that, ignorance belongs to *aathmaa* alone / *aathmaa* alone is ignorant / *aathmaa* alone is the locus of ignorance.

Therefore, 'I', the *aathmaa* alone am seemingly a *samsaari*, because of 'ignorance' located in 'me', the *aathmaa*; and 'I', the *aathmaa* alone am ever free, because of the 'knowledge', which is also located in 'me', the *aathmaa*.

The ignorance is also *vyaavahaarika sathyam*; the later-arriving knowledge also is *vyaavahaarika sathyam*. Thus, 'I', the *paaramaarthika sathya aathmaa*, because of the *vyaavahaarika sathya* ignorance, appear as though bonded and 'I', the *paaramaarthika sathya aathmaa*, because of the *vyaavahaarika sathya* knowledge, become liberated - that also is *vyavahaaricam*. This is the essence of *Vedhaanthic* teaching.

In his *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Bhashyam*, while commenting on the well-known manthra "Brahma vaa idham agra asseeth thadhaathmaanam eva aveth aham brahmaasmi ithi; thasmaath thath sarvam abhavath" (I.iv.10), *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa*, has done all these discussions. The entire discussion of *Sureswaraachaarya*, in this portion, is borrowed from this *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Bhashyam* on I.iv.10.

Aathmaa alone is ignorant. *Aathmaa* alone 'becomes' wise also. But, it should be noted, that, 'ignorance' is also *vyavahaarikam* and 'wisdom' is also *vyavahaarikam* - *Bandhaa* is also *vyaavahaarikam*; *mokshaa* is also *vyaavahaarikam*. "Na mukthir na bandha: chidhaandaroopa: sivoham sivoham" from the popular verse of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* (verse 6 – *Nirvaana Shadkam*) should be ever remembered.

Sambhandha Gadhyaam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

किंविषयं पुनस्तदात्मनोऽजानम् । आत्मविषयमिति ब्रूमः। नन्वात्मनोऽपि जानस्वरूपत्वादनन्यत्वाच्च जानप्रकृतित्वादिभ्यश्च हेतुभ्यो नैवाजानं घटते।

What object does that ignorance located in the Self concern? We answer that it concerns the Self itself. 'But', it may be argued 'the Self is in the nature of knowledge, it is undivided and one and is the source of knowledge. For these reasons, it is impossible that it can support ignorance'.

In this portion, a small re-arrangement of the study is necessitated.

The two sentences (i) *kimvishayam puna: thadhaathmanoajnaanam* and (ii) *aathmavishyamithi bhrooma:*, relate to the 4th topic., viz. "the object of ignorance also belongs to *aathma* only"; whereas, the next sentence following these two sentences in the text, viz., "*Nanu aathmanopi jnaanasvaroopathvaath anyathvaathcha jnaanaprakruthithvaadhibhya:scha hethubhyo naiva ajnaanam ghatathe*" is an additional point in the third topic. For whatever reason, the two topics are slightly mixed up in the portion. Therefore, for the sake of continuity and clarity, the sentence "*Nanu aathmanopi jnaanasvaroopathvaath anyathvaathcha jnaanaprakruthithvaadhibhya:scha hethubhyo naiva ajnaanam ghatathe*" is taken up for study first, skipping the earlier two sentences, for the present.

With regard to the third topic, some more objections are possible. Sureswaraachaarya is raising those additional objections that could possibly raised by a *poorva pakshin*, in this sentence "*Nanu aathmanopi jnaanasvaroopathvaath anyathvaathcha jnaanaprakruthithvaadhibhya:scha hethubhyo naiva ajnaanam ghatathe*" and gives his answer to the objections in the subsequent sentences.

The first objection to the third statement, viz., "aathmaa is the locus of moolaavidhya", runs on the following lines: "Aathmaa is chaithanya svaroopam/ svayamprakaasa svaroopam. Moolaavidhya is thamas svaroopam/ aprakaasa svaroopam / andhakaara svaroopam. Aathmaa / chaithanyam is of the nature of brightness; on the other hand, moolaavidhya is of the nature of darkness. One is of the nature of 'light' and the other is of the nature of 'darkness'. Therefore, the question is: how can 'light' become the locus of 'darkness'?"

In fact, wherever light comes, darkness cannot even exist, because they are of diametrically opposite natures ; how can 'light' which is the 'destroyer' of 'darkness', become the 'supporter' of 'darkness'?

"*Aathma* must be the destroyer of ignorance, because, it is of the nature of light and ignorance is of the nature of darkness. But, you are saying that *aathmaa* is the supporter of ignorance. How can a destroyer ever become a supporter?" is one of the main objections raised by *Visishtaadvaitam* also, which gives seven arguments against the *Advaitin's* contention, that ignorance is located in *aathmaa*.

The seven arguments are given by Sri Ramanujaacharyaa in his introduction to *Brahma Sootra Bhashyam* known as *Sree Bhashyam*. This group of objections is famously known as "*saptha vidha anubhapatthaya:*" – "seven logical fallacies".

One of these seven fallacies, which Sri Ramanujacharya mentions, is: "How can ignorance ever exist in *aathmaa*, *aathmaa* being light and ignorance being darkness. When they cannot even exist together, how can one be the 'supporter' of another?"

This *poorva pakshaa* objection is referred to, by Sureswaraacharya here:

- ननु - I have an objection (the poorva pakshin says).
- ज्ञानस्वरूपत्वात् - Since (*aathmaa*) is of the nature of *jnaanam*,

"*Aathmaa* is of the nature of *jnaanam*. *Jnaanam* means 'light'. And, you say, that, that luminous *aathmaa* is the locus of 'dark' ignorance. How is that possible?" is one argument of the *poorva pakshin*.

- अनन्यत्वात् च - *advaitathvaath cha* / also, since *aathmaa* is without a second,

This is the *poorva pakshin's* next argument: "You say *aathmaa* is *advaitam* – non-dual. Your philosophy itself is called *advaitam* and it claims that there is nothing other than *aathmaa*. Then how do you say, that, on the *aathmaa* there is ignorance and that, the ignorance is projecting the universe? It would mean that you admit that, there are two entities, one being *aathmaa* and the other being ignorance. How do you, then, claim to be an *advaitin*? *Aathmaa* being without a second, how can there be ignorance in *aathmaa*?"

The *poorva pakshin's* third argument:

- ज्ञानप्रकृतित्वात् - and, since *aathmaa* is the source of knowledge,

'Prakruthi' is a technical word meaning 'upaadhaana kaaranam'. 'Jnaana prakruthi' means 'Jnaanasya kaaranam'.

The *poorva pakshin* asks the *Advaitin*: "You yourself say that *aathmaa* is the sentient entity, which is the source of knowledge. If *aathmaa* is the 'producer' of knowledge, how can ignorance ever exist in that *aathmaa*, which being the 'producer' of knowledge, would have produced knowledge and consequently destroyed / removed ignorance? How can that *aathmaa*, the 'producer' of knowledge, be the locus of ignorance?"

(*jnaanasvaroopathvaath ananyathvaath cha jnaanaprakruthithvaadhibhya:cha*)

- हेतुभ्यः - because of these three reasons,

“There are three reasons:

- (i) aathmaa is of the nature of knowledge or light
- (ii) aathmaa is without a second thing, and
- (iii) aathmaa is the producer of knowledge.

Because of these three reasons, aathmaa can never even tolerate ignorance and how can that ignorance remain in the aathmaa, from time immemorial (anaadhi)?” is the *poorva pakshin's* question.

(An interesting aside: The *sankalpa* for every *Vaidhika Karma*, includes the term: “*anaadhi avidhyaa avaasanayaa*”. This is similar to the performer of the *Karma* proclaiming / declaring “I possess *anaadhi avidhyaa*”.)

- न एव अज्ञानं घटते - ignorance is never possible,

Ghatathe means ‘possible’; *na ghatathe* means ‘not possible’. It is logically never possible. Where?

- आत्मनः अपि - in aathmaa also.

Why does the *poorva pakshin* say in *aathmaa also*? Because, previously it was said that *ajnaanam* cannot be in *anaathmaa*, the *poorva pakshin* emphasizes that it cannot be in *aathmaa also* (*api*).

Sureswaraachaarya answers this briefly but succinctly, though, in the normal course, one would expect a lengthy explanation.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

घटत एव । कथम् । अज्ञानमात्रनिमित्तत्वात्तद्विभागस्य सर्पात्मतेव रज्जुवाः ।

We reply that it can support ignorance. How? The divisions within the Self are brought about by mere ignorance as in the rope which appears as snake.

The answer, in brief, is this:

It is true, that, opposite things cannot co-exist. It is also very, very correct to say, that, light and darkness cannot co-exist because of their opposite natures. But, we have to add a

condition also. That condition is that, two opposite things cannot co-exist **only if they belong to the same order of reality**. If they belong to different orders of reality, they can and do co-exist. We have several examples for this fact:

Example (1): 'Dry' sand and 'wet' mirage water do co-exist. In fact, it is because of the 'dryness' of the sand only, that, we experience water. This 'co-existence' is possible, because dry sand is *vyavahaarika sathyam*, whereas, mirage water is *praathibhaasika sathyam*. Because they belong two different orders of reality, they can co-exist.

Example (2): In a movie you can have a dirty object, say, a polluted river, projected on the clear screen. 'Purity' and 'dirt' can thus co-exist during a movie, because the screen is *vyavahaarika sathyam* and the polluted river that is shown in the picture is *praathibhaasika sathyam*. *Praathibhaasika* impurity and *vyavahaarika* purity can co-exist.

Example (3): "An example can be given using 'light' and 'darkness' themselves. Imagine yourself sleeping in a dark room; the room is dark; and, if it has to be 'dark', light cannot exist in that 'dark' room; that is the truth. Still, under one condition, light *can* exist, viz., when you dream and there is a projection of daylight in the dream. In this situation, there is 'brightness' in the dream, while there is 'darkness' in the room. 'Light' and 'darkness' co-exist in one and the same place. How is it possible? Because 'light' is *praathibhaasikam* and darkness is *vyavahaarikam*". Thus light and darkness can also happily co-exist, if they belong to different orders of reality.

In the same manner, as shown in the above examples, *aathmaa* and *moolaavidhya* can co-exist, but, under one condition, viz. that *moolaavidhya* should not be of the same order of reality as *aathmaa* and **it is not**. *Vedhaantha* clearly affirms that, ignorance (*avidhya*) is *mithyaa*, which means that it is of the lower order of reality - *vyavahaarika sathyam*, while *aaathmaa* is *paaramaarthika sathyam*. Therefore, Consciousness and ignorance *can* co-exist.

The *Advaitin*, in fact, goes one step further.

He says: "If Consciousness and ignorance do not co-exist, ignorance cannot be even proved; this is because you are able to talk about your 'ignorance', only because you are 'conscious' of 'ignorance'. If you say I have ignorance of Chinese, how do you know that you have ignorance of Chinese? Your will answer 'I am 'conscious' of my 'ignorance'. Thus, the very existence of ignorance, has to be proved by 'consciousness' alone. If consciousness and ignorance cannot go exist, you cannot talk about any ignorance, including self ignorance. Therefore, we say that, *aathmaa* not only supports ignorance, but *aathmaa* also proves ignorance, by being the *saakshi* of ignorance. Therefore, there is no problem for *aathmaa* and *ajnaanam* to coexist, with *aasraya-assritha- sambhandha*:"

116. Chapter III- Verses 1 (08-11-2008)

In this introduction to Chapter III, Sureswaraachaarya is dealing with four topics, centered on *moolaavidhyaa* or fundamental ignorance.

Of those four topics, the first two topics are over and now we are in the third topic.

As the first topic, Sureswaraachaarya established that '*anaathmaa* cannot be the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*'; and, as the second topic, he established that '*anaathmaa* cannot be the *vishayaa* also of *moolaavidhyaa*'.

In the third topic, that we are now on, Sureswaraachaaryaa is proceeding to establish that, '*aathmaa* alone is the *aasrayaa* or the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*'. After first making this statement, he gave several arguments in support of his statement.

In the current portion, the *Aacharyaa* is answering to an objection raised by a *poorva pakshin*. What is that objection?

The *poorva pakshin* says that, if *aathmaa* is considered as the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*, there will be several logical problems or fallacies. He lists three.

One logical fallacy, according to him, is that by accepting *aathmaa* **and** *moolaavidhyaa*, the *Aacharyaa* is renouncing his fundamental stand of *advaita*. He says: "You claim yourself to be *advaitin*; you have negated the world in order to negate duality. But even as you are dismissing the world, you are accepting *moolaavidhyaa* or *maayaa* as the *anaadhi* cause of the world. According to you, *moolaavidhyaa* is also *anaadhi* – without a beginning and *aathma* is also *anaadhi* – without a beginning. By thus accepting a beginningless *aathmaa* and a beginningless *moolaavidhya*, you are accepting duality and thus discarding your *advaita* position". This is one logical fallacy, viz. '*dvaita dosha*:', mentioned by the *poorva pakshin*.

The second argument of the *poorva pakshin*: "You claim *aathmaa* is *aasrayaa* and *moolaavidhyaa* is *aasritham*. That means there is a *sambhandham* – a relationship between *aathmaa* and *moolaavidhyaa* - the relationship being a 'supporter-supported' relationship / an *aasraya-assritha-sambhandhaa*. But, we cannot accept this, because, according to your own teaching, *aathmaa* is *asanghasvaroopa*: ; *aathmaa* does not have any relationship with anything at all; '*asanghohi ayam purusha*:'(B.U.IV.iii.15)] Therefore, when *aathmaa* is *asangha*:, how can you talk about *aathmasangha* or *aathmasambhandha* ? How can

asangha aathmaa have *aasraya-aasritha-sambhandhaa* with *moolaavidhyaa*?" Thus, according to the *poorva pakshin*, *sambhandha dosha*: is another fallacy.

The *poorva pakshin* then points out yet another logical fallacy in his opinion. He says: "You claim *aathmaa*, as *prakaasa svarooopa*: / *chaithanya prakaasa roopa*: / *jyothi svarooopa*: etc. You loudly proclaim '*jyothishaam api thath jyothi*:' | You also say that *moolavidhyaa* is *ajnaanam*; *ajnaanam* means *aprakaasa roopa*:/ *anthakaara roopa*: / *thamo roopa*: / *thimira roopa*: | Ignorance is of the nature of darkness. Thus *aathmaa* is *prakaasa svarooopa*:; *moolaavidhya* is *aprakaasa roopa*:/ How can *aprakaasaa* and *svaprakaasaa* – light and darkness coexist in the form of *aasraya-aasritha-roopaa*?" This *dosha*, according to the *poorva pakshin*, is, thus, 'co-existence of two entities with opposite attributes', termed in Sanskrit, '*viruddha dharmino: sahavaasa*:' or '*viruddha dharmino: sahasthithi*:' |

"Because of these three fallacies, '*aathmaa* as *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*' is not possible" is the argument of the *poorva pakshin*, presented by the *Aacharyaa* in the sentence, '*nanu aathamana: api jnaanasvaroopathvaath anyathvaath cha jnaanaprakruthithvaadhibhyascha hethubhya: naiva ajnaanam ghatathé*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa promptly replies:

- घटत एव - It **is** very, very possible.

This brief response implies: "We, the *Advaitins*, do not have any intellectual discomfort, in accepting *aathmaa* as the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhya*, because it is possible".

The *poorva pakshin* questions:

- कथम् - How is this possible ? / How do you avoid these three fallacies?

All these fallacies are not real / logical fallacies. They are all anomalies / abnormalities caused by *moolaavidhyaa* itself. This is because *moolaavidhyaa*, or, for that matter, any form of ignorance, is capable of causing logical anomalies. In fact, for *moolaavidhyaa*, all these abnormalities are natural results; but, with proper understanding, this fact that 'these are anomalies', will be realized.

Therefore, the *Aacharyaa* explains:

- अज्ञान मात्र निमित्तत्वात् - All these abnormalities are caused by *ajnaanam* / *moolavidhyaa* only.

What all does *moolaavidhyaa* cause?

- तद्विभागस्य - Duality / plurality is caused (by *moolaavidhyaa*),

Vibhaaga: - *dvaitham* / duality / divisions.

But, this duality caused by *moolaavidhyaa* does not disturb *advaitam*, because *moolaavidhyaa* is *mithyaa* and the duality caused by it is also *mithyaa*. *Mithyaa* duality cannot disturb *sathyam* non-duality, just as plurality of reflections cannot disturb the non-duality of the original object that is reflected. To clarify this example further: "Imagine that I am standing in a room with ten mirrors around. I am non-dual and in the ten mirrors there are ten images (people); but, those ten people are of a lower order of reality. Therefore, the plurality of reflected people will not disturb my non-duality. Even though I experience plurality, it does not intellectually disturb me". In the same manner, *mithyaa moolaavidhyaa* is creating *mithyaa* duality / plurality which will not disturb *sathyam* non-duality. Thus, the first objection of the *poorva pakshin*, viz., 'the acceptance of the existence of *moolaavidhyaa*, in addition to *aathmaa*, causes *dvaitham*' is answered by pointing out that *aathmaa* is *sathyam*, while *moolaavidhyaa* and the duality / plurality created by *moolaavidhyaa* are both *mithyaa*, and, because of this fact, '*dvaitha dosham*' is not there.

The second objection, viz. 'the *aathmaa* having 'relationship' with *moolaavidhyaa* – the *aasraya aasritha sambhandha:* - is untenable, because *aathmaa* is *asangha:*' is also explained in a similar manner, as follows: "This *sambhandhaa* also is *mithyaa* because relationship with a *mithyaa vasthu* is also *mithyaa*. When I am observing a *mithyaa* image, my observer status is also *mithyaa*. When the observed is (*mithyaa*) unreal, my observer-status is also (*mithyaa*) unreal. Thus, *aathmaasraya aasritha sambhandhaa* is not *sathyam*. It is caused by *ajnaanam*. *Sambhandhasya mithyaathvaath*, *aathma* continues to be *asangha:*, in spite of its *mithyaa sambhandha:* | A typical example is the mirage, where the dry sand continues to be dry in spite of the presence of mirage water. Mirage water is located in dry sand; but, dry sand has no real *sambhandhaa* with mirage water, because the mirage water is *mithyaa*. Therefore, dry sand continues to be dry sand". Thus, the second fallacy also should be understood to be an anomaly, which, in fact, is natural to ignorance. All anomalies are natural to ignorance. The job of ignorance is creating anomalies, as expressed by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in his *Maayaa Panchakam* (verse 1) - *agathiha ghatana pateeyasi maayaa*. Thus, the second objection is also ruled out.

In the same manner, the third objection, viz. "if *svayamprakaasa aathmaa* is the *aasrayaa* of *aprakaasa ajnaanam*, it amounts to two opposite attributes co-existing, which is impossible", is answered, by pointing out, that, in this instance of *aathmaa* being *aasrayaa* of *ajnaanam*,

this view of the *poorva pakshin* is also a misperception / an anomaly naturally caused by *moolaavidhya* ; the 'co-existence' is possible, since *aathmaa* and *ajnaanam* belong to two different orders of reality. An example already cited earlier, was that of a dreamer sleeping in a dark room dreaming of bright sunlight, in which instance, the *praathibhasika* sunlight exists in the *vyavahaarika* dark room, co-existence of light and darkness being possible, because the two are of different orders of reality.

Thus, all the three objections of the *poorva pakshin* stand refuted.

This portion is very important and therefore, though covered in the previous session, it is being repeated, especially since *Visishtaadvaiatham* constantly presents objections to *Advaiatham*. A book, known as '*satha dhooshani*' - 'a hundred fallacies in *advaiatham*' - , was written by a *Visishtaadvaiathin*, (out of which we have discussed only three in this portion). An *Advaiathin* responded to the *Visishtaadvaiathin*, also by writing a book, which he called '*satha bhushani*' - 'a hundred decorations'.

The *Advaiathin's* answer to the *Visishtaadvaiathin's* objections: "Whatever you see as logical fallacy in our philosophy, is nothing but a natural anomaly, caused by ignorance. Once you understand it that way, you would not see it as a fallacy. For instance, contrary to what you find illogical, viz., "the co-existence of two 'opposites'" , two 'opposites' *can* and *do* co-exist under the condition, that, one is *sathyam* and the other *mithyaa*, as in the case of (i) a dreamer dreaming of sunlight in a dark room and (ii) the mirage water. In the first example, light and darkness do co-exist, because the *jaagrath* darkness is *vyavahaarika sathyam*, while the dreamt sunlight is *praathibhasika sathyam*. In the second example, 'dryness' and 'wetness' do co-exist, because the dryness of the sand is *vyavahaarika sathyam*, while the wetness of the mirage water is *praathibhasika sathyam*. In both examples, opposite attributes do co-exist, by misperception caused by *adhyasam* or *ajnaanam*. If you call this 'co-existence' a logical fallacy, it is called *dhooshanam*; and, if you properly understand it as natural anomaly caused by ignorance, the very same thing is called *bhushanam*. Learn to see the *dhooshanams* as *bhushanams*. In fact, ultimately *samsaara* itself is *dhooshanam*, when you see it as a burden; but, when you see it as entertainment, the very same *samsaara* becomes *leela* or *bhushanam*. Rama losing Sitha is not *samsaara* but a *leela*, because Rama knew his *aathma svaroopam*. For a person who remembers the real nature, life is entertainment; for a person who forgets the real nature, life becomes a struggle."

Reverting to the text: Sureswaraacharya gives an example to the *vibhaagha: (dvaiatham)*, which *dvaiatham* includes the other two fallacies also (referred to above), which are all caused by *moolaavidhya* only, which itself is *mithyaa*, as indicated by the use of the term '*ajnaanamaathranimitthaathvaath*'.

- सर्प आत्मता इव रज्जुवाः - just as one and the same rope has two opposite statuses .

In the well-known *rajju-sarpaa* example, you can say rope is the support of 'snake' (*sarpa aasraya: rajju:*) and you can also say rope is not a support of the 'snake' (*sarpa anaasaraya: rajju:*). You can say both simultaneously. How?

When you are accepting *sarpa*, you say *rajju* is the *aasrayaa*; once you have understood, that, really speaking *sarpa* is not there, that, it is only an appearance, the apparent *sarpa* is as good as non-existent. When the *sarpa* is not existent, how can you call the rope as an *aasraya* of a non-existent *sarpaa*? Therefore, really speaking, rope is not *aasrayaa* of *sarpaa*.

Thus, rope is *aasrayaa* also and not *aasraya* also. This is similar to Lord Krishna saying, in the *Srimadh Bhagavadh Githa* "in Me, the world is there" and in the very next sentence "in Me, the world is not there". Krishna is comfortably saying "*mathsthaani sarvaboothaan!*" and "*na cha mathsthaani boothaan!*" (verses 4 & 5 – Chapter IX). If the question "Is this not a logical fallacy?" is raised, the answer will be "No; it is not a logical fallacy; it is only an anomaly caused by *maayaa* or *moolaavidhyaa*".

'*Sarpa aathmathaa*' means '*sarpa aasrayathvam*' | *Sarpasya aathmaa* (*aathmaa* means, *aasraya:*, in this context) - *sarpaathmaa* | *Thasysa bhaava: sarpa aathmathaa* | Rope is the 'support' of snake when the *sarpaa* is 'perceived' in it; but, it is really not the support of snake, because, the snake itself is really not there.

With this, the third topic is over. What is the third topic? '*Aathmaa* is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*.' Of course, we have to add appropriate adjectives. *Paaramaarthika sathya aathmaa* is the *aasrayaa* of the *vyaavahaarika sathya moolaavidhyaa*.

One more topic is there – the 4th topic. This is contained in the earlier sentences, preceding the portions just covered, viz., "*Kimvishayam puna: thadhaathmana: ajnaanam*" and "*Aathmavishayam ithi bhrooma:*" |

Kimvishayam puna: thadhaathmana: ajnaanam - What is the object of *moolaavidhyaa*?

Whenever ignorance is discussed, the question "ignorance of what?" automatically arises.

- तदात्मनः अज्ञानम् - That *aathma aasritham ajnaanam* / that *ajnaanam* which is located in the *aathmaa*,
- किं विषयं - is about what object?

"What is the object of the basic ignorance?" is the question.

Sureswaraachaarya deals with the question in one brief sentence. He answers:

- आत्मविषयं इति ब्रूमः - We answer that the object of ignorance is *Aathmaa* / the *ajnaanam* concerns the Self itself.

Not only is the locus of ignorance *aathmaa*; the object of ignorance is also *aathmaa*.

In 'me', there is ignorance and I am ignorant about / of 'myself'.

'Self-ignorance' is the cause of all our problems and the only medicine for this disorder is 'self-knowledge'.

With this the fourth topic, viz. '*aathmaa* is the object of *moolaavidhyaa*', is also completed. Having covered all these four topics, Sureswaraachaaryaa proceeds further:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

तस्मात्तदपनुत्तौ द्वैतानर्थाभावः ।

Therefore, all evil of the nature of duality ceases, when ignorance is dispelled.

Thus, we have seen that 'I', the *aathmaa*, am there and in 'me', the *aathmaa*, the *moolaavidhyaa* is there and this *moolaavidhyaa* has created *dvaitha prapancha*: |

Moolaavidhyaa is also *mithyaa*; the *dvaitha prapanchaa* is also *mithyaa* .

Moolaavidhyaa has got two powers. One power is called *vikshepa sakthi*; the other power is called *aavarana sakthi*: | And, because of the *vikshepa sakthi*, the *moolaavidhyaa* has created *dvaitha prapanchaa*, but, the *moolaavidhyaa*-created *dvaitha prapanchaa* can never affect 'me' at all, because 'I' am *sathyam*.

(Na hi adhyasthasya gunena doshena vaa anumaathrenaapi tha sambhandhyathe |)

In fact, we can enjoy the drama generated by the *mithyaa dvaitha prapanchaa*. But, it is generally seen, that we are not able to enjoy this *dvaitha prapanchaa* as 'entertainment'; on the other hand, it has become a serious 'struggle'; this is because, we are not able to see the *mithyaa dvaitham* as *mithyaa dvaitham*; but are seeing the *mithyaa dvaitham* as *sathyaa dvaitham*. The *mithyaaathvam* of *dvaitha prapanchaa* is 'concealed' for us, because of the second power of *moolaavidhyaa*, viz., *aavarana sakthi*.

Thus, the first power of *moolaavidhyaa* does not cause any problem ; and, is, in fact, a blessing, since, because of the *vikshepa sakthi* alone, we are able to have this wonderful drama of the *dvaitha prapanchaa*. If *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* is not there, 'I', the *Brahman*, will be continually existing without even the knowledge that 'I' am *Brahman*. Such a situation (purely academic) is bound to be monotonous.

Therefore, 'that, *moolaavidhya* is there', is a blessing ; 'that, it has *vikshepa sakthi*' is a greater blessing; 'that the *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhya* can create plurality, novelty, variety and changes' is also a most welcome blessing. Thus, *vikshepa sakthi* is not a serious problem; the problem is the *aavarana sakthi* which is 'covering' facts, because of which *dvaitham* appears as *sathyam* and I do not understand myself as the *asangha aathmaa*, but, mistake the body-mind complex as myself. It is *aavarana sakthi* which has created the triangular format. Instead of taking to the binary format – understanding that, I am the *asangha aathmaa*, and enjoying this wonderful creation with my power called *moolaavidhyaa* and its *vikshepa sakthi* - I mistake myself to be the body-mind complex and a miserable and helpless *jeeva*, because of the *aavarana sakthi*.

And, once I become the *jeeva*, the *jagath* is 'too much' for me. As *aathmaa*, I can challenge the world; but, as body-mind complex, I can never do so; the world appears to be a permanent persecutor. I get a persecution complex, constantly having my *jaathakam* read, wary of the planetary movements, constantly tracking their courses, and constantly trying to foresee the arrival of the different *dasaas* etc. Often, astrological knowledge becomes a curse, because, all the time, I am overwhelmed by *jagath* and rush to do *parihaarams*. All this is because of the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa*. Therefore, we have to tackle this problem of *aavarana sakthi*.

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- तदपनुत्तौ - when *moolaavidhyaa* is eliminated,

Apanutthi: – elimination / destruction; thath – refers to *moolaavidhyaa* ; thasyaa: (*moolaavidhyaayaa*:) apanutthi: - thadhapanutthi : |

- द्वैत अनर्थ अभावः - all the problems, caused by the *dvaitha prapanchaa* are also eliminated.

Elimination of *moolaavidhyaa* is 'removal' of *aavrana sakthi* and 'falsification' of *vikshepa sakthi*; *aavarana sakthi* must be removed; *vikshepa sakthi* is not removed, but, falsified as *mithyaa*.

Once *vikshepa sakthi* is falsified, the *dvaita prapanchaa* is also falsified; and, once *dvaita prapanchaa* is falsified, the *dvaita prapanchaa* becomes an entertainment.

Tragedy becomes much sought-after entertainment, only in one place - a movie or a play. Life also will become an entertainment, but, only under one condition; it should be reduced to a movie / play; and it will become a movie / play, only if one watches it, remaining as *aathmaa*, the *sathya thathvam*.

This elimination of *moolaavidhyaa* alone will make life a *leela*; and, with this wisdom / knowledge, one verily becomes an *avatar*. For this to happen, *moolaavidhyaa apanutthi*: is essential.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse – Chapter III:

तदपनोदश्च वाक्यादेव तत्पदपदार्थाभिज्ञस्य ।

The removal of ignorance is possible only through the proposition of Vedhaantha.

Now, the question is "how do you accomplish elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*?"

It should be remembered, that, whenever this term 'elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*' is used, it means 'removal' of *aavarana sakthi* and 'falsification' of *vikshepa sakthi*. These two-fold processes together are called *apanodha*: or *nivritthi*: | And, *apanodha*: is accomplished, only by study of *Vedhaantha Mahaa Vaakyaani*, indicated by the *Aachaaryaa* here, by the word '*vaakyaadeva*'. *Vedhaantha Mahaa Vaakyaani* are the essence of *Vedhaantha / Upanishads*. In fact, one meaning of the word '*upanishad*' is '*mahaavaakyam*'.

- वाक्यादेव- Only from the mahaavaakyam,
- तदपनोद(भवति) : - the elimination of that ignorance results,

This statement of the *Aachaaryaa* may lead to a doubt in the seeker's mind: " But, though I have read *mahaavaakyam* so many times, nothing has happened to me. In fact, I appear to have become immune to *mahaavaakyam*."

So Sureswaraachaaryaa clarifies:

- तत्पद पदार्थ अभिज्ञस्य - for a person who has clearly understood the words of the *mahaavaakyam* and also the meanings of those words clearly. .

Thadh padham – the words of the *mahaa vaakyam* ; *padha artha* – the meaning / significance of the words; *abhignya*: - one who has clearly grasped / comprehended.

The clear grasping of the fact “‘I’ am of a higher order of reality; everything else is of a lower order” is more than enough to attain *moksha*. No extraordinary or mystic experience is required.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

अतो वाक्यव्याख्यायाध्याय आरभ्यते |

Therefore, this chapter is started with a view to interpret the proposition.

“So,” the *Aachaaryaa* says “that means a ‘project’ has come”. What is the ‘project’?

Clear understanding of:

- (1) *thvam padha* and *thvam padhaartha*,
- (2) *thath padha* and *thath padhaartha* and
- (3) *asi padha* and *asi padhaartha*.

- अतः - Therefore,
- अध्याय - the *thrutheeya adhyaaya*:/ the third chapter
- आरभ्यते - is begun,
- वाक्य व्याख्यानाय - for the analysis / commentary of *mahaa vaakyam*.

What is the purpose of the third chapter? Ans: Extracting the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam* / acquiring the knowledge of the *mahaa vaakyam*, for the elimination of ignorance.

Vyaakyaanam means commentary or analysis.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 1 – Chapter III:

तत्र यथोक्तेन प्रकारेण तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्योपनिविष्टपदपदार्थयोः। :कृतान्वयव्यतिरेकः :

One who has understood through reasoning, according to the procedure stated, the terms in the proposition ‘That thou art’ and their meanings,(fulfils himself as follows):

To arrive at the significance of the words occurring in *mahaa vaakya*, a methodology is used and that methodology is called *anvaya vyathireka nyaaya*: |

By using *anvaya vyathirka nyaaya*, the significance of *thvam padhaa* viz., the *jeevaathmaa* and the significance of *thath padhaa* viz., the *paramaathmaa*, are arrived at. And, after knowing the significance of both, the seeker should study the *mahaa vaakyam*, when the impact will be tremendous.

An example will make this clear : The Laboratory Report of a patient does not signify or convey anything to the lay patient, either the nature of his malady or the treatment thereof ; but, to the Doctor, it conveys a lot of information on the nature of the patient's disorder, based on which he decides the course of the treatment. The same piece of paper, the Report, produces two reactions – 'utter blankness' in the patient but 'instant knowledge' in the Doctor. This is because, the Doctor had prepared himself by the Medical Education that he had received, to understand the significance of the Laboratory Report. With regard to Medical knowledge, the mind of the patient is *asamskritha antha:karanam*, while the Doctor's mind is *samskritha antha:karanam*. The report is capable of providing the knowledge; but, whether the report provides the knowledge or not, does not depend on the report itself but depends upon the type of intellect of the perceiver of the report. In the same manner, *mahaavaakyam* can be powerful or be just a bunch of words, depending on the capacity of the seeker. The difference is not in the *vaakyam*. The *vaakyam* has the potency for the prepared mind; but is impotent on the unprepared intellect.

Therefore, a big title is given by the *Aachaaryaa* to the prepared student, for whom *mahaavaakya* is not a bunch of words, but is the most powerful statement in the entire cosmos, eternally, because that is the only saving grace for all our struggles. Repeat: The only saving grace is the innocent looking statement '*thath thvam asI*'.

'*Krutha anvaya vyathireka*.' is that title given to the prepared student. How has such a student prepared? He has done ('*krutha*' means 'done') or employed the '*anvaya vyathireka*' reasoning.

Krutha: anvaya sahitha vyathirekha: yena sa: - Krutha anvaya vyathireka: |

- कृत अन्वय व्यतिरेकः - The one who has done the *anvaya vyathirekha* reasoning,

What is the subject of the '*anvaya vyathirekha*' reasoning?

- पद पदार्थयोः - on the significance / meanings of the words

Padha – word; *padhaartha* – meaning / significance.

Why does the *Aachaaryaa* use the word 'significance'? Ans: Because one and the same *padham* can have several meanings. For every word, there is *vaachyaartha* (immediate meaning) and *lakshyaartha* (target meaning).

The *lakshyaartha* also has *jahathi lakshyaartha* / *ajahathi lakshyaartha* / *jaha-ajahathi lakshyaartha* .

So many varieties of meanings are possible. The student should, therefore, clearly know and understand the appropriate meaning of *thvam* and the appropriate meaning of *thath*.

The appropriate meaning of '*thvam*' is 'the Consciousness' and not the '*sthoala sookshma kaarana sareeran*'.

The appropriate meaning of '*thath*' is not '*sarvagnya Isvara*', but 'the pure Existence'.

The equation is between 'the Consciousness', which is 'You' and 'the Existence', which is *Brahman*. It is 'Consciousness-Existence-equation'.

'You' are 'chith'; Brahman is 'sath'| And, 'chideva sath ; sadeva chith'|

The *Chaandhogya Upanishad* declaration "*Eithaadhaathmyam idagm sarvam thath sathyam sa aathmaa thathvamas*" – "All this (the whole universe) has got That as the Self. That is Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That" (VI. 8.7) is relevant in this context.

Where are those 'words' ('*padha*' in the text) to be found?

- वाक्य उपनिविष्ट - present in the mahaa vaakyani,

'*Upanivishta*' means 'present in'.

The '*sath-chith* equation' should be discovered in '*thathvamas*' *mahaa vaakyaa*, by applying *anvaya-vyathirekha* method.

Any *mahaa vaakyam* can be taken up for study - '*Aham brahma asmi*' , '*pragyaanam brahma*' etc. But, the very common *vaakyam* taken up is '*thath thvam asi*'. So, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- तत्त्वमस्यादि - such as 'thath thvam asi' etc.,

In what manner should be the *anvaya vyathirekha* method employed?

The *Aachaaryaa* will later emphasize: "After employing *anvaya vyathirkha*, the *mahaa vaakyam* should be read; and, after reading the *mahaa vakyam*, the *anvaya vyathirekha* should be done again; the process should be continued a number of times. This repeated 'reading of the *mahaa vaakyam*' and '*anvaya vyathirekha* analysis' would gradually increase the impact of the *mahaa vaakya* and in course of time, the *mahaavakyam* will become very, very clear.

"The message 'I am free' will be clear – **not** 'I have become free', but 'I was free; I am free and I will ever be free'. Until this stage is reached, the *anvaya vyathirekha* method should be repeatedly employed."

Now, therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- यथोक्तेन प्रकारेण - according to the procedure stated (that is to be laid down in the third chapter),

The sentence is not complete. The positive results of such a study are indicated in the verse (no. 1) that follows.

117. Chapter III- Verses 1 and 2 (15-11-2008)

In this elaborate Introduction to Chapter III, Sureswaraachaaryaa established that, there exists an illusive power termed *moolaavidhyaa*, which *moolaavidhyaa* is located in 'me', the *aathmaa*; and also, that, that *moolaavidhyaa* is the ignorance about *aathmaa*. In other words: "I' have an ignorance which is located in 'me' and that ignorance is about 'me'".

This *moolaavidhyaa* or self ignorance is endowed with *aavarana sakthi* and *vikshepa sakthi*.

And, of these two powers of self-ignorance, *vikshepa sakthi* is a great blessing; it is a wonderful and welcome power that 'I' am endowed with ; because of the *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* alone, 'I', the *aathmaa*, am able to create the entire universe , an universe, which can only entertain me, but which cannot 'touch' me. What a glorious power? 'I' have a power, which can create an universe, which universe will have the capacity to entertain 'me', but, which will not have the capacity to disturb me; such a *vyaavahaarika* universe / a *mithyaa* universe, 'I' can create with the *moolaavidhyaa vikshepa sakthi*. Therefore, I need not complain about this *vikshepa sakthi*; I need not work to stop this *vikshepa sakthi*. 'I' can allow it to do the *srushti- sthithi-laya* of the entire cosmos, eternally, on and on.

But, the disturbing factor is, that, the very same *moolaavidhyaa* has the *aavarana sakthi* also, which *aavarana sakthi* alone is responsible for all problems; because, this *aavarana sakthi* raises the *mithyaa* world to *sathyam* world. This *aavarana sakthi* is the culprit in creating all the problems. Because of the *aavarana sakthi* alone, the world which is *mithyaa*, which cannot disturb me, is raised to a higher level, a level which is on par with 'me'. And, once the world is thus raised to higher level / once 'I' and the world have the same order of reality, then arise all the problems. This world gets the capacity to threaten me / worry me / create all anxiety in me.

The problem is not because of the presence of the world; but, only because of giving more power to the world than it deserves. I, because of *aavarana sakthi*, empower the world to disturb me. It follows, that, once I remove that *aavarana sakthi*, this world would get disempowered; like a defanged cobra, it will be present as a *naaga – aabharanam* for me. A defanged cobra cannot be a threat. Thus, *aavarana sakthi rahitha moolaavidhyaa* becomes an *aabharanam*; *aavarana sakthi sahitha moolaavidhyaa* is a problem.

Therefore, the aim of the *Vedhaanthic* student is to remove the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* ; and, this is done by gaining 'knowledge'; the 'knowledge' will not destroy *moolaavidhyaa* ; it will remove *aavarana sakthi* and will falsify the *vikshepa sakthi* and the universe. The universe *will* be there; but, it will be of a lower order of reality. Whatever is of

a lower order of reality is as good as not existing; it *is* sufficiently there to entertain me, but not sufficiently there to disturb me.

Therefore, our project is: "Through 'knowledge', remove the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhya*, but allow the *moolaavidhya*, with its *vikshepa sakthi* and the world to continue eternally".

And, what should this knowledge be about? It was said that, 'to remove *aavarana sakthi*, 'I' should gain knowledge. What should that knowledge be about? Ans: Obviously, if the ignorance is about the Self, the knowledge also will have to be about the Self. Self ignorance will be eliminated only by Self knowledge, not by any of the other types of knowledge – knowledge of either material sciences or knowledge of *saasthraas*, such as *tharkaa*, *meemaamsaa* etc. Therefore, 'acquisition of Self-knowledge' *is* the Project for a seeker, a *mumukshu*.

The next question: How do you acquire Self Knowledge? Ans: Self-knowledge cannot be gained through any other means of knowledge other than *Vedhaanthaa*, because all other sources of knowledge deal only with *anaathmaa*. The other *pramaanams*, viz., *Prathyaksha*, *Anumaanaa*, *Upamaanaa*, *Arthaapaththi* and *Anupalabdhi* deal only with *anaathmaa*. None of them deals with *aathmaa*.

What about 'meditation', as a means of eliminating Self ignorance? 'Meditation' is not even included as one of the sources of knowledge, in the list of the six *pramaanaas*, whether material knowledge or spiritual knowledge. Tradition does not include 'meditation' as a source of knowledge. In the *shadpramaanam*, *dhyaanam* is not even included. They (the five *pramaanams* mentioned above and *dhyaanam*) are all useless for acquisition of Self knowledge.

There is only one saving grace - the *Vedaas*. And, in the *Vedaas* also, the *Veda Poorva* deals with *anaathmaa*; the *Veda anthaa* alone deals with *aathmaa*. And, even in the *Veda antha pramaanam*, there are topics like *annamaya kosa*, *praana maya kosaa* etc. If, therefore, the seeker filters away all such topics, the only portion that deals with *aathmaa* is the *mahaa vaakyam*. Thus, the study of the *mahaavaakyam* becomes crucial for the seeker / *mumukshu*.

The following example will show the importance of the *mahaa vaakyam* in acquiring *jnaanam*: When the doctor finds it impossible to diagnose the disorder of a chronically sick person, by mere physical examination, he subjects him to specified Laboratory tests, sometimes unique in character. The tests having been done and the reports received, the reports become very crucial to the patient, since the information given by the reports alone

would throw light on the current status of the patient's health and would decide his future - life or death. The patient, naturally, does not treat the Laboratory Reports as just pieces of paper with some unintelligible codes; but, as valuable documents with messages that are extremely relevant to him.

In the same manner, *Vedhaantha* is not just a book with some printed words; but, it contains an important message, which is going to determine whether the student is going to continue as a *samsaari*, facing eternal struggles, doing *praayaschittha* after *praayaschittha* or will realize his 'free' nature, which is not affected by the entire *prapancha*, including his *sareera thrayam*. To remember the 4th capsule of *Vedhaantha* (as enunciated by Swamiji): " 'I' am never affected by any event that happens in the material world or that happens in the material three-fold body; because, 'I' am the 'spirit', not disturbed or influenced by matter and material events". The student should receive this revelation from the *mahaa vaakyam*, which gives the message of *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam* through the expression "*thath thvam asI*" – '*thathI*' referring to *Paramaathma*, '*thvamI*' referring to *jeevaathma* and the word '*asI*' to *eikyam*.

But, Sureswaraachaarya also warns : "While on this subject of '*eikyamI*', when we talk about *jeevaathma* and *Paramaathma*, we have to first note that the *Paramaathma* has got an essential nature, a *svaabhaavika dharma*;, as well as, several non-essential features, *aaganthuka dharma*: | *Paramaathma* is a mixture endowed with one essential and several non-essential features. Similarly, the *jeevaathma* also is a mixture, having one essential and several non essential features. The *eikyam* is **not** in the non-essential / incidental / superficial / *vyaavahaarika* features. If the student keeps in mind only the non-essential *vyaavahaarika* features of the *Paramaathma* and *jeevaathma* , the message of *eikyam* will sound ridiculous or as a joke. Therefore, the student before studying the *maahaavakyaa* / before absorbing the main message, has to remove the non-essential features / attributes".

And, how do you remove them? By applying the principle, that, "whatever feature / attribute is variable, is nonessential; and, whatever feature / attribute is invariable, is essential". The invariableness is called *anvaya* and the variability / variableness is called *vyathirekha*. By studying the *vyathirekha*, whatever is variable, the student has to remove the non-essential features of *Paramaathma*, such as *sarvagnyathvam*, *sarva Isvarathvam*, *sarva kalyaana gunaika nilayathvam* etc. They must all be dismissed as variable and non-essential; because, they are there only during *srushti kaalam*; *pralaya kaale*, they are all resolved.

Therefore, the serious seeker has to scrap all incidental features of *Paramaathma* . This 'scrapping' of all the incidental features in *Paramaathma* is indicated by the word *vyathireka*.

The seeker has to retain only the non-variable feature and the only non-variable feature in *Paramaathmaa* is *sath* - 'Existence'.

"*Sadeva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" - "O good looking one! In the beginning, this was Existence alone, One only without a second", declares Uddhaalaka Aaruni to his son Svetakethu, in the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (VI.2.1).

Other than 'Existence', all attributes of the *Paramaathmaa* should be relentlessly removed. Sentiments such as "I like the beautiful form / nose of the Lord" will not make *Vedhaantha* work in the seeker. Without any weakness or emotion, the *sabda-sparsa-roopa-rasa-gandha* attributes of the *Paramaathmaa* should be knocked off intellectually and pure 'Existence' alone should be retained. And, pure 'Existence' is all-pervading (*Yasyaiva spuranam sadhaathmakam*).

It should also be known and remembered, that (i) 'Existence' is not a part, product or property of the world (ii) 'Existence' is an independent entity which pervades the world (iii) 'Existence' is not limited by the boundaries of the world and (iv) 'Existence' continues even after the resolution of the world.

When the seeker hears the word *thath*, only 'Existence', as its meaning, must come to his mind. His intellect must filter off all attributes. *Sath* alone *is anvayam* ; all attributes are *vyathirekam*. This is the first project to be completed, before listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*. On completion of this Project 1, *sath* should mean, to the seeker, 'Pure Existence'. All others are variables.

Similarly, when *jeevaathmaa* is considered (in the *jeevaathma-paramaathma-eikyam* equation), all the incidental features of *jeevaathmaa*,

- (i) emotions such as *raaghaa*, *dveshaa*, *kaamaa*, *krodhaa*, *lobhaa* etc.
- (ii) *varnaas* such as *Brahmana*, *Kshathriyaa*, *Vaiysya*, *Sudhraa* etc.
- (iii) gender – male or female
- (iv) relationships such as father, mother, husband, wife etc. should be dismissed as *vyathirekha*.

It should be recognized that 'Consciousness' is the only constant invariable factor (*anvayaa*) of *jeevaathmaa*. Either when subject to emotions or when free of emotions such as sorrow, jealousy etc., 'Consciousness' *is*. Thus, all incidental features (*vyathirekha*) should be removed and only Pure Consciousness, the only non-variable (*anvayam*) of *jeevaathmaa*, should be retained. This is Project 2, after successful completion of which, the word *thvam* should mean only the Pure Consciousness to the seeker.

Thus, when the enlightened seeker hears the word `thath`, he should remember `sath`; and when he hears the word `thvam`, he should understand it as `chith`. And, then, when the word `asI` is mentioned, `sath` and `chith` must get `married` in his intellect. This is the holiest `marriage` or probably the only true `marriage`, because, any other marriage brings, in its wake, problems also. This is the only `marriage`, i.e. the *eiyyam* between the *mahaavaakya sath* and *chith*, which `marriage` will not create any problem; but, instead solve all problems. This *eiyyam* means, "I, the `Conscious` being, *am* only the `Existence` principle", which is Reality. All the others are only `dramas` going on – `naama roopa dances` going on. The seeker should not get carried away by them, but, should use them purely for `entertainment` – *kreedaartham*.

"Kreedaaartham srujasi prapancham akilam kreedamrugaa: the janaa: yath karmaacharitham mayaa cha bhavatha: preethyaai bhavatheva thath | sambho svasya kuthoohalasya karanam maccheshtitham nischitham" – "Hey Sambho! You create the entire universe for Your play. The people are Your playthings. Whatever actions I do, are also at Your behest. And, it is certain that they are tools for your pleasure" says Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa in Sivanadalahari, addressing Lord Siva (verse 66). The whole creation is a drama / an entertainment.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*mahaavaakyam* will work, only if you apply *anvaya vyathirkha* and remove the superficial attributes".

Otherwise, when the declaration "you are *aananda svarooa:*", is made, the student, remembering all the problems – at the global, national and personal levels - will view the statement only as a cruel joke.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa underlines the term "*krutha anvaya vyathirekha:*", meaning "one, who has done the *anvaya vyathirekha* reasoning". Only after *anvaya vyathirekha*, the *mahaavaakya* will work.

In what manner is the *anvaya vyathirkha* done?

- *Yathoktha prakaarena* – As was shown in the previous chapter, by pointing out that
- 'I' am the *saakshi* and the *sareerathrayam* is only
- *Anaathmaa* and as to be elaborated in the ensuing chapter.

Before *anvaya vyathirekha* is done, the `eiyyam` will not be realized. Only after completion of the *anvaya vyathirkha* successfully, the *eiyyam* between *sath* and *chith* will be realized.

And, out of this *sath-chith* 'marriage', are born, the offspring, *saanthi*, *thrupthi*, *poornathvam* etc.

After this long Introduction, Sureswaraachaarya proceeds:

Chapter III: Verse 1 –

यदा ना तत्त्वमस्यादेर्ब्रह्मास्मीत्यवगच्छति।

प्रध्वस्ताहंममो नैति तदा गीर्मनसो :सृतिम् ॥ २ ॥

When a person understands 'I am *Brahma*' through the propositions like 'That thou art', his sense of 'I' and 'mine' are destroyed and he goes beyond the realm of words and mind.

- यदा - Suppose,

This word '*yadha*' ('suppose') means 'supposing the message of the *guru* and *saasthraas* has been successfully conveyed to the student'.

- तत्त्वमस्यादेः - from the *pramaana vaakyams* 'thatthvamasī' etc.,

The use of the word '*aadh*' (etc.) is significant, since, it conveys the fact that there are thousands of *mahaavaakyams* occurring in the Upanishads, though it is commonly believed, that, the *mahaavaakyams* are four in number. But, the commonly known four *mahaavaakyams* are only samples, one from each *Veda*.

- ना - a person,

The literal meaning of the word '*naa*' is '*manushya*.' | In this context, it refers to the *saadhana chathushtaya sampanna*;, who has already done *anvaya* and *vyathirekha* and is retaining the essential of nature '*chith*' in himself and the essential nature of '*sath*' in *Paramaathmaa*.

When such an *adhikaari*,

- अवगच्छति - understands / discerns / grasps

Discerns what? That, "I am the *sathya chaithanyam*, which is identical with *sathya chith* or Existence".

And, how (in what form) does he gather that wisdom?

-)अहम्) ब्रमास्मि इति - that 'I' am Brahman,

The word '*aham*' should be 'supplied'. What is meant by '*aham*', in this statement? It is not the body, which always has problems; nor is it the mind, which also always has problems. The FIR (Frequency, Intensity and Recovery Period) of emotions like anger, fear etc. can, at best, be reduced, but, can never be brought down to zero. Even for the greatest *jnaani*, absolute perfection is impossible in the body or in the mind. Only that, in his case, the imperfections will be minimum, to such an extent, that they will be almost invisible.

Therefore, the student, while understanding the word '*aham*', should discard the body, the mind (along with its *raagha-dveshaa* etc.) and the *kaarana sareeram* also and understand '*aham*' as "*sthoola sookshma kaarana sareeraath vyathiriktha:; avasthaa thraya saakshi, pancha kosa vilakshana:; sachhidhaananda svaroopo:*" (as defined in the treatise *Thathva Bodham*).

And, what is that *Brahman*? It is not somebody sitting in *Vaikuntaa* ; nor somebody sitting in *Kailaasa*. One need not *go and join* that *Brahman*. That *Brahman* is the 'Existence' which is all-pervading, and the 'Existence' which is in the body-mind complex also.

That 'Existence' *is* Consciousness and that 'Consciousness' *is* 'Existence'.

When should this understanding take place? It cannot take place in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, when *buddhi* itself is resolved. In *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, neither the source of knowledge is there in the form of *pramaanam* , nor is the mind there, because the mind is resolved during *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* .

The clear 'understanding' **can** and **should** take place only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, when the seeker is very, very alert. When he listens to the 'teaching'- *sravana kaale* - the message has to be received by him. If at all he practices meditation, the meditation is only meant to recollect the teaching that he had gathered during *sravanam*. During *sravanam*, the seeker 'collects' the knowledge and during *nidhidhyaasanam*, he 'recollects' the knowledge.

In *nidhidhyaasanam*, there is no possibility of collecting any new or fresh knowledge. '*Nidhidhyaasanam*' is only 'dwelling upon the already-collected wisdom'.

That's why Sureswaraachaarya says "*sravana kale*, a person gathers the knowledge, from the *mahaavaakyam*".

And as even as the seeker is gathering the knowledge, simultaneously, as a corollary, another thing should happen. That corollary also is very, very important. What is that corollary? Ans: The student should note "this *sareerathrayam* is neither 'me' nor 'mine'". This corollary is extremely important.

Getting the conviction "*sareerathrayam* is not 'me' " is called *ahamkaaranivritthi*: ; getting the conviction "*sareerathrayam* is not 'mine' " is *mamakaara nivritthi*: | The *sareerathrayam* should be distanced from 'Me'.

But, how to dispose of the *sareerathrayam*? Ans: By 'handing over' the *sareerathrayam* to the *viswaroopa Isvara*, Who is the only Possessor and Controller of the *sareerathrayam*. The seeker should deliberately / consciously hand over the *sareerathrayam* to *viswaroopa Isvara*. 'Handing over *sareerathrayam*' means 'refusing to worry about *sareerathrayam* any more'. The seeker should deliberately 'refuse' to worry about *sareerathrayam*, by handing it over to *viswaroopa Isvara*, the total *Anaathmaa*.

Viswa roopa Isvara is also *anaathmaa* – macro *anaathmaa*. Not only should the seeker hand over *sareerathrayam* to macro *anaathmaa*, but, he should also deliberately see *sareerathrayam* as of a lower order of reality.

To repeat: Not only should *sareerathrayam* be handed over to Total Matter , the seeker should see *sareerathrayam* as *mithyaa* also; which means, that, whatever happens there (in the *sareerathrayam*), the seeker should not get affected or disturbed.

An interesting analogy can be given. When a gift to someone is made, it is seen, that, quite often, the person who makes the gift, tends to worry, as to what happens to his gift, whether it is being utilized properly etc. But, this type of worry would mean that the 'gifting' is only lip-service. Once the gift is made, the person who has made the gift should not worry at all, about what happens to the gift.

In the same manner, in the matter of *saranaagathy* to the *Viswaroopa Isvara*, the attitude of worrying about the *sareerathrayam*, after surrendering it to *Isvara*, is not right, since it means that the *saranaagathy* is not total. If the *saranaagathy* is total and genuine, there should be no fear or worry at all.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "corollary of *mahaavakyam* is *sareerathraya sanyaasa*:"|

The advice should also be extended further ; the advice is not limited to non-attachment to one's own *sareerathrayam* alone, while permitting the keeping alive of the relationship and

attachment to one's wife, family etc. It should be understood and remembered that relationship and attachment to wife / family are, after all, only through one's *sareeram* ; when the *mumukshu* is expected to renounce *sareera sambhandha* itself, where is the question of relationships like *bhartha*, *bhaaryaa*, *pithaa*, *maathaa* etc.? All these *sanghaas* (attachments) should also be handed over to the *Viswaroopa Isvara*. *Sarvasangha parithyaghaa* **has** to take place. There is no choice. No *mokshaa* is possible, without *sarva sangha parithyaaghaa*. And, after handing over the relationships also to *Viswaroopa Isvara*, the seeker should not entertain even a little bit of worry or concern about relations. That is also a corollary.

That's why, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* warns "*jnaanam* alone can never give *moksha*, without *sanyaasa*". The *sanyaasa* referred to here, is not "mere wearing of *kaashaaya vasthram* and quitting one's household". One may take to wearing *kaashaaya vasthram* and move to *Badrinath*, but still continue to worry about one's family one has left behind.

"*Kaashaaya vasthra dhaaranam* and *Badrinath vaasam*", by themselves, will not solve *samsaaraa*; '**mental renunciation**' is real *sanyaasa*, which is more important than *Kaashaaya vasthram* and external renunciation of one's family and duties. This real *sanyaasa-sahitha-jnaana* gives *mokshaa*. This is the message that is being conveyed by *Sureswaraachaaryaa*, in the second line of the verse 1 (under study).

- प्रध्वस्त अहंममः - and eliminates the *ahamkaara* and *mamakaaraa* from his / her mind,

What is the definition of *ahamkaaraa*? Ans: Looking at *sareerathrayam* as 'me'.

What is *mamakaraa*? Ans: Looking at *sareerathrayam*, the family and the property as 'mine'.

Both of them must be eliminated (meaning of the word *pradhvastham*) from the seeker's thinking.

The term '*avagachchathl*' denotes 'acquisition of *jnaanam*' and the word '*pradhvastha aham mama:*' indicates the mental renunciation.

The term '*pradhvastha aham mama:*' is actually a noun and literally means 'one in whom *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa* have been eliminated' / 'one who has taken to *aanthara sanyaasaa*.' The term is derived as "*Pradhvasthau ahamkaara mamakaarau yasya sa:*" = "*pradhvastha aham mama:*" /

If both of them viz., *jnaanam* and *sanyaasaa* happen,

- तदा - then / in such circumstances,
- न येति - (the person) does not fall within
- सृतिम् - the field of any transaction,
- गीः - verbal
- मनसोः - or of thought .

'*Sruthi:*' means 'field' or 'scope'. '*Ghee:*' indicates 'verbal / language transactions' and '*manaso:*' indicates 'transactions of mind / thought'. All worries / future plans are thought transactions.

Such a person becomes the *thureeya aathmaa*, as defined in the *Maandookya Upanishad* (7th *manthraa*). There are a number of descriptions of *thureeya aathmaa* in the *Maandookya Upanishad*, one of which, viz., '*Avyavahaaryam*', is highlighted here.

'*Avyavahaaryam*' means 'going beyond 'know'ing *vyavahaaraas* and 'do'ing *vyavahaaraas*' i.e., 'neither available for knowledge nor for action'.

Knowledge takes place in the '*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi*' and actions take place in the '*karthru-karma-karana -thriputi*'.

The *jnaani* is beyond *jnaana vyavahaara thriputi* and *karma vyavahaara thriputi*; and, therefore, is beyond all transactions.

'I' am the medium in which all transactions take place; but, 'I' am not a participant in any of the transactions.

What is the best example of a medium in which all transactions take place, but, which, by itself is a non-participant in any transaction? Ans: We have two examples in the *saasthraas*.

One is *aakasa:* - 'space'. Space is the medium in which all transactions take place; but, space itself does not participate in the transactions nor is it affected by any of the transactions.

What is the second example? *Prakaasa:* / *Soorya Prakaasa:*, in which all our activities are going on; but, the *prakaasaa* itself is not a participant nor is it affected.

In the same manner, 'I' am the 'Existence-Consciousness Medium', in which all transactions – tragic or good - take place, influenced by the powerful *praarabhdhaa*. *Praarabhdhaa* is

unstoppable. Either tragic or welcome events cannot be stopped ; they will all take place, because of the *praarabhdhaa*. But, 'I' am a non-participant in the events.

In effect, Sureswaraachaaryaa declares (in this verse): "The seeker, immediately on 'acquisition of *jnaanam* and deliberate mental renunciation', discovers, that 'I' transcend all transactions ; that, 'I' am the transcendental 'Self', who is free from mental problems".

The human tendency is to venture into transactions, with the fond hope "after this transaction, my life will be better". And, when one wants to improve the quality of one's life, by various worldly transactions, one is said to 'fall within the field of transactions'. And, people do try to improve the quality of their lives, by various worldly transactions. *Vedhaantha* warns: "you can never improve yourself with worldly transactions; even if you do manage to achieve an improvement, it will be short-lived; sooner than later, the same problem or a different type of problem will surface".

"Therefore, never try to improve yourself by any transactions ; understand that 'I' am not 'improvable'" is the advice of *Vedhaantha*. The advice should be understood properly; it does not reflect a 'negative' attitude as if there are no hopes of ever improving. On the other hand, it is a positive assurance "'I' do not **need** to be improved. Nothing can ever 'touch' me; they are meant only for my 'entertainment' ". This is the repeated teaching of *Vedhaantha*.

"Gheer manaso sruthim thadhaa na yethi" is a translation of the Thaitreeya Upanishad statement "yatho vaachaa nivarthanthe apraapya manasaa saha" (Manthraa 9 of Brahmavalli) – "Words along with the mind return without reaching that (Brahman)".

Therefore, who am 'I'? Ans: After assimilation of *mahaavaakyam*, 'I' am the transcendental screen , on which the movie called 'life' is going on. This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to dwell upon, in this chapter 3. This first verse is a *samkshepa sloka*: | Just as research scholars venturing for a 'doctorate', are expected to first submit the synopsis of their subject of research, the *Aachaaryaa* is presenting the synopsis of his 'thesis' in this first verse; the third chapter is the 'thesis' and this *sloka* is the synopsis of the thesis.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 2 – Chapter III:

यदेव तदर्थं त्वमर्थेऽवैति तदेवावाक्यार्थतां प्रतिपद्यते गीर्मनसो :सृतिं न प्रतिपद्यत इति । कुत एतदध्यवसीयते । यस्मात् ।

The significance is that when he discerns the import of 'That' in the import of 'Thou', then itself he attains what is behind the import of the proposition and transcends accessibility to words and mind. How is this known?

The same idea is further clarified by the *Aachaaryaa*, in a different language.

What happens in the prepared, non-preoccupied intellect of a discerning, carefully-listening student, when he is receiving the crucial message `thath thvam asf`?

The *Aachaaryaa* says:

- यदा - At the time of successful *sravanam* ,
- तदर्थ - the meaning / import of the word `thath` ,

When the word `thath` is listened to, by the student, that `thath` is understood as the all-pervading `Existence`, because this *mahaavaakyam* occurs in the 6th Chapter of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* and in that 6th Chapter, the *Upanishad* defines *Paramaathmaa* as the pure `Existence` of the five features.

(As studied in earlier contexts, the five features are: (i) `Existence` is not a part, product or property of the world (ii) `Existence` is an independent entity which pervades the world (iii) `Existence` is not limited by the boundaries of the world (iv) `Existence` continues even after the resolution of the world and (v) the surviving `Existence` is not accessible because of the absence of the world.)

That definition of the *Chandhoghya Upanishad* must be remembered by the seeker, not later, but, at the very time of listening to the word `thath` . The pure `filtered` `Existence` , filtered / free from all the *naama roopas* – the *pancha bhoothaas* such as *aakaasa*, *vaayu* etc., and the different *lokaas* such as *bhoo:* , *bhuva:* etc., - that all-pervading `Existence` alone should be understood as the meaning of the word, when listening to the word `thath`. In the intellect of the student, the word `thath` is retained as pure `Existence`.

The next word that the teacher uses is `thvam`. When the student listens to this word `thvam`, which word literally means `you`, and naturally, when addressed to the student by the teacher, understood as `I`, the Conscious being, that the student is. But, the conscious being is not pure; it is mixed with a lot of incidental attributes, which are thrown into `me` – some attributes from the *sthoola sareeram*, some attributes from the *sookshma sareeram* etc. In the normal course, `I` is associated with several attributes, borrowed from the *sareerathrayam*. So, what does / should the prepared intellect of the discerning student do, when he hears the word `thvam` from the *Guru*? It `gives off` / should `give off` , all the attributes to the respective *sareeram* and `I` should remain as the `sareerI`, the Witness Consciousness – the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

At this stage, in the intellect of the student, two 'things' are present – '*that*' (meaning 'Pure Existence') and '*thvam*' (meaning 'Pure Consciousness') and the stage is set for a 'marriage' between the two.

It is common knowledge, that, in a *Vaidhika* wedding, before the actual wedding ceremony, certain rituals are gone through separately for the bridegroom and separately for the bride. In a similar manner, in understanding the true import of the *mahaavaakyam*, the above two processes – viz., proper understanding of the word '*that*' and proper understanding of the word '*thvam*' – have been completed.

At this stage, in the student's intellect, '*Sath*' is existing separately and '*chith*' is existing separately. Then comes the link between the two, the word '*as*' - (to continue with the wedding analogy) - the priest solemnizing the 'marriage'.

The word '*as*' establishes "you' are 'that'" – that, there is no difference between 'Pure Existence – *Brahman*' and 'Pure Consciousness – *Jeeva*'.

As a consequence of this equation, 'I', the '*chith*' am not located in the body; 'I', the '*chith* **am** the '*sath*' principle, which is not localized anywhere but is all-pervading.

I, the '*chith*, **am** '*sath*'. Therefore, my sense of localization has to be dropped. When I merely say "I' am '*chith*", there *is* a sense of localization, because Consciousness is experienced only in the body and not experienced outside the body. But, the moment the '*sath-chith*' equation takes place / when *chith* is equated to *sath*, the sense of 'localization' goes away, because 'Existence' is everywhere.

'I' am there, everywhere in the form of 'IS'. 'I' am the *sath-chith- aathmaa*, who is all-pervading.

118. Chapter III- Verses 1 and 2 (22-11-2008)

Sureswaraachaarya is analyzing how the mahhavaakyam works in the intellect of a prepared student; in other words, the intellectual process, at the time of receiving the message, through the maahaavaakyaa, is being described by him.

The *mahaavaakyam* that the *Aachaaryaa* has taken up for the study, is '*thath thvam asi*'. When the word '*thath*', is heard by the student, he understands, that, it is a pronoun, which means 'that'.

As is known, a pronoun stands for / refers to a noun which has been mentioned earlier. In Sanskrit, it is termed '*poorvoktha paraamarshi sarva naamā*'.

This '*thaththvamas'* *mahaavakyam* occurs in the 6th chapter of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*. Therefore, to understand the import of the pronoun '*thath*' in this *mahaavaakyam*, the student has to refer to that portion of the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, where the *mahaavaakyam* and the pronoun '*thath*' occur. And, in that portion, we find that Uddhaalaka Aaruni, the teacher of the *mahaavaakyam*, first introduces *Brahman* as pure 'Existence', which alone had existed, before the arrival of all the *naamaroopas*.

The exact text of his declaration is "*sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" (VI.2.1 – C.U.) - "O! Good looking one! In the beginning this was 'Existence' alone, One only, without a second".

What is the definition of 'Pure Existence'? Ans: As had been discussed in the earlier class and in other contexts also,

- (1) 'Pure Existence' is not a part, product or property of any product which is to be created later; not even a property of space, because space itself is to arrive later.
- (2) It is an independent entity which pervades and lends existence to all the other later created *naamaroopaprapanchaa*
- (3) The 'Pure Existence' is not bound by the boundaries of any object - both space wise and time wise boundaries.
- (4) The 'Pure Existence' continues to survive, even after the disintegration of the entire universe, including time and space
- (5) But, the 'Pure Existence' that survives, is not available for any transaction, because, transactions require *naamaroopaa* medium.

That pure Existence is first introduced in the 6th chapter of the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*; and, thereafter the *guru*, Uddhaalaka, teaching his son and disciple, Svetaketu, points out

“the entire creation is nothing but *naamaroopaa* addition on that pure Existence. Upon the *adhishtaanam`sath*, all the *namaropaas* have been superimposed; and they enjoy a lower order of reality”.

And, later, in that same chapter (*shashtodhyaayaa*) of the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*, the Creation is elaborated as *boothathraya srushti / thribootha srushti*, instead of the usual *panchabootha srushti*; and, instead of *pancheekaranam*, the *Upanishad* talks of *thrivrithkaranam*.

All of them have been talked about, inclusive of the arrival of body-mind complex – “*Annamayagum hi soumya mana: aapomaya: praana: thejomayee vaak*” (VI. 5. 4) – “O! Good looking one! Mind is surely made of food, vital force is made of water, speech is made of fire”.

Uddhaalaka Aaruni then tells Svethakethu: “Your *praana*, your mind etc. are also only *naamaroopaaas*, which are objects of experience and superimposed on pure Existence. Because of this, i.e. since all the *naamaroopaaas* are superimposed on Existence, Existence must be there behind all the *naamaroopaaas*, just as water must be there behind all oceans, waves, bubbles, froth etc. Existence cannot be elsewhere but is the very *adhishtaanam* behind all the *naamaroopaaas*. All *naamaroopaaas* are objects of experience and conversely, all experienced objects are superimposed *naamaroopaaas*. Even *desa* and *kaalaa* are created objects, superimposed on pure Existence. And, therefore, you have to negate all the experienced objects/ *naamaroopaaas*”.

As advised, Svethakethu negates the world as superimposed *naamaroopaa*; negates the body; negates the mind; negates everything as superimposed. And, he wants to experience the Pure Existence.

That is his desire: viz. (i) To negate all the *naamaroopaaas*, which are experienced (whatever is experienced is only *naamaroopaa*) and (ii) after negating everything including thoughts, which also are only created *naamaroopaaas*, to experience the ‘Pure Existence’.

With that intense desire (the Tamil word **ஆவல்** is more apt in conveying the intensity of his desire), he is sitting in *nirvikalpakasamaadhi*, to experience that Pure Existence. At that time, Uddhaalakaa warns him: “Never try to experience the Pure Existence, because it is **not** an object which can be experienced”.

Then, what is it? Uddhaalakaa answers: “It is ‘you’ ” (*Thath thvam asi*)?

What is that 'you'? It is not the body 'you', which has been negated; not the 'mind' you, also negated; not the thoughts 'you', also negated; not even the blankness 'you', which is also negated. After negating all of them, what is left behind is the Pure Consciousness principle.

'I' am the *chith thathvam*, who am wanting to experience the *sath thatvam* - the Pure *namaroopa-rahitha-sath*.

At that crucial juncture, Uddhaalakaa says: "*eithaadhmiam idhaagum sarvam thathsathyam sa aathmaa **thath thvam asi Svethaketho***" - "That which is this subtle essence, all this has got That as the Self. That is the Truth. That is the Self. **Thou art That, O! Svethaketu!**" (C.U. VI. 9.4).

And, thus, it can be seen, that, the pronoun '*thath*' means / refers to 'Pure Existence'. *Sath* is not an 'experiencable' object. It happens to be the very Experiencer/ Subject itself.

This is what is called *sath- chith* equation.

Thereafter, i.e., after listening to this equation properly, if the student has a prepared, observant and absorbing mind, he will claim "I am the *sath*". And, whatever definitions were given to *sath*, he will apply to 'I' also, viz., as: "'I' am not a part, product or property of the universe; 'I' pervade the universe, lending it existence; 'I' am not limited by the boundaries of the universe; I continue to survive even after the entire *naamaroopa prapanchaa* resolves; 'I', that *Sath*, is free from all types of limitations".

This knowledge is not something to be postponed; but to be absorbed, as efficiently as a sponge does, at the time of *sravanam* itself. *Sravanam* positively works for an observant listener.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says: "*mahaavaakyam* is an instantaneously- liberating primary teaching of the *Upanishads*."

- यदा एव - (The student), at the very time of listening itself (*sravana kaale eva*),

Then, what is the purpose of *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*? *Mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam* are not for 'becoming' *sath*, because 'I' am always (am / was/ will ever be) *sath*; nor for 'experiencing' *sath*, because *sath* is never an object of experience. They (*mananam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*) are meant to break our habitual orientation. One may call them 'orientation-dismantling exercises'.

And, what does this 'dismantling of orientation' mean? "*Moksha* is something that is to happen in future" is the orientation, even after long periods of *sravanam*. The *Vedhaanthic* student, even after 25 years of *sravanam*, only 'hopes', that, *sometime* in the future, he will be able to claim "I am also liberated".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "this hope for a **future** *moksha* is a false orientation. *Moksha* is my *svarooopa*; *Moksha* is to be claimed **'here and now'**".

Nidhidhyaasanam is prescribed only to break this wrong orientation, viz., "*mokshaa* is something that will happen to me, *sometime* in the future".

The claim of *mokshaa* has to happen at the time of *sravanam*. This is the significance of the use of the word '*yadhaa*' by the *Aachaaryaa*, meaning '*sravana kaale eva*'.

- अवैति - grasps / jaanaathi
- तदर्थ - the meaning of the word *thath* (occurring in the *maaha vaakayam*),

And, what is the meaning of *thath*? Ans: 'Pure Existence'

This is *aparoksha jnaanam* not *paroksha jnaanam*. *Paroksha jnaanam* is not possible, because , *paroksha jnaanam* is only of an object which is far away. One can get only the *paroksha jnaanam* of Gangodhri / Kailaasaa etc., because they are 'located' far away. One will get only 'indirect' knowledge of distant objects.

But, 'knowledge of *Brahmar*' can never be indirect knowledge, because *Brahman* is not far away, in terms of place also and in terms of time also.

The belief that "*Brahman* is available **only** in *nirvikalapa samaadh*" is also a result of wrong understanding. What the *Upanishads* aver is that *Advaitam Brahman* is available in all the *avasthaas*; therefore, *sravana kaale eva* (at the time of *sravanam* itself) , *Brahman* is available directly - *aparkoshathayaa*.

'Yadhaa' - 'sravana kaale'; 'Avaithee' means 'aparokashthayaa jaanaathi'.

Every word in this portion is significant.

How (in what form) does the student know *Brahmar*? Not as something remote; but-

- त्वमर्थव - as identical with 'I', the Self,

'I', the Self, is the ever-experienced Consciousness. One does not have to work for the experience of Consciousness; one has to work for the experience of everything else other than Consciousness; but, Consciousness is an entity for whose experience one need not work, because Consciousness is ever / all the time experienced, just as one experiences the light all the time, which (experience of light) is proved by one experiencing the objects around him. If 'light' is not being experienced, the objects around also will not be experienced.

Experience of every object presupposes the experience of light. Similarly, every knowledge presupposes the experience of Consciousness; therefore Consciousness is the ever experienced Self.

And what is *Brahman*? *Brahman* also happens to be that 'I', the Self, which is the ever-experienced Consciousness. This means that *Brahman* is ever experienced as *aham* or in the form of 'I'. All the people are experiencing *Brahman* all the time.

This may give rise to a question: "In that case i.e., if everyone is experiencing *Brahman*, all the time, as the Self ever-experienced Consciousness, where is the need for the study of *Vedhaanthaa*?"

Ans : *Vedhaanthaa* is **not** for the experience of *Brahman* or *Aathmaa*. The purpose of / need for studying *Vedhaanthaa* is explained as follows: "Along with the experience of 'I', the *Brahman*, experience of the body (*sthoola* and *sookshma sareeraani*) is also there. Thus, we have got experience of a mixture – the *Sathyam Brahman* and the *mithyaa* body. And, we commit the mistake of taking the attributes of the body, as the attributes of 'my' self. The aim of *Vedhaanthaa* is not to give us the experience of Brahman but correcting this mistake - transferring every experienced attribute to the body, so that, once this transference is done, an individual, after saying 'I am', will not add 'a male' (or such similar descriptions) , because descriptions such as 'male' have been transferred to the body".

"I' am *not* a male (or a female). 'I' am the genderless Consciousness principle".

Vedhaanthaa is required to make the seeker realize this fact and make him stop with the claim " 'I' **am**", instead of saying "I am fat"; "I am happy" etc. , the fatness, happiness etc., being attributes of the body only (*sthoola* or *sookshma*) .

Vedhaanthaa is not required for experiencing *Brahman*, because, *Brahman* is ever experienced as '*thvamarthaiva*' i.e. 'in the meaning of the word *thvam*'.

And what is the meaning of *thvam*? Ans: *Saakshi chaithanyam*.

- तदा एव - (and) at that very moment,
- अवाक्यार्थतां प्रतिपद्यते - gets the knowledge of the *aathmaa*, which is not a prameyam.

'*Avaakyarthathaa*' means '*aprameyathvam*'. How does one get this meaning ?

It is explained thus: *vaakyam* is a *pramaanam*; one of the six *pramaanams* is *sabda pramaanam*; *vaakyam* is a *sabda pramaanam*; '*vaakya arthaa*' means the '*prameyam* of the *sabda pramaanamvaakyam*'. Therefore, '*Vaakyarthathaa*' means '*prameyathvam*' and '*avaakyarthathaa*' means '*aprameyathvam*'.

'*Aprameyathvam*' means '*thriputi atheethathvam*'.

So, then itself, the student understands "'I' am the Pure Existence which is beyond the *thriputi* of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*". Therefore, '*avaakyarthathaa*' is a technical word for '*thriputi-atheetha-thureeyathvam*'.

Prathibhadhyathe – 'I' 'become' *thureeyam*. ('Become' is, strictly speaking, not the right word, since the fact is "'I' am *always thureeyam*", and, therefore, used here, within inverted commas.)

That means, 'I' am neither *viswa* nor *thyjasaa* nor *praagnyaa*. The student has to instantaneously remember the famous seventh manthraa of *Maandookya Upanishadh* – "Naantha: *pragnyam na bahi: pragnyam nobhayatha: pragnyam na pragnyaanaganam na pragnyam na apragnyam | Adhrishtam avyavahaaryam agrahyam alakshanam achinthyam avyapadesyam ekaathmaprathyayasaaram prapanchosamam saantham sivam advaitham chathurtham manyanthe sa aathmaa sa vignyeya: |*" – "They consider the *Thureeya* to be that which is not the outward Consciousness, not the inward Consciousness, not the Consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of Consciousness, not the all-knowing Consciousness, not unconscious; beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference, beyond thoughts, beyond description ; traceable through the unbroken self-awareness ; free from the world, tranquil, auspicious and non-dual. It is the Self. It is to be known".

'I' am the *thureeyam*; 'I' am not the known object; not even the 'knower'; 'I' am the 'Existence', pervading the *thriputi* but transcending the *thriputi*.

What happens if I am one of the *thriputi*?

If I am a *pramaatha* or a *pramaanam* or a *prameyam*, I will become a limited entity; and, therefore, through the *mahaavaakyaa*, I understand myself not to be a limited entity, but the limitless *thureeyam*.

And, which *thureeyam* is:

- गीर्मनसोः सृतिं न प्रतिपद्यते - And, which (aathmaa or thureeyam) does not fall within the range of words and thoughts.

'*sruthi*' means 'range' / 'field' / scope; '*ghee*.' means 'words', which is a *pramaanam*; '*mana*.' (in this context) means 'thought', which is also a *pramaanam*.

'I' transcend the range of any *pramaanam*, in the form of thought, word, sense organs etc.

This is because whatever falls within any *pramaana* is a *prameyam* (an object) and 'Pure Existence' is not available for any *pramaanam*.

In short, "*thureeyam prathibhadyathe; gheer manaso: sruthim na prathibhadhyate*" –" 'I' 'become' *thureeyam* and 'I' transcend the range of any *pramaanam*, in the form of thought, word, sense organs etc." | And, when does this happen? Ans: At the time of *sravanam* itself, if *sravanam* is done properly.

And, of course, for doing proper *sravanam* also, one has to practice *sravanam* for a number of years. Then alone, it gradually becomes proper *sravanam*; and, even as the *sravanam* becomes proper, the student receives the teaching. (In a lighter vein: at that time only, the student gives credit to the teacher, saying 'now the teacher has started teaching properly'. Really speaking, what is happening, is that repeated *sravanam* makes the *sravanam* proper).

- इति - This is the message.
- कुतः एतद् अध्यवसीयते - How is such a conclusion made?

Adhyavaseeyathe – nischeeyathe / concluded / ascertained.

Sureswaraacharya says:

- यस्मात् - Because of the following reason.

In fact, the teaching of the entire third chapter is "(i) *sravanam* itself can give *aparoksha jnaanam* and (ii) *jnaanam* and *moksham* are simultaneous".

"You need not postpone *jnaanam* and *mokshaa*, if you are listening to your *Aachaaryaa* properly" is the message that Sureswaraachaaryaa is struggling to convey, throughout the third chapter. But, *maayaa* is so powerful, that the student will still say "Yes, Swamiji ! Everything is very clear. But, how can I claim / am liberated, of all the people? I need your special blessing to achieve liberation."

What is the reason? Ans: There is some *prathibhandhaa*, sometimes *dhrishta prathibhandhaa* and sometimes *adhrishta prathibhandhaa*. Therefore, all the *saadhanaas* are required not for the 'understanding', which every student has; but for removal of the various obstacles (*prathibhandhaas*), removal of which alone, take time.

Chapter III: Verse 2 –

तत्पदं प्रकृतार्थं स्यात्त्वंपदं प्रत्यगात्मनि ।

नीलोत्पलवदेताभ्यां दुःख्यनात्मत्ववारणे ॥ २ ॥

The term 'That' signifies the subject-matter under consideration. The term 'Thou' signifies the inner Self of experience. As in the expression 'Blue Lotus', subjection to misery and the character of being non-Self are negated by these two terms.

So, what happens when the student listens to the words '*thatH*' and '*thvam'*', in the statement '*thatH thvam asi?*' (The word '*thvam'*' means 'you'; but, when the teacher says '*thvam'*', meaning 'you', the student has, naturally, to convert it to '*aham'*', meaning 'I'. Also, he has to convert the word '*thatH*' as '*Brahman'*').

What does this proximity of these two words – '*thatH*' meaning '*Brahman'*' and '*thvam'*' meaning '*aham'*' – do?

Sureswaraachaarya conveys the idea through an example – '*neelam uthpalam'*'. '*neelam'*' means 'blue' and '*uthpalam'*' means a 'lotus' or a 'lily'. Suppose a person listens to a statement 'there is a blue lily flower'. Because of the proximity of the word 'blue' to the word 'lily', what happens? The word 'lily' conveys the meaning of the lily group of flowers. If the listener hears only the word 'lily', his mind thinks of the lily group of flowers, which flowers, he knows, come in different colours. But, when he hears the word '*blue lily'*', all other colours are excluded from the substance 'lily' and in his mind only a particular flower, 'blue lily', comes. So, what is the function of the word 'blue', in this statement? Ans: 'Exclusion of all other colours'. This exclusion is called '*vyavrutthi:'*' The word 'blue' excludes all other colours. '*Anyavarna vyavrutthi:'*' is the function of the word 'blue'.

In the same manner, when the listener hears only the word 'blue', his mind thinks of several blue objects – a blue chair / a blue cloth / a wall painted blue / a pillar painted blue etc. But, when the term 'blue lily' is mentioned, what is the function of the word 'lily', in the term? It excludes all the other objects except the lily. "Exclusion of all objects other than lily" - "*uthpala bhinna dravya vyaavrutthi*" - is the function of the word 'lily'.

The word 'blue' removes all other attributes and the word 'lily' excludes all other substances. Thus, respectively excluding all other attributes and substances, 'blue' and 'lily' come together to specify one particular entity, having 'lily' status and 'blue colour' status. This is what happens in the mind of the listener.

Sureswaraacharya says that this should happen at the time of hearing the teaching '*thath thvam asI*' also. When I listen to the word '*thathI*', the word means *sath Brahman*, whose nature is *aanandhaa*, as the *Upanishads* declare, as, for example, in *Thaithreeya Upanishad*, *Bhrugu valli* (6): "*Aanandho brahmethi vyajaanaath | Aanandhaath eva kalu imaani boothaani jaayanthe | Aanandhena jaathaani jeevanthi | Aanandham prayanthi abhisamvisantheethi*" – "*Aanandhaa is Brahman*, because from *Aanandhaa* alone all these beings are born, the born beings exist by means of *Aanandhaa* and they go back to *Aanandhaa*, while resolving" |

Thus, *aanandhaa* is the nature of *Brahman*. When that *Brahman* is placed in the proximity of *aham*, what does this do? The *aanandhaa* excludes all other non-*aanandhaa* attributes from 'me'. Just as the word 'blue' removes / excludes all the other colours from the lily (in the example cited), the word *Brahman*, *Aanandhaa*, excludes all other attributes from 'aham', the *chaithanya aathmaa*.

The *mahaavaakyam* instantaneously knocks off the most commonly experienced attribute, '*dhu:kham*' or 'worry', from 'me' and hands over the attribute to anything other than *aathmaa*, which means that the attribute belongs to *anaathmaa*. Thus, after *mahaavaakyam*, if the *vaakyam* is understood properly, the seeker should never say, for the rest of his life "'I' am worried". Of course, "'I' am the illuminator of the worrying mind" is an acceptable statement. But, the statement "'I' am worried" should/ would never be made by the *jignyaasu*, who has successfully assimilated the *mahaavaakyam*.

Thus, the proximity of the word *Brahman* to 'me', takes away the *dhu:kham* attribute from 'me'. This is the first consequence of the proximity of the two words *Brahman* and 'I'.

In the same manner, because of the proximity of 'I' with *Brahman*, in *Brahman* also, a very important attribute gets excluded. Earlier, as explained, the 'worry' attribute was removed

from 'me', because of the proximity of the word *Brahman* to 'I'. Now, a powerful attribute, which creates several problems, is going to be removed from *Brahman*.

What is that? Because the word 'I' is the subject and that subjective word is used along with *Brahman*, *Brahman*, after *sravanam* of the *mahaavaakyam*, should not be taken to be an object either to be experienced or to be 'merged with' after death.

In general, most seekers have the hope "somehow I should exhaust *praarabhdhaa*, and after death 'merge' with Brahman, so that I will never come back".

"Escaping' from the world and 'joining' the Lord" is the hope that a *Vedhaanthic* student has, even after long years of study. But, in an intelligent and discriminating seeker, such a thought should never arise, since how can 'I' 'escape' from this world or how can 'I' 'join' the Lord, when that *Brahman* or the Lord happens to be 'I'?

In fact, during *Vedhaanthic* study, whenever the word '*Brahman*' is mentioned by the *guru*, the thought pattern of a diligent student, should be, that the teacher is talking about 'me'.

The student should not also think of entering into *nirvikalpa samaadhi*, looking for a mystic experience, assuming that *Brahman* will be experienced in a flash. This *is* also a wrong expectation, since, if this is the case, once the seeker comes back from *nirvikalpa samaadhi*, he will again lose sight of *Brahman*.

So, Sureswaraacharya says: "Never entertain such thoughts or expectations; on the other hand, firmly maintain the conviction '*Brahman* is myself'. Then alone the simultaneousness of *sravanam* and *mokshaa* can be appreciated".

This attitude is (what *Swamiji* refers to, using the term) the 'binary format'.

- तत्पदं प्रकृतार्थं स्यात् - The word '*that*' has a contextual meaning.

Prakruthartham means 'a contextual meaning'.

This was explained earlier. The context where the word '*that*' occurs is the 6th chapter of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, where it means '*Sath*' or 'Pure Existence'. Therefore, '*prakruthartham*' means '*sathroopartham*'.

- त्वंपदं प्रत्यगात्मनि - The term '*thvam*' signifies the inner Self of experience.

When the word `thvam` is mentioned, the seeker should not look outside for something such as a mystic experience. That 'looking out' tendency should go away, since it is the biggest obstacle. On the other hand, the mind should fall back into 'myself', who is 'looking out'. That 'looker-out' is *Brahman* and not the 'looked-out'.

As explained, because of the proximity of the words `that` and `thvam`, two misconceptions are eliminated. They are mentioned by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the second line of the verse.

- दुःखी अनात्मत्व वारणे एताभ्यां - 'Worry' and the 'character of being non-Self' are negated, by these two terms coming together,

The word `Dhu:khee` indicates 'misery' or 'worry'. "I am worried" is a constant *sruthi*, for most people. 'What I am worried about' (i.e. the object of worry) changes. But, 'that I am worried' is (in a lighter vein) more permanent than *Brahman* itself. That 'worry' attribute which is added to me is knocked off, by the proximity of the word *Brahman* to 'I'. In other words, the proximity of the word '*Brahman*' to 'I', is the eliminator of the 'worry' from 'I'. The words `dhu:khee` and `vaarane` indicate the process of `dhu:khithva vaaranam` – 'elimination of worry or misery'.

Similarly, the proximity of the word 'I' to *Brahman*, (in *aham Brahma asmi* or *that thvam asi*) knocks off '*anaathmathvam*' from *Brahman*, the word '*anaathmathvam*', meaning 'objective status' of *Brahman*.

What do you mean by objective status? Most seekers 'look for' *Brahma anubhavaa*. This very attempt for *Brahma anubhava* reveals the misconceived, but, quite common orientation "there is something called *Brahman*; I have to practice intense meditation; and, during the meditation, at a particular moment, that *Brahman* will be experienced in a flash and after that, *Brahman* will not be available".

This 'experience-orientation' indicates, that, the seeker has classified *Brahman* as an object ; But, what is the fact? *Brahman* is the *chaithanyam* experienced **all** the time, in **all** the *avasthaas*, as *Sankara Bhagavad Paadhaa* declares in his *Maneesha Panchakam*: "*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa yaa samvith vijrumbhathe*".

Under such circumstances, why should I work for *Brahma Anubhavaa*, which *Brahman* is all the time experienced? *Brahman* is not an object of experience. *Brahman* **is** 'me'; 'I' do not need to become *Brahman*. Neither do 'I' need the experience of *Brahman*.

The 'objective status' is negated by the proximity of the word `aham` to `Brahmam`.

Thus, *dhu:kithvam* and *anaathmathvam* are *vaarane* – eliminated.

'*Vaarane*' is a noun (*dvi vachanam*), meaning the '(two) eliminated'.

Eliminations of these two attributes, *dhu:kithvam* and *anaathmathvam*, take place because of the proximity of the words *thath* and *thvam* to each other. The *Aachaaryaa* gives the example of the 'blue lily' (as explained earlier):

- नीलोत्पलवत् - like the 'blue lily' statement eliminating colours other than blue and flowers other than lily, by the proximity of the word 'blue' and 'lily' to each other.

And, suppose a person asks "I have understood the message of *mahaavaakyam*; and I have realized that I should never say 'I am worried' ; and, as a consequence, I may promise to myself that I will never say 'I am worried' and always try to claim 'I am not worried'. But, even as I try to say 'I am not worried', I am experiencing the worry; when I am intimately experiencing the worry, how can I say 'I am not worried?' "

This is where *mananam* helps. *Mananam* is meant for such questions as 'when I am experiencing worry, how can I say I am not worried?', that may arise in the intellect.

The student's argument is 'I have worry, because I experience worry'. The guru has the responsibility to correct the student, based on *Vedhaanthaa*, which says 'you have no worry, because you *experience* worry'. This is to be understood very clearly.

So, to repeat, *Vedhaanthaa* exhorts "You have no worry, because you *experience* worry; experienced attributes belong to experienced objects and never to the 'experiencer' subject. May you understand this through repeated *mananam*".

An important principle of *Vedhaanthaa*: "Experienced attributes do not belong to the 'experiencer' subject but only to the experienced objects".

Vedhaanthaa does not deny the experience of worry. It only denies the wrong conclusion arrived at, based on the experience of worry.

An example can make this clearer: A scientist does not negate the experience of the sunrise; no scientist can; science only negates the conclusion based on the experience, viz., "the sun is moving around the earth". This wrong conclusion alone is negated; the experience of sunrise and sunset is not negated.

In the same manner, *Vedhaanthaa* will never negate the experience of worry, because *Vedhaanthaa* knows that human minds are very creative with regard to worries.

Vedhaanthaa does not negate worry; but, negates the conclusion "since I am experiencing the worry, I am worried".

Instead, *Vedhaanthaa* points out: "The worry does not belong to you; the worry belongs only to your *anaathmaa* mind".

And, one does not have total control over the *anaathmaa* mind, because, one is only a contributor never a controller with regard to *anaathmaa*.

Important lessons to be drawn are, therefore: "You may try to improve the *anaathmaa*; but, do not mistake that *anaathmaa* as yourself.

"Never conclude 'I have worry'. If you do, you will have two worries

- (1) the original worry and then
- (2) worrying 'I have got worry'.

"Worry is an attribute of *anaathmaa*, which is never under your total control. You can try to improve *anaathmaa*; but, you can never make it perfect. Perfect body / perfect mind / perfect intellect etc. do not exist. They will all have *jvaram*; you avoid *anujvaram* (Swami Vidhyaaranyaa's *Panchadasa* – Chapter 7).

"Do not identify with *anaathmaa*".

The interesting thing is that when one stops worrying about worry, worry goes away.

More technical aspects are to be discussed in the following verses.

119. Chapter III, Verses 2 and 3 (29-11-2008)

Analyzing the function of the *mahaavaakyam*, '*thath thvam asI*', Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that, primarily, the *mahaavaakyam* removes two misconceptions, one centered on *jeevaathmaa*, 'I', the Subject and the other centered on *Paramaathmaa*, i.e. the *thath padhaartha*: |

According to Vedhaanthat, whatever idea we have about ourselves, has to be a misconception only; this is because, by ourselves, we do not have any way of knowing our true nature, except the fact, that, I am a Conscious being. Other than knowing this much, we can never have the resources to know who exactly 'I' am.

This is again because of two reasons. One reason is, that, 'I', the Subject, is never available as an object; since Subject is never available for objectification, I have no way of seeing me – objectifying me. Therefore, I cannot know myself, just as the eyes have no way of seeing themselves. This is one reason.

The second reason is, that, all the experienced attributes can belong to the experienced objects only; experienced attributes can never belong to the 'Experiencer'- Subject. Physical attributes belong to the physical body, which is an object of experience; emotional attributes belong to the mind, which is also an object of experience; and intellectual attributes belong to the intellect, which is *also* an object of experience. Thus, since *all* experienced attributes belong only to the objective world and not to the Subject 'I', in the absence of any attribute, "what exactly is 'my' nature", we have no way of knowing at all .

And, thus, no one knows who he or she really is; and, without knowing who 'I' really am, whatever conclusion I make about myself, will be a misconception only. Thus, every individual has got misconceptions regarding oneself, the basic misconception being "'I' am a finite individual".

In the same manner, when the scriptures describe *Paramaathma* as 'Pure Existence', we have no way of identifying how the 'Pure Existence' will be, because, Pure Existence is also not available for perception. Whatever object that can be described in terms of at least one of the five attributes – *sabda*, *sparsa*, *roopa*, *rasa* and *gandha* - will alone be available for perception. Since 'Pure Existence' cannot be described by any one of these attributes, 'Pure Existence' is also not available for perception. This fact results in the second misconception: "Pure Existence is a mysterious Object existing somewhere".

So, one misconception is: "'I' am a finite entity"; this is a misconception centered on 'I', the Subject. The second misconception is centered on *Paramaathmaa*, the Pure Existence, that, "'Pure Existence' is some kind of a mysterious Object, which we have to experience or we have to attain or we have to reach".

The job or function of the *mahaavaakyams* is to knock off both these misconceptions. When the word *thath* is used in proximity to the word 'me' (i.e., 'I'), the first misconception removed is that "'I' am a finite entity". By bringing 'sath' along with 'me', *sath* being 'Existence', 'I' am no more a finite entity; the finitude centered on 'me' is removed.

Expressing the same idea in a different manner: When 'Existence' is associated with 'me', my notion regarding 'my' finitude is knocked off; I *am* the 'Existence', not localized in one place; but, all-pervading.

Thus, because of the proximity of *sath*, I remove the misconception of localization centered on 'my'self'.

Similarly, because of the proximity of the word 'I', with *thath*, i.e. 'Pure Existence', the misconception regarding 'Pure Existence' viz., that, "'Pure Existence' is a mysterious remote object" also goes away. Both the 'mystery' and the 'remoteness' regarding Existence are removed; that mysterious and remote 'Existence' becomes 'I', the Conscious being – not any more a mysterious and remote object.

Thus, *Param Brahma* becomes 'my'self; and 'I' become limitless.

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys by the term "*dhu:khyanaathma vaarane*". *Mahaavaakyam* removes the 'finitude' (which is called '*dhu:kithvam*', in this context), centered on 'my'self; and it removes the 'remoteness' (which is called *anaathmathvam*, in this context) with regard to *Paramaathma*. Both of them are 'knocked off' simultaneously by the *mahaavaakyam*.

Both coalescing together, there is One all-pervading 'Existence- Consciousness' alone, left behind. And, it is not an entity which can be objectified; it is 'myself' the *sath- chith- aathmaa*.

This idea is being presented by the *Aachaaryaa*, through a technical analysis, in the following portion.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 3 – Chapter III:

एवं कृतान्वयव्यतिरेको वाक्यादेवावाक्यार्थं प्रतिपद्यत इत्युक्तमतस्तद्व्याख्यानाय सूत्रोपन्यासः।

Thus, one who has reasoned in this manner, grasps through the proposition itself, an import beyond the import of the proposition. In interpretation of this assertion, the principle is formulated in an aphoristic form:

- एवं - In this manner,
- कृत अन्वय व्यतिरेकः - the one who has done the analysis of the variables and non-variables, both at subjective and objective levels,

What is the non-variable principle, at the objective level? Ans: 'Existence' alone is the non-variable at the objective level. In the external world, everything else is subject to change all the time. The only non-changing factor is "'is'ness'" or 'Existence'. Thus, the diligent seeker has filtered out the non-variable 'Existence' from the objective world and has set aside all the variable factors of *sabdha-sparsa-roopa-rasa-gandha* attributes.

And, at the Subjective level, the seeker similarly has filtered out the non-variable principle. What is that non-variable principle at the Subjective level? Ans: 'Pure Consciousness' is the only non-variable, at the Subjective level.

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, Consciousness is there; 'what I am Conscious of' varies; but, 'that 'I' am Conscious' is non-variable. Therefore, the Consciousness principle is the non-variable, filtered out at the Subjective level.

Thus, 'Existence' is outside; 'Consciousness' is inside. 'Tying them up' is the job of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

'*Krutha anvaya vyathirkha:*' is the name of the student who has removed all the *naama roopaas*, at the Subjective level also and at the objective level also. In his mind, only two things are there - 'Pure Existence' outside and 'Pure Consciousness' inside, both rid of all the *naama roopaa* attributes. (In a lighter vein: One is the bride and the other is the bridegroom.)

And, when the student is ready with this mindset, the *mahaa vaakyam* comes and says:

वाक्यादेव - through the *mahaa vaakyam* itself,

The *mahaa vaakyam* talks about the 'Pure Existence', by the word '*that*' and 'Pure Consciousness' with the word '*thvam*' and equates these two by the word '*as*' – meaning 'is equal to'. From this *mahaa vaakyam*,

- अवाख्यार्थं प्रतिपद्यते - receives the knowledge of this equation.

What is that equation? Ans: "I", the 'Pure Consciousness', **am** the 'Pure Existence'.

What is the meaning of the word '*Avaakyartham*'? It is a technical word, already explained in the earlier session. The word means 'beyond the *thriputi* / 'beyond the division of knower-known-knowing instrument'.

'I' am the 'Pure Existence' and the 'Pure Consciousness', which is the medium in which the *thriputi* is functioning, but, 'I' am not a participant in the *thriputi vyavahaaraa*.

If I take 'my'self as one of the *thriputi*, what will be the consequence ? Ans: I will become a finite entity. (This was also discussed earlier).

By knowing that 'I' am the 'Existence - Consciousness', which is beyond the *thriputi*, 'I' become a non-participant in *jnaana vyavahaaraa* and a non-participant in *karma vyavahaaraas* also. This is the message that the diligent student is supposed to receive. '*Prathipadhyathe*' means 'understands' / 'grasps'.

- इति उक्तं अतः - This is the message; thereafter, (implying 'since this is the message, that is to be grasped by *sravanam*')
- तद् व्याख्यानाय - to dwell upon this message itself, by elaboration,

'*Vyaakyaanam*' means 'elaboration'.

- सूत्र उपन्यासः - I am starting with the soothra vaakyam in this sloka.

In this *soothraa slokaa*, the *Aachaaryaa* is going to point out that this message is received intellectually, through three stages. He says: "This message has to be received by the trained intellect not in one shot, but, in three stages; and I want to present in this *slokaa* those three stages, in a capsule form, which will later be elaborated in this entire chapter".

- '*Upanyaasa:*' means 'presentation'.
- '*Soothra upanyaasa:*' means 'presentation of the synopsis / capsule (of the absorption process)'.

The following *sloka* is a very, very famous one, which has been quoted in *Vedhaantha Saaraa*, and whose import is studied elaborately by *Vedhaanthic* students. Sureswaraachaarya himself explains the verse in detail, later.

Chapter III: Verse 3 –

सामानाधिकरण्यं च विशेषणविशेष्यता ।

लक्ष्यलक्षणसंबन्धः पदार्थप्रत्यगात्मनाम् ॥ ३ ॥

Co-ordination, subject-predicate relation and indirect indication are the three ways governing terms, their meanings and the inner Self.

The three stages are only enumerated here. Sureswaraachaarya does not elaborate on them here, because this is a *soothra vaakyam*.

What are these three stages?

The first is:

- सामानाधिकरण्य सम्बन्ध(ग्रहणम्) : - (The understanding of) the sambhandhaa called saamaanaadhikaranyam.

The word '*grahanam*' is supplied and means 'understanding' or 'grasping'. '*Sambhandhaa*' means relationship. The first *sambhandhaa* is called '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*'. Details will be explained later. At this stage, only enumeration is being done.

'Samaanaadhikaranyam sambhandha grahanam / darsanam' is the first stage.

The second stage is viseshana viseshya sambhandha: |

- विशेषण विशेष्यता संबन्ध(ग्रहणम्) : - (The understanding of) the relationship between *viseshana* and *viseshya* .

Relationship no. 1 has to be noticed first and relationship no. 2 is to be noticed next.

The third stage is:

- लक्ष्य लक्षण संबन्ध(ग्रहणम्) : - (Observation or understanding of) the (third) *sambhandhaa* , which is called *lakshya lakshana sambhandhaa*.

The term '*Sambhandha grahanam*' has to be added to all three, viz., saamaanaadhikaranyam, viseshana-viseshyathaa and lakshya-lakshana.

The *mahavaakyam*, '*thathvamas'* is quite popularly known and is often quoted very casually. But, it is important to note, that this single *vaakyam* has been analyzed at length, by all *Aachaaryaas* , because when a serious spiritual seeker assimilates the message of the *vaakyam* thoroughly, he/ she fulfills the purpose of not only his/ her present *janma*, but his / her innumerable earlier *janmaas* also. The huge project, *anaadhi kaala pravruttha:*, which all *jeevaas* carry out, by being born as a plant , an insect, an animal , a bird or a human, will be completed once the significance of the *vaakyam* is grasped thoroughly, during the human birth. If this opportunity in the human *janma* is missed, the *jeeva* has to go through the entire process again. The cycle will go on as a huge endless project, which will be completed only if this *thathvamas'* message is grasped and the message becomes a fact for the seeker.

Knowledge is knowledge only when the content of the knowledge is a fact for the seeker.

And, what should be that fact for the spiritual seeker? Ans: "I' am the Existence-Consciousness medium, in which the whole life's drama is eternally going on ; but, in 'me', nothing is happening. I was free / I am free/ I ever will be free. But, this drama is unstoppable and uncontrollable. I may be able to stop or change a few of them; but, many of them, I will not be able to stop. The eternal, unstoppable drama was / is going on and *will* go on; But, I have to only observe it, without passing any judgment – positive or negative. That alone is liberation. This life-drama eternally goes on in the medium called 'Existence - Consciousness'. 'I' can only be aware of the drama - but 'I' am a non-participant and therefore not a victim also."

This one important message, if it can become a fact / if I can see this as a fact, it is called 'knowledge'. 'Knowledge' is defined as 'that whose content is a fact for me'. If it is not a fact for me, it will be called only an 'information'. 'Information' does not liberate me; 'knowledge' alone liberates.

The difference between 'knowledge' and 'information' is that, content of an 'information' may not be a fact for me; but, content of 'knowledge' *is* a fact for me.

If this message "I' am the ever free nonparticipant observer of the things happening" is driven home to the seeker, *mahaavaakya* has successfully delivered the goods.

And, since it is a life-transforming message, it is worth putting in any amount of effort to convert the 'information' into 'knowledge', which (to repeat) means, the content of this, should be a fact for me, even when crisis situations come closer to me.

Even when tragic events happen in places remote and far away, we tend to be affected emotionally. Such situations can come closer - to our own city and to our own family also. But, it should be realized that events happening in remote places are *anaathmaa* events happening in *anaathmaa* places and close-by events are also only *anaathmaa* events happening in closer *anaathmaa* places.

Events will happen, quite often unstopably, in remote *anaathma* and in proximate *anaathmaa* also. We cannot control most of the events; we can only 'contribute' a little bit, at the body-mind levels; but, cannot totally control events and situations. For a person who remembers this fact, and the fifth capsule of *Vedhaanthaa* (as enunciated by *Swamiji*), viz., "By forgetting my nature, I convert life into a struggle and by remembering my nature, I convert life into a sport / entertainment", all events – even the worst tragic events - are entertainment. Conversely, if this message is forgotten, life becomes a burden and a problem.

Therefore, this message changes one's attitude towards every event in life, whether the event is a remote event or a very, very proximate event. It may be happening to one's very physical body, which is very, very close to one. As one grows older, the doctor may diagnose serious disorders in one's body; but, those disorders also are only events happening in *anaathmaa*. Even when such situations arrive, this message "*anaathmaa* events will happen; they cannot be stopped" must be ringing in a mature person's ears and mind. If one can have that 'internal space' (as *Pujyasri Swami Dayananda* calls it), one can stand aloof and watch, without any disturbance, events happening in one's own body and events happening in one's mind also, though the mind is even more proximate *anaathmaa* than the body.

We may not be able to stop certain emotions in the mind also. But, if I am able to 'watch' those emotions as a by-stander, remembering 'I' am the 'Existence – Consciousness' medium, and mind is one of the infinitesimal part of the total *anaathmaa*, I will not attach too much importance to the emotion or to the event leading to the emotion, because, I will know that, that both are only insignificant events, in the total *anathmaa*. If I can remember this fact even on the death-bed, then the message has been successfully driven home.

Since it is, thus, a life-altering message, all the *Aachaaryaas* attach a lot of importance to it and try to intellectually convince us with regard to this fact.

The problem is, that, of the entire humanity, only one percent may accept and assimilate this fact. 33% of the humanity may say "I am not convinced of this teaching, viz., 'I am the ever free Pure Existence-Consciousness'". Another 33% may say "I am convinced of the teaching as a fact; but, it is not a practical teaching. When problems come, I want

parihaarams". A third group of another 33%, may say "It is convincing and, we concede, practical also. But, / am not ready for it yet".

Thus, a majority of the humanity sets aside this message and wants some other solutions for the problems in life. It is admittedly not easy

- (i) to be convinced of the message
- (ii) to conclude that the message is also practical, and
- (iii) having been convinced of the message and its practicability, to diligently try the 'binary format'.

Those people who receive the message properly and move to the 'binary format' are indeed very rare.

The *Aachaaryaas* are fully aware of this fact and therefore, in their infinite compassion for humanity, take enormous pains to convince people of this message.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is also struggling to convey the message. He says: " First, I am presenting the message as a *soothram* and later, I will dwell on the *vyaakyaanam*, so that, you will come to the binary format. Even when events jolt, shock and shatter you, you should maintain the objectivity 'this is also only an insignificant event on the infinite *anaathmaad* ".

As a first step, 'saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa', 'viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa' and 'lakshana lakshya sambhandhaa', in the mahaa vaakyam, 'thath thvam asi', are being presented by the Aachaaryaa for study.

Before entering the 'study', these three terms are briefly explained as below:

'*Saamaanaadhikaranyam*' is the relationship obtaining among two or more words – not between objects or people. In other words, it is an attribute existing among the words of a sentence. And, since it is a 'relationship', there must be two or more words, since, obviously, in a single word, we cannot talk of a 'relationship'.

And, what is that relationship? It is a relationship which comes when two or more words, used in apposition (side by side), reveal only one object. When, though the words are many, but, they are all descriptions relating to one object only, then such words are said to have '*Saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandham*'.

'*Samaanam*' means 'common'; '*adhikaranam*' means 'object'; '*samaanam adhikaranam*' means 'common object described by many words'. For example, in *Vishnu Sahasranamaam*, which has a thousand words, though the words are many, they are all revealing only one object, viz., *Bhagavaan Vishnu*.

Needless to mention, all the thousand words in *Vishnu Sahasranamaam* are not the same word; words are different and they have different meanings also; the first word '*visvam*' has a particular meaning; the next word, '*Vishnu*.' has a different meaning; and the word '*vashatkaara*.' has yet another meaning; and so on. Descriptions are different; but all of them 'converge' into one object – *Bhagavaan Vishnu*. Such a 'converging' group of words is said to have '*saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha*.'

Another example can be quoted from the 'Geetha Dhyaana slokaa:' | In a particular verse of the 'Geetha Dhyaana slokaa:', there are five terms 'prapanna paarijaathaaya', 'thothra vethraika paanaye', 'jnaana mudhraaya', 'Krishnaaya' and 'Geethamruthaduhe'| But, the verse does not mean, that, namaskaarams are being offered to five different gods; all the five words have different meanings; but, all of them refer to one and the same Krishna ; namaskaaram is offered to that one Krishna, who is 'prapanna paarijaatha:', who is 'thothra vethraika paani' , who is 'jnaana mudhra:', who is 'geethamrutha duh' and who is 'Krishna'. Five words are there; but the object is one. That is called *saamaandhikaranya sambhandhaa*.

In contrast, another prayer verse runs: "*namas sooryaaya, somaaya, mangalaaya, bhudhaaya cha guru sukra sanibhyascha raahave kethave nama*:" | This verse also offers *namaskaarams* and there are many words in this verse also - '*sooryaaya*', '*somaaya*', '*mangalaaya*', '*bhudhaaya*' etc. Are these words referring to one object or many objects? Ans: No, In this verse, *namaskaarams* are not to one *devathaa*, but nine different *devathaas* – '*sooryaad*', '*chandraad*', '*mangalaad*', '*bhudhaad*' etc. In this verse, words are many and the objects they refer to, are also many.

In Sanskrit grammar, we have special names for the two types of verses quoted. In the earlier verse, from the *Geetha Dhyaana Slokaas*, words are many; but, object is one. Such an usage is called '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*'.

When words are many and objects are also many, as in the second verse (*namas sooryaaya, somaaya, mangalaaya, bhudhaaya cha guru sukra sanibhyascha raahave kethave nama*:), it is called '*vaiadhikaranyam*'.

In Sanskrit language, every word has got a 'case' (nominative etc.). There are seven 'cases' or *vibhakthis* in Sanskrit grammar. And, '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*' is indicated, by use of the

words in the same 'case'; in other words, in '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*', the *vibkathis* will be the same. In a sentence, even if descriptions are different, if the *vibakthis* are the same, the object of the sentence also will be the same.

"Bhinna pravrutthi nimitthaanaam samaana vibhakthikaanaam padhaanaam eka vishayathvam saamaanaadhikaranyam".

In understanding the *mahaa vaakyam*, the student should first observe whether there is '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*' or '*vaiadhikaranyam*' in the *vaakyam*. Sureswaraachaarya answers this. He says "the first thing we observe in the sentence, is that, there is *saamaanaadhikaranyam* obtaining between the two words *thath* and *thvam*. They are two different words; but, revealing only one entity".

This is a very, very important message viz., that, "the *mahaa vaakyam* does not talk about a *jeevaathmaa* **and** a *Paramaathmaa*". From the *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, the important conclusion to be arrived at is: "we are not talking about a *jeevaathmaa* **and** a *Paramaathmaa*". If the student does not arrive at this conclusion, he/ she is committing a blunder, viz., that he/ she has taken the *vaakyam*, as referring to two objects.

Visishtaadvaitam takes *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* as two different entities and say that *jeevaathmaa* is a part of *Paramaathmaa*. Visishtaadvaitins do differentiate the two, by which action they are flouting the *saamaadhikaranyam sambhandhaa*; violating the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* message of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Dvaita philosophy also ignores the *saamaanaadhikaranyam sambhandhaa*. The *Dvaitins* consider the *jeevaathmaa* to be 'here', on the earth and the *Paramaathmaa* to be 'there', in *Vaikunthaa*. Any *vaidhika* system of philosophy, which talks about *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa* as different, overlooks the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* in the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out here: "Once you note the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* in the *mahaavaakyam*, the conclusion is that, *sruthi* is talking about *jeevaathmaa* that is *Paramaathmaa* / *Paramaathmaa* that is *jeevaathmaa* / *jeevaathmaa* alias *Paramaathmaa*. As even as the student notices this, the student's mind will / should undergo a change.

'When will I attain *Paramaathmaa*?', 'During *videha mukthi*, escaping from this world, I will attain *Bhagavaan*', 'I want to escape this world and attain the Lord' etc., are all wrong notions / expectations, unfortunately continuing even after a number of years of *mahaavaakya vicharaa*.

In the prayer 'I want to escape this world and attain the Lord', which 'Lord' would the seeker like to attain? When the *mahaavaakyam* describes that Lord, as 'you' yourself, how can an informed *Vedhaanthin* resort to this prayer at all?

Videha mukthi is a promise given, before the study of *Vedhaanthaa*. But, after a study of *Vedhaanthaa*, the word '*Videha Mukthi*' is irrelevant to a *Vedhaantic* student. To attract the student to the study of *Vedhaanthaa*, initially, a compromised idea of *mokshaa* is given. But, as even as the study of *Vedhaanthaa* becomes more and more / intensifies, the idea of '*Videha Mukthi*' should go away.

Instead, the convictions "'I' am the ever free 'Existence - Consciousness', in which all these bodies are 'floating'. And, why should I care 'whether the bodies continue or not' or 'whether this *sookshma sareeram* is going to take up another *sthoola sareeram* or not'? Why should this be a worry, when, for me, the entire *anaathmaa* has been reduced to an insignificant speck? Why should I be bothered about as to whether my *sookshma sareeram* is going to travel or to where; or, whether my children will do *sraardham* for me? As an informed *Vedhaanthin*, all these doubts/ fears / questions have become irrelevant to me, since whatever happens at the *anaathma* level, I do not care" should take roots in the mind of the advanced seeker.

The diligent student should get all these messages, by the 'penetration' (assimilation) of the *saamaanaadhikaranyam* in the *mahaa vaakyam*. This (*saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa*) is the first relationship, talked about, by the *Aachaaryaa*.

What is the second 'relationship' in the *mahaa vaakyam*? Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to this as '*viseshana viseshyathaa*'. To explain this *sambhandhaa*, the *Geetha Dhyaana Slokam* quoted earlier, viz., '*Prapanna paarijaathaaya, thothra vetraika paanaye* etc.' may again be taken as an example. As already seen, the verse contains different words, which are different attributes; but revealing only one object, viz., *Bhagavaan Krishna*. Therefore, all these attributes should belong to that only Krishna. '*Prapanna paarijaatha:*' is one description of Krishna; '*Thothra vetraika paani*', '*Jnaana mudhraa*' and '*Geethamrutha duh*' are the others. All these are different 'virtues' or 'glories' of Krishna and each one is called '*viseshanam*', in Sanskrit; and Krishna is the '*viseshyam*'. The relationship between the '*viseshanaas*' and '*viseshyam*' / the 'descriptions' and the 'described' / the 'attributes' and the 'substance' - the 'attributes-attributed-relationship' is called '*viseshana viseshyathaa*'.

Where does this relationship obtain? Ans: Not among the words. Relationship among the words is called *saamaanaadhikaranyam*. The relationship '*Viseshana viseshyathaa*' is **not** the relationship among the words; but, among the *meanings* of the words. *Padha arthayo:*

viseshana viseshya sambhandha: / The different attributes, indicated by different words, qualify one Krishna, the substance.

In the same manner, 'Existence' and 'Consciousness' are both essential features, qualifying one *aathmaa*. One *aathmaa* alone is qualified as *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*. *Jeevaathmathvam* and *Paramaathmathvam* are attributes or features of one and the same Reality only. In other words, *Paramaathmaa* status and *Jeevaathmaa* status, which are the meanings of *thath* and *thvam* respectively, are two statuses belonging to the one and the same Reality, called *aathmaa*. This is called *viseshana viseshya sambhandha:* /

Then comes the last relationship, the '*lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha:*' |

This is a step required only in rare cases like the *mahaa vaakyam*. We are entering a highly technical topic, which cannot be skipped. Normally, whenever *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyams* come, the *padhaarthaas* will have *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandha* ; and, with that, normally, the job (of the sentence) will be over. But, in certain rare cases, we have to go to the third stage also.

In the Bhagavadh Githa Dhyaana Slokaa quoted above, we have *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, followed by *viseshana viseshyathaa*. In this verse, 'Prapanna paarijaatha:', 'Thothra vetraika paani', 'Jnaana mudhraa' and 'Geethamrutha duh' are descriptions of / adjectives to Krishna and 'Krishna' is the noun. The words have *saamaanadhikaranya sambhandhaa* and the meanings of the words, the 'different attributes' and the 'substance referred to, by the attributes', have *viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa*. With that, the slokam has been understood. And, what is the understanding? "Salutations to Krishna, who has got the attributes / descriptions 'Prapanna paarijaatha:', 'Thothra vetraika paani', 'Jnaana mudhraa' and 'Geethamrutha duh'". The two relationships – *saamaanaadhikaranyam* and *viseshana viseshyathaa* - are sufficient to understand this slokaa; we do not have to go to *lakshana lakshya sambhandhaa*.

There are no problems, because, the four virtues / attributes with which Lord Krishna is described, in the verse, can all co-exist in Krishna. The first description - *Prapanna paarijaatha:* - 'a great giver of blessings', the second '*Thothra vetraika paani* - 'Holder of a whip in one hand', the third description, '*Jnaana mudhra*' - 'Who is with *Jnaanamudhraa*' and the fourth, '*Geethamrutha duh*' – 'Who has milked the nectar of Githa' are all descriptions, which comfortably fit one *viseshyam* – noun-, Lord Krishna.

But, in certain cases, there will be problems. When some of the virtues are mutually contradictory, those virtues cannot co-exist in one and the same substance, obviously

because of the logical rule, that mutually contradicting attributes cannot co-exist in one and the same locus.

And, therefore, under such circumstances, when some of the *viseshanams*, being contradictory to one another, cannot co-exist, the students are at a loss; they have to find out as to how they can explain the *viseshana- viseshya- sambhaandhaa*.

The solution to this situation is to remove some of the contradictory attributes, so that there will be no logical problem. That 'removal of the contradictory attributes' is the third stage that the students will have to go through.

In this *mahaavaakyam*, '*thath thvam asi*', both *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are given as two statuses of one and the same ultimate Reality. In other words, one ultimate Reality is revealed, as both *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, by the *mahaavaakyam*, '*thath thvam asi*'. Hence, the attributes of *jeevaathmaa* and the attributes of *Paramaathmaa* have to co-exist in the one ultimate Reality that is revealed.

But, the problem is, that, at least some of the attributes are mutually contradictory. The main contradictory attributes (such as the limited knowledge, limited power, localization and ephemeral nature of the *jeevaathmaa*, in contrast to the omniscience, omnipotence, *sarvagathathvam* and *nithyathvam* of the *Paramaathmaa*) are well known and need not be elaborated on.

What is to be done is to remove those contradictory features which all belong to the *Anaathmaa*.

Once all the contradictory features are removed from the *jeevathmaa*, the '*jeevathvam*' belonging to the *sthoala-sookshma-kaarana-sareeraani-anaathmaa* goes away. The '*jeeva*' adjective goes away; and, when *jeeva* adjective goes away, the '*dhu:kham*' adjective also goes away. (If *dhu:kham* remains, one will never be able to claim *aham aananda:*) When, thus, the *jeevathvam* goes away, the 'Consciousness' principle alone remains.

In the same manner, in the *Paramaathmaa* also, the contradictory attributes, such as 'remoteness' - either space-wise or time-wise - are removed.

Why is *Paramaathmaa* considered 'remote' in terms of time? Ans: Because it is believed that *Paramaathmaa* is the cause of the universe, and whenever one talks about a cause, the cause is always in the past, and therefore, 'remote in time'. In other words, 'causality', as an attribute of a substance, makes the substance 'remote in time'. Therefore, the 'causality' of *Paramaathmaa* is to be removed. *Paramaathmaa* is not a *kaaranam* and *jeevaathmaa* a is

not a *kaaryam*, since both '*kaaranam*' and '*kaaryam*' attributes belong to *anaathmaa*. Once the '*kaaryathvam*' of the *Paramaathmaa* and the '*kaaranathvam*' of the *jeevaathmaa* are knocked off, what will remain are 'Pure Existence' and 'Pure Consciousness' only. And, they **can** be together, without any logical contradictions.

The Existence (*sath* in the *Paramaathmaa*) and Consciousness (*chith* in the *jeevathmaa*) are not thrown away; only the *kaarana kaarya sambhandhaa* , *desa kaalaa* etc., are removed. And, hence, it is only a 'partial' removal, the consequence of which, is that, the misconception " 'I' am a *jeevaathmaa* here and there is a *Paramaathmaa* elsewhere, both having attributes" gives way to the conviction " 'I' **am** the *aathmaa*, which is *sath* also and which is *chith* also".

120. Chapter III, Verses 3 and 4 (06-12-2008)

This verse (verse no. 3 of Chapter III) is a very important verse, which is very often quoted by several aachaaryaas. It has also been elaborately analyzed in the Vedhaantha Saaraa of Sadhaanandaa. In this verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks of how the intellect grasps the message of mahaa vaakyam, by understanding three types of relationships, the first relationship being saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha:, the second being viseshana viseshya sambhandha: and the third being lakshya lakshana sambhandha:

In the first three quarters of this verse, Sureswaraachaarya just names the three relationships. Detailed explanations will be given later.

Obviously, at least two objects are required for any 'relationship' to exist; one cannot talk of a 'relationship', when there is only one object. Therefore, after naming the three relationships in the first three quarters, Sureswaraachaarya indicates the names of the three pairs of objects – the three pairs of 'related members' - between which, each of the above three relationships obtains, in the 4th quarter of the verse. But, the *Aachaaryaa* does not directly mention the three pairs; the student has to discern the three pairs from the fourth quarter, '*padhaarthaprathyagaathmanaam*'.

- पदार्थप्रत्यगात्मनाम् - (the three relationships) of the terms, their meanings and the inner Self.

From this compound term '*padhaarthaprathyagaathmanaam*', the student has to first take the word '*padha*', then, the word '*arthaa*' and then '*prathyagaathmaa*' and has to find the three pairs from these.

The word '*padha*' indicates the two words '*thath*' and '*thvam*', in the *mahaa vaakyam*. i.e., the word (*Padha*) should be read in dual number as '*thath padham*' and '*thvam padham*'. Through this word '*padha*', the *Aachaaryaa* implies: '*Thath padha thvam padhaya: saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha: asthi*| To repeat: The word '*padhaa*' actually refers to two words and the two words referred to, are '*thath padhaa*' and '*thvam padhaa*'. Between the '*thath padhaa*' and '*thvam padhaa*', the relationship is *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha:* |

The next word in the *sloka* is '*arthaa*'. This word '*arthaa*' also reveals two '*arthaas*' – one is '*thath padha arthaa*' and the second is '*thvam padha arthaa*'. Between the two *arthaas* - the

meanings of the two words `thath' and `thvam' - there is *viseshana viseshya sambhandha:* / *Thath padhaartha thvam padhaarthayo: viseshana viseshya sambhandha: asthi*

Then the third part is `prathyagaathmanaam' | Here, the student has to take

- (i) the `thath thvam padhaartha' together and
- (ii) the *aathmaa*, the *lakshyaartha*, as the pair of the two entities having the relationship.

Between (i) the *padhaarthaas* (viz. the meanings of the two words `thath' and `thvam') and (ii) the *lakshyaartha*, which is the *aathmaa*, the relationship is `lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha.' | *Padhaartha prathyagaathamano: lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha: asthi* | *Padhaartha lakshyaarthayo: lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha: asthi*

Thus:

- (i) Padhayo: saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha: |
- (ii) Padhaarthayo: viseshana viseshya sambhandha: |
- (iii) Padhaartha laskhyaarthayo: lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha: |

To a student, these statements may sound too technical and difficult to comprehend. But, the fact is, that, we are operating these `relationships' all the time in our mundane lives also. These technical names, viz., `saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha.', `viseshana – viseshya-sambhandha.' and `lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha.' are given to only what our intellects are doing regularly. It is similar to the doctor giving some technical names for common ailments such as stomach pain or head ache. Quite often, what a layman experiences and calls as `ache' or `pain', is called by a medical term by the doctor. Similarly, though unaware of the technical names for the *sambhandhaas* or relationships, we are operating / making use of all these.

An example will make this clear. When a statement `there is a red rose' is made, and the listener understands the meaning of the term `red rose', the understanding of the word `red rose' happens very casually; but, on a careful analysis, it would be found, that, in the understanding / grasping of the meaning of the word `red rose', the listener's intellect has actually discerned two types of relationships.

What are those two relationships?:

- (i) The first relationship is between the words - `red' and `rose'.
- (ii) The second relationship is between the meanings of these two words. Every word is uttered, to reveal a particular meaning ; in this example also, the word `red' has a meaning and the word `rose' has a meaning; and, between the two `meanings' there is a relationship.

Thus, there is a 'word-pair' relationship (*padha sambhandhaa*) and there is a 'meaning-pair' relationship (*padha artha sambhandhaa*). When the term 'red rose' is mentioned, though its meaning is seemingly understood in a very casual manner, actually, the listener's intellect has grasped the two *sambhandhaas* - *padha sambhandhaa* and *padha artha sambhandhaa*.

Now, what are the names of the two *sambhandhaas*?

Ans:

- (i) Between the two words: the relationship is 'noun-adjective' relationship, 'rose' being the noun and 'red' being the adjective. The word 'noun-adjective relationship' can be applied only to the words i.e. the 'noun-adjective relationship' can exist only between the two words.
- (ii) Between the meanings of the two words: The word 'red' conveys a colour and the word 'rose' conveys a substance – a particular flower. Between the colour and the substance, the relationship is 'attribute – substance relationship'. Just as the 'noun-adjective' relationship can exist only between the words 'red' and 'rose', the 'substance-attribute' relationship can exist only between the meanings of the two words.

To repeat: Between the two words, one can never say there is 'substance-attribute' relationship; it can only be 'noun-adjective relationship'. In the same manner, between the two meanings, one can never say there is 'noun-adjective relationship'. It can only be 'substance-attribute' relationship.

Thus 'noun-adjective relationship' is distinct; 'substance-attribute relationship' is distinct. These two relationships cannot be interchanged.

Another example that can be considered is the term 'tall man'. In this term also, the two relationships can be differentiated. Between the two words 'tall' and 'man', it is 'noun-adjective' relationship. And, between the meanings of the two words there is 'subject-attribute' relationship.

In the same manner as in the above two examples, in the *mahaa vaakyam*, between '*thath padhaa*' and '*thvam padhaa*', the relationship is 'noun-adjective' relationship; and between '*thath padha arthaa*' and '*thvam padha arthaa*', there is 'substance- attribute' relationship.

'*Jeevaathmaa*' is the substance. '*Paramaathmaa*' status is the attribute. And, '*Paramaathmaa*' is the substance and '*Jeevaathmaa*' status is an attribute.

Thus, through the *mahaavaakyam*, we get a *jeevaathma-paramaathma* substance, which has got the statuses of *jeevaathmathvam* and *paramaathmathvam*. When *Jeevaathmaa* is

taken as the substance, *Paramaathmaa* characteristics will become attributes and when *Paramaathmaa* is taken as the substance, *Jeevaathmaa* characteristics will be the attributes. Joined together, one *aathmaa* is revealed, endowed with both *Jeevaathmaa* characteristics and *Paramaathmaa* characteristics. One *aathmaa* is revealed, because of mutual 'substance-attribute' relationships.

But, there is an important difference between the *mahaa vaakyam* and the terms given above as examples viz., 'red rose' and 'tall man'. In the case of the examples, to comprehend the meanings of the statements, the two relationships, 'noun-adjective relationship' and 'substance-attribute relationship' will suffice. But, in the case of *mahaa vaakyam*, we have to do one more step.

What is that? Ans: By using the two relationships, the student has arrived at an *aathmaa*, which has both *Jeevaathmaa* attributes and *Paramaathmaa* attributes. But, between the *Jeevaathmaa* attributes and the *Paramaathmaa* attributes, there are certain contradictory portions. And, therefore, the student has to filter away the contradictory portions. The final step is where the student removes the contradictory features and retains only the non-contradictory features. Then, he / she arrives at one *aathmaa*, which has got non-contradictory features only.

What are the non-contradictory features? Ans: '*Sath*' is the feature of *Paramaathmaa* and '*chith*' is the feature of *Jeevaathmaa*, between the two of which, there is no contradiction. Removing all the contradictory attributes like (i) the omniscience, omnipotence of *Paramaathmaa* as against the limited intellect and powers of *Jeevaathmaa* and (ii) the *sathgunaas* of *Paramaathmaa* as against the *dhurgunaas* of *Jeevaathmaa*, and also the various *naama-roopaas*, and retaining the only two non-contradictory features '*sath*' and '*chith*', the student arrives at one *sath-chith-aathmaa*.

The relationship between the *vaachyaarthaa* and the *lakshyaarthaa* of the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*', is termed '*lakshyalakshanasambhandha*.' |

To consolidate again:

- (i) padhayo: saamanaadhikaranya sambhandha: - 'noun-adjective' relationship.
- (ii) padhaarthayo: viseshana viseshya bhaava: - 'attribute-substance' relationship.
- (iii) padhaartha prathyagaathmano: lakshyalakshanasambhandha: |

The jeevathma-paramaathma pair (the *vaachyaarthaa*) is lakshanam; the ekaathma – the non-dual *aathmaa* - is lakshyam. The relationship between the jeevaathma-paramaathmaa pair and the ekaathma is lakshyalakshanasambhandha: |

When the operation - the proper assimilation of the *mahaa vaakyam* - is over, the *jeevathma-paramaathma* pair disappears; the '*jeeva*' adjective is gone; the '*parama*' adjective is also gone. '*Ekaathmaa*' alone remains; what remains is, only one *sachchidhaathmaa*, where *sajaatheeya*, *svajaatheeya*, *svagatha bedhaas* are not there.

The Mandookya Upanishad (Manthraa 7) defines this aathmaa as: "Naantha: pragnyam na bahi: pragnyam nobhayatha: pragnyam na pragnyaanaganam na pragnyam naapragnyam| Adrishtam avyavahaaryam agraahyam alakshanam achinthyam avyapadesyam ekaathmaprathyayasaaram prapanchopasamam saantham sivam advaitham chathurtham manyanthe sa aathmaa sa vignyeya: |" – "They consider the Thureeya to be that, which is not the outward consciousness, not the inward consciousness, not the consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of consciousness, not the all-knowing consciousness, not unconscious, beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference, beyond thoughts, beyond description, traceable through the unbroken self-awareness, free from the world, tranquil, auspicious and non-dual. It is the Self. It is to be known".

In this *advaitam*, '*viswa-viraat*' division is not there; '*thyjasa-hiranyagarbha*' division is not there; '*praagnyaa-Isvara*' division is also gone. There is One pure, attributeless 'Existence' – One pure attributeless 'Consciousness' alone, which is called '*thureeyam*'. And, I do not know the *thureeyam*; I am the *thureeyam*.

And, if the question 'how to experience that *thureeyam*?' is raised, the reply can be only, that, the question is meaningless and invalid. *Thureeyam* is never experienced, because the 'experiencer-experienced-experience *thriputi*, is itself gone.

I do not experience *thureeyam*. The Kena Upanishad manthraa (II. 2), where the Upanishad student admits "Naaham manye suvedhethi no navedhethi veda cha yo nasthadvedha no na vedehethi vedha cha"- "I do not think that I know Brahman well. Not that I do not know Brahman. I know and I do not know. Among us, the one who knows the statement 'not that I do not know; I know and I do not know' knows that Brahman" is relevant here.

What does this statement "I do not know the *thureeyam*; not that I do not know; I know I do not know" mean? It means: "I am *thureeyam*, which need not be known, because it is the ever-evident Consciousness principle".

This is the essence of the third *sloka* (a very elaborate analysis of which has been done in *Swamiji's* earlier classes of *Vedhaantha Saraa*).

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 4:

अस्मिन् सूत्र उपन्यस्ते कश्चिच्चोदयति योऽयं वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तौ पुर्वाध्ययेनान्वयव्यतिरेकलक्षणो न्यायः :
सर्वकर्मसन्त्यासपूर्वकोऽभिहितः किमयं विधिपरिप्रापितः किं वा स्वरसत एवात्र पुमान्प्रवर्तत इति।

On hearing this aphorism someone questions this way : Is the procedure of rational discrimination laid down in the previous chapter, for comprehending the import of the proposition, preceded by the renunciation of all actions, enjoined by scriptural imperatives or is it undertaken by natural propensity?

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa takes a small diversion and enters into another highly technical topic, widely debated among the *advaitins*.

The topic is this: When a person practices *jnaana yoga*, there are several disciplines prescribed as parts of the *jnaana yoga*. When the *sruthi* prescribes these several disciplines, will they come under *veda vidhi* or not? Will all these instructions come under *vedic* injunctions / commandments or not? If they come under a *Vedic* commandment, certain principles will become very relevant. If they do not come under a commandment, certain other principles will have to be applied. Therefore, the issue, as to whether these instructions have got commandment status or not, is very, very important.

Therefore, a *poorva pakshi* asks whether *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasana* etc. are *vidhi* or not.

In short, "*jnaana yoge vidhi: asthi vaa na vaa?*" – "In *jnaana yoga*, is there a *vidhi* or not?" is the debate.

The answers will be two-fold; i.e. the answer will have two components. The *jnaana yoga* itself will be divided into two; and two different answers will be given.

The first component: "As far as knowledge is concerned, knowledge cannot have any commandment at all, because knowledge is not an action".

This is also a technical topic, which has been discussed now and then, in different contexts.

"Whether knowledge comes under action or not" is the question / doubt raised; and, the answer is, that, according to *Vedhaantha*, 'knowing' is **not** an action.

'Doing' is an action; but, 'knowing' is **never** an action, because of several differences between 'doing' process and 'knowing' process.

(Some differences have been discussed earlier during *Brahma Sootra* classes and some during *Sarva Vedhaantha Siddhantha Saara Sangraha* classes.)

Among them is the following important difference: With regard to 'doing', when *karmendriyaas* are to be operated, at the time of using the *karmendriyaas*, the individual has got a choice. But, during the course of 'knowing', when *jnaanaendriyaas* are brought into use, the individual has no choice at all.

The *Vedhaantha* class itself can be used as an example for this axiom. In the class, when a particular student holds his pen and takes down notes, he is a 'writer'; 'writing' is an action done by the *karmendriya*, the hand. And, as a writer, the student has choices. He may choose to write (take down notes) or not ; he may choose to write what he wants to and leave out what he does not want to etc.

But, when the student uses his *jnaanedriyaa*, the ears, as a listener, he has no choice with regard to what he listens to. If a particular listener has come for the first time to a *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class, he has to listen to the class and the subject of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* for one full hour, whether he likes it or not. He has no choice at all. When the Sanskrit text is read, he is the listener of Sanskrit words; and, when the meanings of the text are rendered in English, he is the listener of English ; when the teacher observes silence he listens to 'nothing'. As a listener, for one full hour, the student or the casual visitor has to helplessly listen to whatever *prameyam* is made available. This shows, that, in 'knowing', or as a 'knower', the individual is helpless.

Similarly, as a 'seer', when the eyes of an individual are open, he has no choice as to 'what is seen'; as a 'smeller', again, he has no choice as to 'what is smelt', whether pleasant or foul.

The individual may have a choice as to whether to approach or avoid a foul-smelling body of water, since 'going' is an 'action'. As a 'walker' he has a choice; but, once he is in the vicinity of the foul smelling body of water, as a 'smeller', he has no choice – he has to undergo the unpleasant experience of the foul smell.

Similarly, as a 'talker', the individual has a choice; 'talking' is an action; but, as a 'listener' he has no choice.

All the above examples show, that, *Jnaanam* is not will-based; *karma* is will-based. In Sanskrit, this is expressed as "*Karma* is *karthruthanthram* ; *Jnaanam* is *vasthuthanthram*", *vasthuthanthram* meaning "dependent on 'whatever is available'".

This is one difference between *jnaanam* and *karma*. The second difference is, that, *Karma* produces four types of results, whereas, *Jnaanam* does not produce any one of these four.

The four consequences of *Karma* are as below:

- (1) *uthpatthi*: - production ./ manufacture of an object.
- (2) *aapthi*: - reaching a place or acquisition of an object
- (3) *vikhaara*: - transformation /modification / conversion of an object and
- (4) *samskhaara*: - purification.

(Viewed from another perspective, production, reaching / acquisition, transformation and purification are the *only* possible results of action. Even *sandhyaavandanam* is only an action for purification - purification of the mind. So also 'going to or reaching *svarga*' is also the result of action – the prescribed *karma*.)

In contrast, when one acquires knowledge, none of the above four consequences will result. If, for instance, when an individual opens his eyes and merely observes the clothes worn by somebody in his proximity, what results can he / she produce, by the mere perception of the clothes? Obviously, he / she does not 'produce' the clothes; they were already there. He / she cannot 'acquire' the clothes. Nor do the clothes get 'transformed' into something else – even as any other type of dress - by mere perception. And, by merely 'looking at' a set of dirty clothes, he / she cannot have the clothes 'purified'.

In essence, 'seeing' or 'knowing' is a phenomenon, in which the object 'looked at' or 'observed / known' does not undergo any change ; there is no production / acquisition / transformation / purification. Only the ignorance about the object is shed; nothing else happens.

And, this 'removal of ignorance' cannot also be considered as 'purification', since, it is not as though 'ignorance' was 'sitting upon' the object and has now been removed, since, in that case, the object should have lost weight on 'removal of the ignorance'. One cannot say that, "Ignorance removal' is a purification process, in which some dirt has been removed".

'Knowing' does not produce any one of the *karmapalans*. Therefore, 'knowing' does not come under *karma*. '*Jnaanam*' is not a '*karmad*'.

So what? After noting this first lesson, we have to move to the next lesson or the corollary of this first lesson, which first lesson, to repeat, is that, *jnaanam* – 'knowing' - is different from *karma* – 'doing'. And it must be carefully noted, that, the word '*jnaanam*', in this statement, means both *aathma jnaanam* as well as *anaathma jnaanam*; in other words, *saasthreeya* as well as *loukika jnaanam* . 'Knowing' is different from 'doing'.

The next lesson / corollary is, that, "Commandment' is possible only where *karma* is involved". This is because, as discussed earlier, there is 'will' or 'choice' in *karma* alone, and, obviously, there is a scope for 'commandment', only where there is 'will' or 'choice'. Of course, one can choose to 'obey' or 'ignore' a commandment.

To make this second lesson clearer : Going back to the earlier example of a foul-smelling body of water, the individual has a choice in going near that body of water or avoiding it. And, therefore, another individual can 'command' him to approach the water body. Assuming that the first individual obeys the command and approaches the foul smelling water body, there cannot or need not be a command with regard to the 'smelling', since there is no 'will' or 'choice' with regard to 'smelling', which happens automatically or helplessly. A commandment 'do not smell' cannot also be made, since 'smelling' or 'not smelling' does not come under one's choice. Of course, one can choose to avoid smelling by covering one's nose, but even that 'avoiding' is only a result of 'doing' – 'physically covering one's nose'.

Therefore, it is clear, that "Do's' and 'Don'ts' are not possible in the field of *jnaanam*, while they are possible in the field of *karma*". This can be expressed as: "*jnaane vidhi: naasthi; karmane vidhaya: santhi.*"

Therefore, if the question "is there *vidhi* in *jnaana yoga* or not ?" is raised , the answer will be "with regard to actual 'knowing', there is no question of any *vidhi*".

"However, "*Vedhaantha* says : " while, with regard to actual '**knowing**', there is **no** question of any *vidhi*, with regard to all the **disciplines** allied / associated with *jnaanam*, there **are** *vidhis*. Developing *viveka* and *vairaagya*, by practicing *karma yoga* and *upaasanayoga* etc., and approaching a *guru* for *sravanam* and *Vedhaantha vichaaram* (as in the *Bhagavadh Githa*, verse 34, Chapter IV, the popular *sloka* – "*thadh vitthi pranipaathena pariprsnena sevayaa upadekshyanthi the jnaanam jnaanina: thathvadarsina:*" – " May you gain that knowledge by prostration, and service to and by proper enquiry with wise sages, who will impart the knowledge") - with regard to all the *sahakaari* disciplines, there are *vidhis*. With regard to actual 'knowing', there cannot be any *vidhi*."

Then, the next question is "what is the view of *Vedhaantha*, on the actual process / methodology of bringing the allied disciplines - the *sahakaari saadhananaani* - under a *vidhi* or commandment?"

This factor has also to be analyzed by the student – again a highly technical subject.

Wherever there is a series of disciplines, *saasthra* gives a series of commandments. Thus, we have packaged sets of disciplines, coming from different sets of commandments and any whole package of disciplines is directed towards one particular goal. Taking the path of *jnaana yoga* itself as an example, all the allied disciplines associated with *jnaana yoga*, viz. "going through *karma yoga* and *upaasana yoga*, acquiring *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, going through *sravana-manana-nidhishyaasanani* etc." are a package / set of disciplines. But, the only goal / objective of all the disciplines in that particular set of disciplines, is the *nishtaa`aham brahma asmi*.

In the *Vedas*, different sets of commandments have been given, with different sets of disciplines, for different goals. In the four *aasramaas* prescribed by the *Vedas*, each *aasramaa* has got a certain type of disciplines, as a 'package', to be followed for a length of time. *Brahmacharya aasramaa* is the name for a package of a number of disciplines, containing both worldly and *saasthric* disciplines. Similarly, *grahastha aasrama* also has a set of disciplines, both *loukika* and *saasthreeya*. So also the *vaanaprasthaa* and *sanyaasa aasramaas*.

Vedha adhyayanam is a discipline, associated with *brahmacharya aasramaa*; *karma yoga* is a bunch of disciplines, associated with *grahastha aasrama*; *upaasana yoga* is a bunch of disciplines, associated with *vaanaprastha aasramaa* and *jnaana yoga* is also a set of disciplines, associated with *sanyaasa aasrama*. Thus, every *aasramaa* refers to a set of disciplines.

Whenever a package of disciplines for any particular goal is prescribed as to be followed for a length of time, the practice of such disciplines, naturally, requires 'commitment'. The 'commitment' of the aspirant is very, very important, since the result is directly proportional to the commitment that the aspirant has.

A serious aspirant has, therefore, to enter into any package of disciplines in a formal manner, by which he /she takes a 'commitment' or a 'vow'. Somewhat similar to legal contracts, *Veda* also has got *saasthric`contracts`*, with regard to *Vedic* disciplines.

A person can formally commit himself to the study of the *Vedas*, for a specified time of five years / seven years / twelve years. The formal commitment to study *Vedas* – *Veda Adhyayanam* - is the *upanayanam* ceremony, a formal entry into the *brahmacharya aasramaa*. This is the 'registration'- as it were- , showing the *sraddha* of the student, for the group of *veda adhyayana* disciplines.

The *Vaidika* wedding with *agni* as *saakshi*, is the formalization of the commitment for the *grahastha aasramaa*, with its mandatory *karma anushtanaas*, to be performed as *karma*

yoga and later, for the *Vaana prastha Aasramaa*, with emphasis on the *Upaasana Yoga*. The *Vaidika* wedding is a 'contract' between a consenting couple, but, considered irreversible in Hindu tradition.

For the pursuit of *jnaana yoga* alone, there is a choice. The seeker may choose to enter into a package of disciplines in a formal manner, with a formal 'vow' or may enter that package of disciplines in an informal / casual manner, without the 'vow'.

The formal manner for entering *jnaana yoga* practice, prescribed by the *Vedas* is called the *sanyaasa vidhi*, by which, the seeker assumes the *sanyaasa aasramaa* and thereafter, devote his / her entire time to the pursuit of *jnaana*.

Alternately, he / she can choose to practice *jnaana yoga*, without the *sanyaasa aasramaa*, but diligently observing all the other disciplines of the mind.

'Commitment' to any discipline consists of three factors - *nischaya*, *sankalpa* and *abhyaasa*. If a seeker decides to follow the 'binary format', he / she should first decide to *start* on the binary format; this is '*nischaya*'. Then follows the *sankalpa*: "hereafter, I shall look upon myself as *aathmaa*", which *sankalpa* is taken, as a firm commitment. And, thereafter, the student should renounce special prayers; for him/ her, even during the worst crisis, there is no question of praying "O, Lord! save me", because he / she has decided " 'I' am the ever-saved *aathmaa*, which does not require a savior". This is *abhyaasaa*.

According to the *saasthraas*, this '*nischaya-sankalpa-abhyaasaa*' commitment can be made in the formal manner, the *sanyaasa vidhi*, which is a ritualistic process, by which, the aspirant takes a vow: "hereafter, I shall not follow the 'triangular' format, however tempting or attractive it may be".

One can cultivate these convictions through an informal entry also, with a firm decision (*sankalpa*) in the mind and with only a symbolic *rudraakasha* / *thulasi maala*, and approaching a guru for the necessary *sravana-mananam*.

In the *Bhagavadh Geetha*, the Lord promises "*Maschittha: sarvadhurgaani mathprasaadhaath tharishyas*" – "With your mind fixed on Me, you shall cross over all obstacles, by my grace" (verse 58 – Ch. XVIII).

Such passages in the scriptures, where the Lord says "Come to me . I will save you", are, no doubt, attractive; and, also reassuring, that 'there is Somebody to 'save'. But, entry into *jnaana yoga*, with or without the *sanyaasa aasramaa*, calls for the firm resolutions: "However attractive may be the 'triangular' format, I will resist the temptation to enter that

format. Even in the face of the worst adversities, I shall not look for any *saadhana – loukika or vaidhika* - to get over the adversities. For me, *saadhanaas* do not exist. Hereafter, I will never go to the Lord with the prayer to 'save me'. I no more have the 'Saviour-saved' concept. My visits to the Lord or thoughts of the Lord, shall be only for expressing my thanks to Him; or for the prayer '*sarve bhavanthu sukhina:*' | Come what may, with regard to myself, I shall never look upon myself as a *mumukshu*, but as *mukthaa*. I do not, therefore, have to ever look upon *mokshaa* as a goal, hereafter".

The essence of all these discussions, is that, "with regard to the actual 'knowing' component, *vidhis* are not there; but, as for the allied disciplines, *vidhis* are there".

There is one more important point. Formal entry into *jnaana yoga* i.e. the *sanyaasa aasramaa* has its advantages and disadvantages.

This is similar to a legal contract, which is subject to a court of law. One cannot afford to violate the provisions in a legal contract; violations are subject to punishment. When there is no formal / written / legal contract, but, only an oral understanding, violations of the oral understanding, may result in unpleasantness, but not in litigation.

Sureswaraachaaryaa will be pointing out: "When a person formally enters *jnaana yoga*, he / she will have an advantage. What is that? Every discipline that he/she follows, will have an additional positive *adhrishta palan*. This advantage is not there for the individual who does not enter the *jnaana yoga* formally. By the same token, there is a disadvantage also. If any commitment is violated, it will give a negative *adhrishta palan* also – a *paapam* or a spiritual fall. The person who makes a formal commitment to *jnaana yoga* and violates a discipline, will have a stronger / a more intense fall".

The *Aachaaryaa* calls such a person '*aarooda pathitha:*' – 'one who *climbs* and falls'. Obviously, a fall from higher levels than from the lower levels, is more injurious and serious.

This is the topic in this paragraph: "sahaakaari kaarane vidhaya: asthi | vidhi sathvaath punyam asthi; paapam api asthi" |

121. Chapter III, Verse 4 (13-12-2008)

In this portion (*sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 4), Sureswaraachaarya is taking a diversion topic, on the question of whether there is any *Vedic* injunction, with regard to the pursuit of *jnaana yoga*: | And, he explains, that, there *is* a *Vedic* injunction.

By establishing that it is a Vedic commandment, the student gets some important corollaries also (as discussed in the earlier session).

It is important to remember the basic *Vedic* approach to its teaching; namely, that, it has divided the human life into four *aashramaas* – *brahmacharya*, *grahastha*, *vaana prasthaa* and *sanyaasaa*. In each *aasramaa*, a person pursues his materialistic interests also. *Veda* perfectly allows the pursuit of the worldly desires viz., security, entertainment, comfort etc. But, while pursuing these worldly goals, *Veda* envisages a parallel pursuit of the ultimate spiritual goal also, which pursuit should start not in the final *sanyaasa aasramaa*; but, right from the *brahmacharya aasrama* itself. Therefore, in each *aasrama*, *Veda* prescribes certain religious disciplines in the form of 'Dos' and 'Don'ts', known as *vidhi* and *nisheda*.

And, in each bunch of 'Dos' and 'Don'ts', *Veda* visualizes a particular level of spiritual growth to be accomplished. The growth is not a sudden jump, but a gradual one. Just as our physical body gradually builds up, cell by cell, the spiritual 'body' should / can also be gradually built up. And, just as growth of the physical body starts right from the womb of the mother, the spiritual growth also should start right from the beginning.

Till the beginning of the *brahmacharya aasrama*, marked by the *Upanayanam* ceremony, it is the parents of the individual, who have to contribute for the spiritual growth of the child – right from *garbhaadhaanaa*, followed by *pumsavanaa*, *naamakaranaa*, *annaprasanaa*, *chowlaa* etc. All these are spiritual contributions to be made by the parents towards the children.

The children will take over the responsibility for spiritual growth - 'receive the baton', as it were – at the *Upanayanam* ceremony, marking the beginning of the *brahmacharya aasrama*. In each *aasramaa* thereafter, there is a prescribed a set of 'Dos' and 'Don'ts'.

Adhyayanaa is the main aim of *brahmacharya aasrama*; karma yoga that of *grahastha aasrama* ; upaasana yoga is the main aim of *vaana prastha aasramaa* and *jnaana yoga*, the main aim of *sanyaasa aasramaa*.

And, to pursue these aims, the individual has to have the appropriate infrastructure , the appropriate P.O.R.T. (possessions, obligations, relationships and transactions), the appropriate dietary disciplines and the appropriate 'Dos' and 'Don'ts'. It is a package together. Each *aasramaa* is a bunch of disciplines.

The entry into each *aasramaa* is to be done in a formal manner, which is similar to taking an oath in a court of law; after taking the oath in a court of law, whatever statements are made, will have to be true; and, if untruthful or misleading statements are made, the court can take appropriate punitive action against the perjurer.

In the same manner, in the *Vedic* tradition also, once a formal / ritualistic entry is made into any *aasramaa*, the 'Dos' and 'Don'ts' of that *aasramaa* become compulsory and binding. That is conveyed by the word *vidhiparipraapitha:*, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*.

A *vidhiparipraapitha:* rule, becomes a vow / an oath. Once it becomes an oath, there are both advantages and disadvantages. The *palan* of each of the *aasramaas* is supposed to be two fold. One is called *dhrishta palan* and the other is called *adhrishta palan*.

If and when the disciplines of any *aasrama* is followed by someone, even without a formal entry into the *aasramaa*, the *dhrishta palan* is acquired by that individual. But the *adhrishta palan* - the invisible gain - can be acquired only by the formal entry into the *aasramaa*. This is the difference between formal entry and informal entry.

An example is 'studying *Veda* after *Upanayanam* and without *Upanayanam*'. If somebody studies *Veda* without *Upanayanam*, there will be *dhrishta palan*, viz., the pleasure of chanting the *manthraas* and enjoyment of the beautiful sound of the *manthraas* etc. Also, if a student of an *Upanishadh Bhaashyam* had already learnt the chanting of that *Upanishad*, he will have an advantage - the ease in assimilating the *Bhaashyam*. All these come under *dhrishta palan* of *Vedic* chanting. But, when one undergoes the *Upanayanam* ceremony and then chants the same *Veda* and the same *Gaayathri manthraa*, *Veda* holds, that, there is an *adhrishta palan* also.

Another example is the *agni hothram*, prescribed by the *Vedaas* as mandatory for a *grahasthaa* ceremony. The ceremony is getting popular now, even in the Western countries. In South America, there is a special society for advocating and popularizing *agni hothraa*. The *Vedic svaras* are given in Western notes by the society to its members, for easy performance of the ceremony. What the *Veda* says is, that, even if *agni hothraa* is done in such a fashion, without a formal entry into *grahastha dharma*, the *dhrishta palan* - in the form of purifying of the atmosphere etc. - will certainly result. But, if *adhrishta palan* of the *agni hothraa* is aspired for, the aspirant should be a *grahasthaa* with his 'marriage'

necessarily formalized through the *Vaidhika* wedding ceremony, with its constituent rituals such as *sapthapathy* etc. When such a *grahastha* performs *agnihotra*, it will give *dhrishta palan* **as well as** *adhrishta palan*.

Similarly upasana and jnaana yogaas also can give dhrishtam and adrishtam.

Jnaana yoga can be resorted to, in two ways – one through a formal entry and the other informal. Informal entry is when one just takes a decision to follow *jnaana yoga*, wears a symbolic *maalaa* or *rudhraakashaa*, goes to a *guru* and studies *saasthraas*, taking efforts towards a gradual reduction of P.O.R.T. (possessions, obligations, relationship and transactions) . 'Formal entry' or 'ritualistic entry' into *jnaana yoga* , is 'taking to the *sanyaasa aasrama*' - 'formal and total renunciation of family ties , possessions, obligations and transactions of a *grahastha*'. *Dhrishta palan* will be there, in both cases. But, in the case of *sanyaasa aasrama* there is *adhrishta palan* also. That is one corollary, of understanding that there are *Vedic* commandments – *vidhi* and *nishedha*

But, there is also a warning: "While the *adhrishta palan* is there in undergoing *jnaana yoga* in the *sanyaasa aasrama*, there is a disadvantage also."

What is that disadvantage? Ans: Once one formally enters any particular *aasrama*, then 'following' / implementation of the rules and regulations of that *aasrama* will give extra *punyam* alright; but, if, on the other hand, those rules and regulations are violated, then such violations will result in *adhrishta paapam*.

For instance, if a *grahastha* does not study the *bhaashyams* properly, for want of time, consequent on his duties as a householder, he does not incur any *paapam*; but, once a person takes to the *sanyaasa aasrama*, *Upanishad paraayanam*, *Bhaashya paraayanam*, *sravanam*, *mananam* etc. become compulsory *vidhis* for him. And, if a *sanyaasi* does not do *sravanam*, *mananam* and *nidhidhyaasnam* every single day without exception, then he is subject to *prathyavaaya paapam*. Therefore, once one accepts *jnaana yoga vidhi*, there is *adhrishta punyam* and *adhrishta paapam* – *punyam* in implementation and *paapam* in non-implementation. To establish these corollaries, Sureswaraacharya is asking this question : "Is there a *vidhi* in *jnaana yoga* or not?"; and answers : "in *jnaanam* itself, there is no *vidhi*. But, in all the allied disciplines such as *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* , *brahmacharyaa*, *sravana-mananam* etc., there are *vidhis*, which have to be followed compulsorily and diligently".

That is what is the topic here.

Reverting to the text:

- अस्मिन् सूत्रे उपन्यस्ते - When this soothram is declared,

The 3rd *sloka* is the *soothra sloka*. And, what is that *soothram*? Ans: "Understanding of *mahaavaakyam* needs application of (i) *saamaanaadhikarana sambhandhaa* between the *padhaas*, (ii) *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa* between the *padhaarthaas* and (iii) *lakshana-lakshya-sambhandhaa* between *padhaarthaas* and *lakshyaarthaas*". A *sanyaasi*, in the pursuit of *jnaana yoga*, has to apply these all the time. Every day, his job is *sravanam* of these three or *mananam* of these three or *nidhidhyaasanam* of these three – in other words, *sambhandha thraya abhyaasaa*, otherwise called the 'binary' format. The 'binary format *abhyaasaa*' will become a compulsory rule for a *sanyaasi*. He cannot afford, even in a weak moment, to enter into 'triangular' format, because, that will produce *prathyavaaya paapam* for a *sanyaasi*, though, such lapses may be excused in a *grahastha* in pursuit of *jnaana yoga*. The 'binary format *abhyaasaa*' is the *soothram* referred to.

- कश्चित् चोदयति - a person is raising a question:

The question follows: "ayam vaakyarthaprathipatthau poorvaadhyayena anvaya vyathirelalakshano nyaaya: sarvakarmasanyaasapoorvaka: abhihitha: kimayam vidhiparipraapitha: kim vaa svarasatha eva athra pumaan pravarthathe?"

The implication of the question asked, is: "Is this 'binary' format compulsory? Or can one switch over to 'triangular' format, now and then?"

- अयं न्यायः अभिहितः - This teaching has been given / this principle has been taught.

Nyaaya: - Application of this principle. *Abhihitha*: - has been taught.

What is that principle?

- अन्वय व्यतिरेक लक्षणः - The principle of binary format, in which one learns to remain as *aathmaa* and to look upon everything else as *anaathmaa*.

One's property must be consistently seen as *anaathmaa*; family must be seen as *anaathmaa*; one's own body must be seen as *anaathmaa*; even mental problems should be seen as *anaathmaa*. This practice of perceiving property, family, body and mind consistently as *anaathmaa*, is *anvaya vythireka nyaaya*:/ In other words, 'binary' format *abhyaasa*: is *anvaya vythireka nyaaya*: |

This has been taught. Where?

- पूर्व अध्यायेन - In / through the second chapter.

This 'binary' format *abhyasa*: can be practiced in two ways – (i) formally, with a vow and (ii) informally, without taking a vow.

What is taking a vow? That is called:

- सर्व कर्म सन्यास पूर्वकः - Taking to the fourth *aasramaa* called *sanyaasa aasramaa*.

The aspirant takes to the *sanyaasa aasramaa*, so that he / she will have two-fold advantage. The *dhrishta palan* is P.O.R.T reduction; there is no family, property etc., to worry about. *Adhrishta palan* also results when the aspirant takes the oath formally, as "Hereafter, I have no family; I have no property; I am *asangha aathmaa*; in and through all my experiences, I will practice the dictum '*aham sathyam jagan mithya*'. Any event brought about by *praarabhdhaa*, I will view as an event happening in *anaathmaa*. I will religiously shed *ahamkaaraa*; and, also remove *mamakaaraa* in family, in property, in the body and in the mind also. Even if there are inevitable *raagha dveshaas* in the mind, I do not claim them as 'my' *raagha dveshaas*. I am free from all of them".

When the aspirant takes such an oath in *sanyaasa aasramaa*, it is called 'formal entry' into 'binary' format, which, Sureswaraachaaryaa calls '*Sarva karma sanyaasa poorvaka*:|

"*Ayam sarva karma sanyaasa poorvaka: anvaya vyathireka lakshana nyaaya: poorva adhyaayanena abhihitha*: - "This teaching of the principle of the practice of 'binary' format, by taking to formal *sanyaasa*, has been taught in the previous chapter". This is the statement, the *poorva pakshi* makes, before he raises the question, that follows.

- किं अयं विधिपरिप्रापितः - Is this binary format practice prescribed by *saasthraas* as a compulsory injunction / rule?

Ayam – This binary format practice; *vidhi paripraapitha*: - prescribed as a compulsory injunction / rule for a *jnaana yogi*; *kim* – indicates it is a question.

The questioner continues:

- किं वा स्वरसत एव अत्र पुमान् प्रवर्तते - Or, does a human being practice this rule voluntarily, without any compulsion by *saasthraas*?

"Is it a voluntarily practiced 'binary' format or is it compulsorily practiced 'binary' format?" is the question. In short, "Is the practice of 'binary' format, voluntary or compulsory?"

'*Svarasatha*:' implies 'voluntary'. '*Rasa*:' means '*icchaa* / desire'. '*Svarasatha*:' means 'one who acts, because of one's own desire'. '*Pumaan*' means 'a person', in this context, meaning 'the seeker'. '*Pravarthathe*' means 'ventures into / practices'.

- इति - Thus.

'*Ithi*' should be connected with '*chodhayathi*', as '*Ithi chodhayathi*', meaning, 'is asking such a question'.

Then, Sureswaraacharya, in turn, questions the *poorva pakshi*: "Why are you so particular about this question? How does it matter, whether it is voluntarily practiced or compulsorily practiced? Or, whether it is practiced in *grahastha aasrama* itself or whether it is practiced by entering into *sanyaasa aasrama*? What difference does it make? What is the difference between *jnaana yoga* practiced in *sanyaasa aasrama* and the very same *jnaana yoga* practiced in other *aasrama*? Does it make any technical difference at all?"

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 4:

किंचात् :

What is the significance of the question?

अतकिं : - What is the benefit you get from your question,?

The term '*kinchaatha*:' should be rearranged as '*atha: kim?*'. '*kinchaatha*:' is an expression, that is found very often, in the writings of both *Sankaraacharya* and *Sureswaraacharya*. In this context, this is a question asked by Sureswaraacharya, to the questioner / the *poorva pakshin*, who asked whether '*sanyaasa aasrama* for the pursuit of *jnaana yoga*' is a *vidhi* or not .

To that *poorva pakshin*, Sureswaraacharya is addressing the return question "Why is this factor so important to you? Is your question a worthy question at all? By asking this question and getting the answer, what is the advantage you get? In short, why should I or you or any one, know the difference, if any, between the *jnaana yoga* practiced in *grahastha*

aasramaa and the *jnaana yoagaa* practiced in *sanyaasa assramaa*? Why are you asking this question at all?"

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 4:

श्रुणु । यद्यात्मवस्तु-साक्षात्करणाय विधिपरिप्रापितोऽयं न्यायः तदा अवश्यम् आत्मवस्तुसाक्षात्करणाय व्यावृत्तशुभाशुभकर्मराशिः एकाग्रमनाः अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां यथोक्ताभ्याम् आत्मदर्शनं करोति ।

Listen. If it is undertaken in obedience to an imperative, for the purpose of realizing the Self, then it is inevitable that, one, having renounced good and bad actions, and with a concentrated mind, should proceed to discover the Self in the manner of discrimination, for gaining a direct vision of the Self.

The *poorva pakshin* starts replying:

- श्रुणु - Listen.

The *poorva pakshin* starts his reply with this '*srunu*', meaning "Hey! Sureswaraa! May you listen".

Then follows the answer given by the *poorva pakshin*, justifying his question/ explaining the reasons why he was asking the question.

- यदि - Suppose,
- अयं न्यायः - this binary format practice / *abhyaasaa*,
- विधिपरिप्रापितः - is compulsorily prescribed by the *Vedas*,

For what purpose?

- आत्मवस्तुसाक्षात्करणाय - for the purpose of realizing the Self,

What is the translation of '*saakshaathkaaraa*'? It should be carefully remembered, that, '*Saakshaathkaaraa*' means 'the binary format becoming natural and effortless'. It is **not** a mystic experience.

In the binary format, the seeker, when subjected to the experience of diverse events, remaining as *asangha - aathmaa*, refrains from looking upon any event, as an event affecting him / her as an individual or as an event affecting his/ her family. In binary format practice, *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa* are naturally absent. For such a person, anything happening anywhere, is just an event in the *mithyaa anaathmaa*, an event which is

organized by *Viswaroopa Isvara*, but, which does not call for a judgment and a reaction. When this attitude of 'no judgment or no reaction with regard to any event' becomes natural and effortless, it is called 'binary format *saakshaathkaara*' or '*aathma saakshaathkaara*'. It is **not** a mystical event; **nor** is it a sudden event; but, is something that grows on the seeker, by deliberate practice. Whatever one 'deliberately' practices, will become 'natural', in due course.

Initially, the aspirant should diligently practice the 'binary' format, during simpler problems, so that, gradually, even in the worst crisis, he / she will maintain equanimity. Even in the worst crisis, he / she can state "In the *anaathma prapanchaa*, the *praarabhdtaa* is active ; global meltdown is active ; but, these do not affect me". This attitude cannot be achieved in one day. It *is* the result of sustained *abhyaasaa*. *Saakshaathkaranam* is that *jnaana nishtaa* alone.

Suppose (*yadh*), for this *saakshaathkaranam*, this binary format practice (*ayam nyaaya:*) is compulsorily prescribed (*vidhiparipraapitha:*),

- तदा - then / in that case,
- आत्मवस्तुसाक्षात्करणाय - for the purpose of realizing the Self,
- अवश्यं - it is essential, that,
- एकाग्रमनाः - (the seeker should) with singular commitment, take to *sanyaasa aasramaa*, considering *saakshaathkaranam* as the only goal in life;
- यथोक्ताभ्यां अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां - constantly remembering that everything else is *anaathmaa*, using the prescribed *anvayavyathirekha* logic / process of discrimination,
- व्यावृत्त सुभासुभकर्मराशिः - and renouncing all the bundles of *punya* and *papa* karma,

Vyaavruttha – becomes free from; karma raasi: - bundles of karma; subha and asubha – in the form of *punya* and *papa* karma.

How does the person become free from *punya* and *paapa karma*? Ans: Not by doing *praayaschitthaa*. On the other hand, in binary format, he claims 'I do not have any *punyam* nor any *paapam* requiring a *praayaschitthaa*. It *is anaathmaa* that has *punyam* and *paapam* and *anaathmaa* exhausts them. At the *anaathmaa* level, duties are performed; but, there is no question of any neutralization. *Parihaaraa* etc. does not become relevant for 'me', the *asangha aathmaa*.'

"Na punyam na paapam na saukyam na dhu:kham na manthro na theertham na vedhaa: na yagnyaa: aham bhojanam na naiva bhojyam na bokthaa chidhaanandarooapa: sivoham sivoham" is a relevant verse from Nirvana Shadgham of Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa.

'*Vyaavruttha subha asubha karma raasi:*' is a description of the *sanyaasi*, who is practicing 'binary' format as a compulsory duty.

- आत्मदर्शनं करोति - (he) will discover the Self / attain aathma saakshaathkaaraa .

The words should be carefully understood. The statement '*aathma darsanam karothi*' (*அவன் ஆத்மாவைப் பார்ப்பான்*) should not be understood in the literal sense, as "the seeker should sit in *nirvikalpaka samadhi*, *aathmaa* will reveal its *dharsanam* and then go away". It only means, that, the conviction "I' am the *aathmaa*' will become natural to such a seeker; that, for him, the 'binary' format will become effortless.

But, then, there is a disadvantage also. What is that disadvantage? That is said in the next sentence.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 4:

अपरिसमाप्यात्मदर्शनं ततः प्रच्यवमानः आरूढपतितः भवति |

If it happens that the discovery of the Self is not completed and he relapses from the endeavor, he falls from the height gained.

After formally entering into *sanyaasa*, till binary format practice becomes natural / the *jnaana nishtaa* is achieved, the *sanyaasi* should limit himself to (i) stabilization of *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* and (ii) *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani*. He cannot even engage in any service to the society.

For carrying out service to the society and to the world, the appropriate *aasramaa* is the *grahastha aasramaa*.

Sanyaasa aasramaa, especially in the initial stages, is meant only for binary format *abhaayassa*. **After** binary format becomes natural, i.e. when, as defined in the *Bhagavadh Githa* "even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening and closing the eye, he understands 'I do not do anything at all' " – "*naiva kinchith karomeethi manyetha pasyan, sravan, sparasan, jigran, asnan, gacchan, svapan, svasan, pralapn, visrujan, gruhnan, unmishan nimishaanap*" (Verses 8 and 9 – Chapter V), the *sanyaasi* can go back to the world and involve himself in any activity for *loka sangraha*. But, till the *nishtaa* is achieved, the *sanyaasi* has to diligently practice only *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani*. If he does not do that, but does

something else, then he will get *prathyavaaya paapam*. That is what is conveyed in this sentence.

For a *sanyaasi*, who has formally taken a vow to follow the binary format, *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasnam* is a compulsory discipline. Obviously, once a person becomes a formal *sanyaasi*, the family duties will not be there, since there is no family at all for him. He need not even observe or celebrate *Rama Navami*, *Krishna ashtami* etc. *Veda* tells him "You are absolved of / free from all those duties".

There are no *Pujas* also to be performed by a *sanyaasi*; *Pujas* are, in fact, banned for a *sanyaasi*, since, if *Puja* is a duty for a *sanyaasi*, he will have to possess the necessary *Puja* implements, acquire necessary *Puja dravyaas* and therefore, find monetary resources also for these. Obviously, therefore, performance of *Pujas*, will make the renouncement of P.O.R.T., which renouncement is mandatory for a *sanyaasi*, impossible.

It is true, that, in the *Sankara mataas*, the *Aachaaryaas* perform daily *Pujas*; from this, lay people get the wrong impression, that *Puja* is a compulsory duty of a *sanyaasi*. It is not so. A regular *aasrama sanyaasi* has to do *only sravanam / mananam / nidhidhyaasanam* all the time. With regard to *Pujaas*, a *mataathipathi* may be considered exempt from this general rule for the *sanyaasi*.

There is also one more exception to this rule. There is another type of *sanyaasaa* called *thridhandhi sanyaasa*, in which *sanyaasaa*, the sacred thread is not discarded, but maintained. Such a *thridhandi sanyaasi* is allowed to perform *Pujas*; but, the *paramahansa sanyaasi* is not allowed to do *Pujas*, because, he is expected to utilize *that* time also for binary format *abhyaasaa* alone. And, if a person does not do that, what will happen? Answer follows:

- अपरिसमाप्यात्मदर्शनं - Without accomplishing nishtaa or saakshaathkaaraa / without completing the 'project' of making 'binary' format natural,
- ततःप्रच्यवमानः - a *sanyaasi* who slips from the endeavor,
- आरूढपतितभवति : - becomes aarooda pathitha: |

Aarooda pathanam is called a special type of sin. There are several types of sins. This is a special sin. What is that sin? Ans: A *sanyaasi*, who is yet to attain *aathma saakshaathkaaraa*, doing worldly activities, dropping spiritual *saadhanas*. This is called spiritual fall – *aarooda pathanam*. The world may glorify him for doing a number of social services – establishing schools, hospitals etc.; but, *saasthraa* considers this a spiritual fall.

At the same time, the following fact also should be very, very carefully noted and remembered: a *sanyaasi*, **after** achieving the goal of making 'binary' format natural, **can** enter into social / worldly activities, such as building schools, hospitals etc. Only when and if, without making 'binary' format natural, a *sanyaasi* undertakes worldly activities, even if those activities are meant for the good of the society, his action is considered '*aarooda pathanam*', literally meaning 'climbing and falling'.

'Entering *sanyaasa aasrama*' is considered 'climbing' and 'taking up worldly activities, without achieving the purpose of the *sanyaasa aasrama*' is considered 'falling'. *Saasthraas* consider it a very serious *paapam*.

(During the course of study of *soothraas* III. iv. 42 and III. iv. 43, of the *Brahma Soothras* also, this subject is discussed).

Such persons are supposed to be ostracized, even by the society, as in the case of *Jnaanadeva* and his siblings (in the 12th century) in Maharaashtra, whose father, after taking to *sanyaasa aasrama*, gave up the *aasrama* and reverted to *grahastha aasrama*. *Jnaanadeva's* father was, therefore, considered an *aarooda pathitha*: and his children were also ex-communicated from society, as was the then-prevalent practice, to discourage such actions.

Such problems are not there for a *grahastha*. He is even permitted to skip his *Vedhaanthic* studies, for fulfilling his social and family obligations. He does not get *prathyavaaya paapam* by doing so.

Grahastha aasrama is meant for *Karma Yoga*; therefore, *Karma* becomes primary, for a *grahastha*; giving up *karma* will produce *prathyavaaya paapam* for him. But, skipping *Vedhaanthic* study will not produce *paapam* for him; the optional *Vedhaanthic* study, though, will add to his *punyam*.

If a *sanyaasi* attends social functions also, **before** accomplishing *nishtaa*, he will get *prathyavaaya paapam*. Similar to social activities, **after** *jnaana nishtaa*, a *sanyaasi* is free to attend social functions also; but, before achieving *aathma nishtaa* or *saakshaathkaaraa*, *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani* are his constant and only duties.

Thus, the *aasrama* decides what will produce *prathyavaaya paapam* and what will not. This clarity must be there, for a seeker.

A *sanyaasi* will have a serious problem, if he takes a commitment according to *vidhi* and then fails to keep his commitment. On the other hand:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 4:

यदि पुनर्यदृच्छातः प्रवर्तते तदा न कश्चिदोष इति ।

If the undertaking is by natural propensity, then there is no such blemish.

All these are explanations given by the *poorva pakshin*, to find out whether there is *sanyaasa vidhi* or not.

- यदि पुनः - Again, suppose
- यदृच्छा अतः प्रवर्तते :- (there is no *sanyaasa vidhi* and a *grahastha*) because of his own interest decides to take up *Vedhaanthic* study / voluntarily practices *Vedhaantha*,

A *grahastha* can take to *Vedhaanthic* study in any manner according to his convenience, availability of time and co-operation of his family. There are no hard and fast rules for him.

- तदा - then,
- कश्चित् न दोषः - there is no question of *prathayavaayaa paapam* / 'aarooda pathana paapam', for him, (by the omission of *sravana- mananam*.)

This is an advantage for a *grahastha*. What is the disadvantage? Ans: In *sanyaasa aasrama*, when *sravana-mananam* are practiced by the seeker, there is an *adhrishta punyam* resulting. That extra invisible *punyam* will not be available for a *grihastha*, because, he does not have that ritualistic commitment to *jnaana yoga*.

The advantage of *grahastha aasrama* alone is talked about in this portion, viz., that, the *grahastha* will not get *prathyavaaya paapam*, if he skips *sravana-mananam* at times, because of other compulsions. The disadvantage of his 'not acquiring *adhrishta palar'* is not talked of, here.

इति - Up to this is the *Poorva Pakshin's* question.

Now, Sureswaraacharya is answering:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 4:

विधिपरिप्रापित इति ब्रूमो यत आह ।

In this matter, we say that this process is initiated by the imperatives of scriptures to that effect:

- विधिपरिप्रापित :इति ब्रूमः - We answer that 'jnaana yoga' / 'the practice of 'binary' format' exists as a compulsory duty, for a person who takes the commitment.

'*Vidhiparipraapitha:*' means 'it exist as a compulsory duty'. For whom? Ans: For the seeker who formally takes to the 'binary' format by taking *sanyaasa aasrama* oath.

The entry into *sanyaasa assrama* **is** indeed an oath; the would-be *sanyaasi* should enter a sacred tank or river, discard all his clothes under water to symbolize not having *abhimaana* even in his body, and, thus totally naked, discarding even the *koubeenam*, take a few steps towards North and take the oath: "Hereafter I am not a competitor in society; I will not compete / stake a claim even for food. Whatever food comes from anywhere, I will take and survive. I have got only one duty – the practice of the 'binary' format". He should, in a loud voice, address all the humans / *devathaas* / trees / animals and declare "I have renounced everything; I look upon everything as *Viswaroopa Isvara*. I have no wife, no children, no grandchildren. Not even this body, I look upon as mine".

This alone is symbolically indicated, in the *Bhaagavatha Mahaa Puraana*, through the episode of Krishna's *Gopi vasthra apaharanam*. The episode – the *Gopis'* surrender to Krishna, the *Paramaathmaa* - is only symbolic of the seekers taking to *sanyaasa aasrama*.

Thus, *sanyaasa aasrama* **is** a sacred oath taken by a serious aspirant; and, thereafter if the *sanyaasi* acquires any possession or looks upon even an *aasrama* (hermitage) as *his* hermitage and starts worrying about the hermitage, he is subject to *prathyavaaya paapam*.

(Striking a personal note, Swamiji says, in a lighter vein: "Even if I start worrying about the preservation of the tapes or discs containing my speeches, then, that also becomes a *prathyavaaya paapam*. As a *sanyaasi*, my attitude should be: 'If the tapes are preserved, well and good; if not, it does not matter'")

A *sanyaasi* takes an oath "Nothing is mine". By taking this oath, there is an advantage to him and there is a disadvantage also, as explained above.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says '*Vidhiparipraapitha: ithi bhrooma:*' - 'we answer, that, it is a compulsory duty, for a *sanyaasf*.

But, if *sanyaasa aasrama* and the consequent duties are prescribed as 'compulsory', where is it prescribed? Ans: They are prescribed in various Upanishads.

The Aachaaryaa says:

- यत् आह :- I will tell you where they are prescribed.

Chapter III: Verse 4

शमादिसाधन : पश्येदात्मन्यात्मानमजसा ।

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां त्यक्त्वा युष्मदशेषतः ॥ ४ ॥

Let one equipped with qualities like the control of the senses, see the Self in the self, through the method of discrimination, having abandoned the non-Self in its entirety.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa is referring to the *sanyaasa aasrama vidhi* and the compulsory duties to be followed by a *sanyaasi*; the *manthraa* that is kept in the mind, is *Brahadhaarnyaka Upanishad Manthraa IV – iv – 23*, which talks about formal, committed entry into 'binary' format.

122. Chapter III, Verses 4 to 6(20-12-2008)

In this portion (the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 4), Sureswaraachaaryaa is taking a small diversion from the main topic.

A possible *poorva pakshaa* question is raised and answered. The *poorva pakshin's* question is "Yoyam vaakyaarthaprathipatthau *poorva adhyaayena anvyavythitrekalakshano nyaaya: sarvakarmasanyaasapoorvaka: abhihitha: kim ayam vidhiparipraapitha: kim vaa svarasatha eva athra pumaan pravarthate?"* The *poorva pakshin's* stand was being discussed in the earlier session also.

Jnaana yoga disciplines consist of (i) nourishing *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi* (ii) *sravana – manana - nidhidhyaasanaani* and (iii) diligently remaining in the 'binary' format'.

The *poorva pakshin's* question is: "Suppose a person takes to a *sanyaasi's* lifestyle and follows all the *jnaana yoga* disciplines, in the form of nourishing *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi*, in the form of *sravanam-mananam-nidhidhyaasnam*, in the form of struggling to follow the 'binary format' etc., will these two – viz., the *sanyaasi* lifestyle and the *jnaana yoga* disciplines - come under *Veda Vidhi / injunction*, or are they voluntary disciplines chosen and followed by the seeker?"

In response, Sureswaraachaaryaa raised a counter question: "*Kimchaathaa:?"*, implying "Why are you particular about the question? What is the consequence or benefit of knowing an answer to this question?"

The *poorva pakshin* replies: "Based on the answer, we get two types of corollaries. If *sanyaasa aasramaa* and *jnaanayoga* disciplines are followed only voluntarily, out of one's own will, such voluntary pursuit will have only *dhrishta palan* (the visible benefit) when they are followed efficiently; and, if and when they are not followed efficiently, the consequent negative results also will come under *dhrishtaa* category only. There will be no *adhrishtaa* consequences of *punyam* or *paapam*, when *Veda vidhi* is not involved. But, the moment the word *vidhi* comes, it falls within the range of *punyam* and *paapam*. Proper performance will produce *punyam* and improper performance will produce *paapam*. To repeat: if *sanyaasa aasramaa* lifestyle and *jnaana yoga* disciplines are only voluntary pursuits, there is no scope for *punyam* or *paapam*. On the other hand, if they come under *Vedic* injunction, then there are different consequences. What are they? Proper performance, in addition to practical utility, will give an additional booster benefit of *adhrishtam* also, pushing the seeker closer to the goal. At the same time, if there are lapses in *sanyaasa aasrama* lifestyle or in the observance of *jnaana yoga* disciplines, there will be serious consequences, in the *adhrishtaa*

plane, in the form of *prathyavaaya paapam*. Therefore, my question is meant to know whether *adhrishtaa* influences are there in *jnaana yoga saadhanaa* or not, and is a very, very relevant question."

Thus, the *poorva pakshi* justifies his question, by saying "aparisamaapya aathma darsanam thatha: prachyavamaana: aaroodapathitha: bhavathi | Yadi puna: yadruchaa atha: pravarthathe thadhaa na kaschith dosham" - "if there is a Vedic injunction and the *sanyaasa aasrama* and *jnaana yoga* disciplines come under Vedic

injunction, then he should not permit himself any lapses in those disciplines; and, suppose there are lapses – viz., a person half way through the pursuit, after taking to *sanyaasa aasrama*, drops *sravanam* and *mananam* and enters into social service or any other activity, for the sake of name / fame / glorification by others etc., without completing the project for which he took to *sanyaasaa* and *jnaana yoga* – if he slips from *jnaana maargaa* / if he strays from *jnaana yoga*, there can be no worse blunder. Such a person will get a special *prathyavaaya paapam* called *aarooda pathanam* and the person will be called *aarooda pathitha*: | This is the condition when it is *veda vidhi* based. On the other hand, suppose there is no *Vedic* injunction and a person follows *sanyaasa aasramaa* and *jnaana yoga* of his own volition, without there being a *Vedic* injunction in this regard, the advantage is, that, even if that person violates the *sanyaasa aasramaa* disciplines, he will not have the *aarooda pathana prathyavaaya paapam*".

The *poorva pakshin*, based on the above arguments, seeks to know from Sureswaraachaaryaa, as to whether the *sanyaasa aasramaa* and practice of *jnaana yoga* disciplines are subject to *Vedic* injunctions or not.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives his answer in the last line of the *sambhandha gadhyam* "vidhi paripraapitha: eva" - "You have to note that both *sanyaasa aasrama* and *jnaanayoga* disciplines are based on *Vedic* injunctions only".

Therefore, an *aasrama sanyaasi* cannot afford to 'play around' with *jnaana yoga* disciplines. For him, it is not a casual approach or a hobby; he should be committed and be serious about following it.

The *Bhaagavatha Mahaa Puraanaa*, in a particular portion, talks about the great *paapam* involved, when a person takes to *sanyaasa aasramaa* and later gives up the *sanyaasa aasramaa* and reverts to *grahastha aasramaa*. The *Puraanaa* condemns such an action in very strong terms, in five or six verses. The *Puraanaa* also gives a very nauseating example to such an action. It says: "After renouncing *grahastha aasrama* and therefore, the *dharma - artha - kaama* pursuit and taking to *sanyaasa aasramaa* or the *mokshaa* pursuit, if a person

drops the *moksha* pursuit and again goes back to *grahastha aasramaa* and the *dharma – artha – kaama* pursuit, his action is similar to his vomiting the undigested food from his stomach and afterwards deciding to consume the same vomit”.

“After throwing out the *dharma-artha- kaama- parichinna- palam* and taking to *sanyaasa* and again coming back to the very same *grahasthra aasramaa*, is as nauseating and as terrible” declares the *Bhaagavatha Puraanaa*. The exact words used are “*thavai vaanthaa aasi apathrapa:*”, ‘*vaanthaa*’ means ‘vomit’, ‘*aas/*’ means ‘consumer’ and ‘*apathrapa:*’ means ‘shameless person’.

And, then, the *Bhaagavatha Puraanaa* further says that this person will be born as a worm, repeatedly, for several *janmaas*, wallowing in filth. Such a repulsive *janma* is the *palam* for taking to *sanyaasa aasramaa* and later, forgetting its value, returning back to worldly pursuits.

Sureswaraachaaryaa also says “*jnaana yoga* is a serious pursuit and is not just a ‘time-pass’”. He further gives the source of the *vidhi*, in the following *sloka* (verse 4), introduced in the earlier class.

This *vidhi* topic has been discussed in *Brahma soothraas* also, in *soothraa* no. 3.4.47. In this *soothra*, this *vidhi* had been discussed as *niyama vidhi*.

And, what is the source (both for the *Brahma soothraas* and for Sureswaraachaaryaa’s contention)? The *Aachaaryaa* indicates, that, it is found in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, *manthraa* IV.iv.23.

And, what does the *manthraa* say? Ans: One has to diligently cultivate *samaadhi shadga sampatthi*: |

“*Saantho dhaantha: uparatha: thithikshu: sraddhaavitho bhoothvaa aathmanyeva aathmaanam pasyathi, sarvam aathmaanam pasyathi*” is the relevant *Brahadhaaranyaka Vaakyam*, in the *manthraa* IV.iv.23., the meaning of which, is briefly given below :

- *saantha:* - The aspirant should develop *samaa*, mind control;
- *dhaantha:* - The aspirant should develop *dhamaa*, sense control ;
- *uparatha:* - The aspirant should reduce the P.O.R.T. heavily;

one should withdraw from or reduce possessions and activities, as much as possible, because the more the P.O.R.T. is, the more the mental preoccupation. Possessions, duties, relations, and transactions will increase mental preoccupation. A preoccupied

mind is a shallow mind and a shallow mind is not available for deeper study of *Vedhaanthaa*.

The *saasthraas*, in fact, translate the word *uparama:*, as *sanyaasa:*; but, in the context of a *grahasthaa* studying *Vedhaanthaa*, the word can be interpreted as P.O.R.T. reduction , or as withdrawal from extrovert activities.

- *thithikshu:* - The aspirant should develop *thithikshaa*, forbearance or tolerance
- *sraddhaavitha:* – The aspirant should develop *sraddhaa* in *saasthra pramaanam*.

Thus, if all these disciplines are practiced seriously and diligently, the *Brahadhaaranyaka manthraa* declares "*aathmanyeva aathmaanam pasyathi, sarvam aathmaanam pasyathi*" - "(such an aspirant) sees the Self in his own self (body) and he sees all as Self".

The *Aachaaryaa* paraphrases this *Brahadhaaranyaka manthraa*, in this verse 4:

- शमादिसाधनः - One, equipped with *samaadhi shadgha sampatthi*,
- पश्येत् आत्मानं - should / will recognize the *aathmaa*,
- अञ्जसा - directly / *aparokshathayaa* / as the very Subject,
- आत्मनि - in one's own *antha: karanam*,

Here, the word '*Aathmaanam*' refers to *aathmaa*; and, the word, '*aathmani*' refers to the mind. In one's own mind, one should recognize the *aathmaa* as the *saakshi chaithanyam*.

But, before recognizing the *aathmaa*, the aspirant must have taken a very, very important step, as a preparation. What is that important step?

Ans: 'I', the *saakshi chaithanyam*, is now mixed up with *anaathmaa*; and, as long as the *anaathmaa* 'mixture' is there, *poornathvam* can never be claimed. The aspirant, therefore, should carefully 'push aside' the *anaathmaa* part.

Only after 'pushing aside' or separating the *anaathmaa* component, the *saakshi* can be recognized as *Brahman*.

And, therefore, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* says:

- युष्मत् अशेषतत्यक्त्वा : - abandoning the non-Self in its entirety,

'Yushmath' means the *anaathmaa* component; 'yushmath asmath prathyaya gocharayo:' is a common technical Vedhaanthic usage.

'*Yushmath*' is the *anaathmaa* component, which is fourfold - family, property, body and mind.

At the time of *Vedhantha sravanam*, the *anaathma* component in the form of 'family' must be pushed aside, far away; otherwise, the dictum '*aham brahma asmi*' will not work. Only thoughts about the family and relationships will be dominating. Therefore, family *anaathmaa* component should be pushed far aside.

'Property' *anaathmaa* component also should be pushed aside; otherwise, *saasthraas* warn that *Vedhaantha* will not be understood / will not work.

Coming closer, 'body' *anaathmaa* component should also be pushed far away; and fourthly, but most importantly, the mind *anaathmaa* component also must be pushed aside. The mind will always have several unsolved issues. There is no question of a perfect mind for any one at any time; therefore, if mind is included in 'me', '*aham Brahma asmi*' equation will never tally. Therefore, the mind also should be pushed aside.

This fourfold *anaathmaa* has to be '**falsified**'. There is no need to '**improve**' them. This is the biggest difference between the agenda which *Vedhaantha* sets for serious aspirants and the agenda that a normal human being has. The agenda of a normal human being consists of projects, undertaken repeatedly in the form of 'improvement of *anaathma*'. If the actions of any normal individual is analyzed, it will be found, that, they are all in the form of '*anaathmaa* improvement' only. 'Property' *anaathmaa* improvement, 'family' *anaathmaa* improvement, 'body' *anaathmaa* improvement and 'mind' *anaathmaa* improvement are the projects of the entire humanity. *Vedhaantha* warns, that, as long as an individual considers these as his / her only projects, *samsaara* will not cease to exist for him / her.

Of course, if an individual has not understood this message of *Vedhantha*, then, as the *Mundakopanishad* (Ch. I. - Sec ii. - *manthra* 12) suggests " *Pareekshya lokaan karma chithaan brahmana: nirvedam aayaath*" – " Having examined the worlds which are achieved through *Karma*, a *Brahmin* should come to dispassion", the individual can take some more time, go around, take a few more *janmaas*, go through a few more *grahastha aasramaas* and then understand that '*anaathma* improvement as a project' is only a perpetuation of *samsaara*.

The project of *Vedhaanthaa* is, therefore, totally different. Instead of 'improvement of *anaathmaa*', 'falsification of *anaathmaa*' is the agenda of *Vedhaanthaa*. The assimilation of the dictum '*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa*' is the most important project of *Vedhaanthaa*. Unless this dictum is clearly understood, *Vedhaanthaa* will not work for the seeker.

After falsifying the *anaathmaa* / after assimilating *anaathma mithyaathvam* / after achieving this *nishtaa*, one can come back to *anaathmaa* and *may* work for its improvement, but, not as an important project. 'Improvement of *anaathmaa*' should never become a serious goal; if it does, it will become *samsaaraa*. Converting 'anaathmaa improvement' into a casual hobby after 'its (*anaathmaa*) falsification' is the project of *Vedhaanthaa*. If this approach is not understood, one may even commit the blunder of trying to use *Vedhaanthaa* for improving *anaathmaa*. One of the greatest blunders is the attempt to improve *anaathmaa*, with the help of *Vedhaanthaa*.

'That *anaathmaa* can be improved by *Vedhaanthaa*' is never the promise given by *Vedhaanthaa*, whose advice is '**falsify** *anaathmaa*'.

How is this known? Ans: Because of the well known Vedhaanthic manthraas such as " '*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa*', '*Neha naanaasthi kinchana*', '*Na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi*', '*Na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha*' " etc., which manthraas firmly falsify *anaathmaa*.

These are *manthraas* to which a *Vedhaanthic* student is repeatedly exposed; but, unfortunately, in spite of the repeated exposure, many students, in their deep subconscious minds, want to use *Vedhaanthaa* to improve *anaathmaa*; and when the 'improvement' does not happen, wonder where they have gone wrong. Their mistake is that they have not understood the real message of *Vedhaanthaa*, even after study over a long period. The message of *Vedhaanthaa* is not 'improvement of *anaathmaa*' but 'falsification of *anaathmaa*'.

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* also stresses here, by this statement '*Yushmath aseshatha: thyakthvaa*' – 'having pushed aside / separated the *anaathmaa* totally.'

How is this 'separation / pushing aside' to be done?

- अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां - by applying the anvaya vyathirekhaa logic (as explained in the previous charter).

Thereafter (i.e. after falsifying *anaathmaa*), the seeker should understand "'I' **am** the *aathmaa*, which does not require improvement".

This fact (that, *aathmaa* does not need improvement) needs to be stressed, because, a student, having falsified *anaathmaa*, may concede "from now on, I shall not work for improvement of *anaathmaa*"; but, may come back with the question "Shall I, then, work for improvement of *aathmaa*?" This again shows that the student has not understood the message of *Vedhaantha* properly, since *Vedhaantha*, by its declaration '*thath thvam asI*' meaning '*nithya suddha muktha svabhaava: thvam asI*', points out: "'you' do not need improvement / 'you' do not require to *become poorna*: | 'You' are *already* the fine *poorna aathmaa*".

This ("anvaya vyathirkhaabhyaam yushmath aseshatha: thyakthvaa samaadhisaadhana: aathmani aathmaanam anjasaa pasyeth") is the injunction of the Brahadahaaranyaka Upanishad. Therefore, it **is** a vidhi.

Chapter III: Verse 5 –

युष्मदर्थे परित्यक्ते पूर्वोक्तैर्हेतुभिः श्रुतिः ।

वीक्षापन्नस्य कोऽस्मीति तत्त्वमित्याह सौहृदात् ॥ ५ ॥

When what is signified by 'Thou' (i.e. objective factors like the body, mind and ego) is abandoned on the grounds stated previously, and then there arises in the enquirer the question "Who, then, am I?", the *sruthi* answers in compassion "You are 'that' ".

- युष्मदर्थे परित्यक्ते (सति) - When what is signified by 'thou' (i.e. objective factors like property, family, body, mind and ego) is abandoned,

Yushmadharthaa (as already discussed) means the *anaathmaa* component in me, consisting of the four factors – possessions, family, body and mind. These are the most powerful *anaathmaa* components, subjects of *ahamkaaraa* and *mamakaaraa*, i.e. falling within the scope of 'me' and 'mine'.

All of them should be 'pushed aside;' they should not be part of 'I', the Subject; but, should be part of the world, the object.

Sureswaraacharya says "for this 'pushing aside' the *anaathmaa*, I have given several logical supports before".

- पूर्वोक्तैर्हेतुभिः : - by employing the different reasonings given earlier (in the previous chapter),

Five reasonings were given in the earlier chapter, to 'push aside' the 'family' as the objective world, the 'property' as the objective world, the 'body' as the objective world and the 'mind' as the objective world.

They are enumerated below (For details, the 'summary' of the 2nd chapter – Class no. 110 - may be referred to):

- (1) *Dhrusyathvam* – all of them are objects of experience.
- (2) *Boudhikathvam* – all of them are material products.
- (3) *Sagunathvam* – all of them are endowed with attributes.
- (4) *Savikaarathvam* – all of them are subject to modification / change and
- (5) *Agamaapaayithvam* - all of them are subject to arrival and departure.

(To explain the term '*aagamaapaayithvam*': During *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas*, all these four, viz., the family, possessions, body and mind, will be present ; but, in *sushupthi avasthaa*, all these will disappear. In *sushupthi*, 'body' is resolved / 'mind' is resolved / 'family' is resolved / 'property' is resolved. This alternate 'availability and resolution' is, what is meant by '*aagamaapaayithvam*'.)

Thus, 'dhrusyathva, boudhikathva, sagunathva, savikaarathva, aagamaapaayithva pancha **hethubhi:**', one has to 'push away' all anaathmaa.

When all of them / all the objects of experience are removed, what remains? Ans: Only the *saakshi* / the non-observable Observer / the unobjectifiable Subject alone, is left behind. 'I', the *saakshi* alone remain. *Saakshi roopena*, 'I' **alone** remain.

And, once the seeker comes to this stage i.e. when he / she is left behind with *saakshi* as the only 'remainder', he / she has a problem. What is that problem? He / she has no way of knowing what is the nature of the *saakshi*. He / she only knows: "'I' am a Conscious being"; but, has no way of knowing what is the nature of the *saakshi*, because *saakshi* cannot be objectified.

Just as one's eyes cannot see the colour of the eyes themselves, 'I', the *saakshi*, can never 'know' the *saakshi*, as brought out by *Yaagnyavalkyaa* asking his wife and student *Maithreyi* (in verse II.iv.14 of *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*): "*Vijnaathaaram arey kena vijaaneeyaath'* - "Who can know the Knower?".

Thus, 'I', the *Saakshi*, am curious to know what 'my' nature is. But 'I' do not have any means of knowing; therefore, 'I' have to resort to the *saasthram* to help 'me' know what 'I' am, since *saasthram* alone is the *pramaanam* to reveal the *saakshi svaroopam*.

This is the crucial juncture where the seeker finds himself / herself: "I am remaining as *saakshi* and 'I' have got the curiosity to know what 'I' am ; 'I' have asked the question to *saasthraa* and I am looking forward to the answer from *saasthra*".

(A mundane example for this intense eagerness may be compared to the eagerness and anxiety with which one looks forward to the report coming in after a biopsy examination, though the example may sound negative).

The *saasthra*, in reply, says: "*Eithadhaathmyam idagm sarvam thath sathyam sa aathmaa thath thvam asi*" – " that *jagathkaaranam*, the 'Pure Existence' alone is You, the 'Pure Consciousness' "(*Chaandoghya Upanishad* – Ch. VI.8.6 etc.). And, therefore 'you' are the all-pervading *adhishtaanam* of the entire *naama roopa prapanchaa*.

What a mind boggling revelation?

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- को अस्मि इति वीक्षापन्नस्य - to the seeker who asks "Who am 'I'?",

'*veekshaapannasya*' means 'to the seeker who wants to know'; '*veekshaa*' means '*jnaanam* / knowledge ; '*aapanna:*' means 'one who has come near'; '*Veekshaapanna:*', therefore, means 'a seeker who has come to the doorstep of *jnaanam* / self-knowledge'.

Such a seeker has knocked at the door of the *sruthi pramaanam* and is asking: "Who am 'I'?" In this question, what type of 'I', does the seeker refer to? When he / she uses the word 'I', the reference is to 'I', the *saakshi*, which has already been separated from property, family, body and mind.

After separating / pushing aside / abandoning all *anaathmaa* components, 'I' remain as a *saakshi* and ask '*Ko asmi?*' - 'Who am 'I'?

When, thus, the seeker has to come to the doorstep of knowledge, with the question "Who am 'I'?", in mind:

- श्रुति :आह - sruthi reveals

Sruthi reveals the most relevant wisdom in the life of an individual. And, what is that teaching?

- तत् त्वं इति - that "You are 'that'",
- सौहृदात् - out of compassion.

'*Sauhrudham*' literally means 'friendship' and is to be interpreted here as 'compassion' of a 'well-wisher'.

The anavayaa of this verse will be: "poorvokthai: hethubhi: yushmadharthe parithyakthe (sathi), "ka: asmi?" ithi veeekshaapannasya, sruthi: sauhrudhaath 'thath thvam' ithi aaha| This is a very beautiful sloka.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 6 (Chapter III):

अत्रापि चोदयन्ति सांख्या :। शरीरेन्द्रियमनोबुद्धिषु अनात्मसु आत्मेति निस्संधिबन्धनं मिथ्याज्ञानमज्ञानं | तन्निबन्धनो ह्यात्मनोऽनेकानर्थसंबन्ध | :तस्य चान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामेव निरस्तत्वान्निर्विषयं तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यं प्राप्तम् । तस्माद्वाक्यस्य चैष महिमा योऽयमात्मानात्मनोर्विभाग इति । तन्निराकरणायेदमुच्यते ।

•

In this connection, the *Saamkhyaa* philosophers raise the following objection: Ignorance is the false knowledge, attaching itself fast that the body, senses, mind and the intellect, which are not the Self, are the Self. From that arises the association of the Self with manifold evils. When this ignorance is got rid of, through rational discrimination itself, there is no matter to be communicated by the scriptural proposition "That thou art". Therefore, the glory of that proposition would lie merely in this discrimination between the Self and non-Self. In refutation of this objection, the following is stated:

The previous diversion topic is over. What was that diversion topic? "Whether *sanyaasa aasrama* and *jnaana yoga* disciplines fall under *vaidhika vidhi* or not". The answer is: "They fall under *vaidhika vidhi*".

And, this particular vidhi is called *niyama vidhi*. Meemaamsa saasthraa talks about various types of vidhis - *niyama vidhi*, *apoorva vidhi*, *parisankyaa vidhi* etc. Vedhaanthaa holds that *sanyaasa aasrama* and *jnaana yoga* disciplines fall under *vaidhika vidhi* . But, it should be clearly known and understood, that the vidhi is not in the actual 'knowing' process.

As already discussed, in 'knowing' no *vidhi* is possible. Only in 'doing' there can be *vidhi*. 'Knowing' is not a form of 'doing' and, therefore, in 'knowing', there can be no *vidhi*. Therefore, the *niyama vidhi* is not in the 'knowing' process; the '*niyama vidhi*' is in all the allied disciplines other than 'knowing'. 'Allied disciplines' mean the *sanyaasa aasrama* discipline, *saadhana chathushtaya* disciplines and *sravana- manana-nidhidhyaasanaani* .

In Brahma *soothras*, there is a *soothra* on this topic, which *soothra* itself is called *sahakaari anthara vidhi*: | In *sahakaari saadhanams*, i.e. in allied disciplines, *niyama vidhi* operates. This is a technical *poorva meemamsa* topic applied here.

Now, Sureswaraacharya is entering into another diversion topic, based on the views of a *saamkhyaa* philosopher.

The *Aachaaryaa* will have to do these diversion topics ; only then this treatise can be called a *siddhi grantha*: | When an author writes a *siddhi granthaa*, he has to present the views of several other systems of philosophy and refute them . If he avoids all other systems of philosophy and presents only the *Vedhaanthin's* view, his book or treatise will not be called a *siddhi granthaa*; it will be called a *prakarana grantha*: / An example is the *Viveka Choodaamani*.

In a *prakarana granthaa*, the author can avoid all other views of philosophy ; but, a *siddhi grantha* is expected to present the views of other schools of philosophy and also to refute them. The more the views that are presented and refuted in a *siddhi granthaa*, the greater it is, as a *siddhi granthaa*.

A student choosing a *siddhi granthaa*, has to, therefore, tolerate the intrusions of the *poorva pakshins*. In this portion of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, a *poorva meemaamsakaa* philosopher first intruded and raised a question as to whether the *sanyaasa aasramaa* and allied disciplines come under *vaidhika vidhi* or not.

Now, a *saamkyaa* philosopher is intruding and raising another question. His question is given in this *sambhandha gadhyam*.

-
- अत्र अपि - Here also,
- सांख्या :चोदयन्ति - the *saamkhyaa* philosophers raise a question.

What is their question? It is explained as below:

In the previous verse, it was said that the seeker should first 'push aside' the *anaathmaa* and thereafter, remaining a *saakshi* has to listen to *mahaa vaakyam*. And, from the *mahaa vaakyam*, should know that the *saakshi* is identical with *Brahman*, the all-pervading Existence.

'*Aathma anaathma viveka*' is the first step and the next step is '*aathma brahma eikyam*'. For the first step, viz., '*aathma anaathma viveka*.', the seeker should use *anvaya vyathirekha*

logic and for the second step, viz. '*aathma brahma eikyam*', the seeker should make use of *mahaavaakya sravanam*. This is the *Vedhaanthic* procedure.

The *Saamkhyaa* philosopher finds fault with this scheme. He tells the *Vedhaanthin*: "You are unnecessarily introducing two steps. The first step need be the only step; it is more than sufficient for liberation. Why should we unnecessarily take the second step at all? Why should we unnecessarily use *maha vaakya saravanam*? *Aathma brahma eikyam* is redundant; *maha vaakya sravanam* is redundant; therefore , *maha vaakyam* itself is redundant. The only *saadhanaa* that is needed and is also sufficient, is, '*aathma anaathma viveka:*'; to achieve this *aathma anaathma viveka:*, the method to be used, is *anvaya vyathirekhaa*. And, when, because of this *viveka:*, I realize that I am the *asangha saakshi chaithanyam*, who is not affected by *anaathmaa*, I am, at once, free from all the *samsaara*. I want only freedom from *samsaaraa*. I have got that freedom, from separating myself from the body-mind complex, which were giving me problems. Why, then, should I unnecessarily go to the second step? Why should I unnecessarily go to *Brahma Eikyam*?"

123. Chapter III, Verses 6 and 7 (27-12-2008)

Till now, Sureswaraachaaryaa had been establishing that Self-knowledge has to be acquired in two stages. The first stage is *thvam padhaartha viveka:* and the second stage is *thath padhaartha eiykyam*.

The *thvam padhaartha viveka:* alone is called *aathma-anaathma-viveka:*, through which *vivekaa*, the seeker should arrive at himself / herself as the *saakshi chaithanyam* and everything else experienced by him / her, the mind, the body and the world as *anaathmaa*.

And, having separated oneself as *saakshi*, the seeker has completed the first stage of *thvam padhaartha viveka:* or *aathma-anaathma-viveka:* | Sureswaraachaarya says there is a major second stage. In that second stage alone, 'I', the *Saakshi*, is equating 'myself' with *Sathbrahman* and only then, there is *Advaita siddhi*.

When *Jeevaathma-paramaathma-eiykam* is claimed, in the process, *anaathma* should get falsified also. The 'falsification' of *anaathmaa* is an important step in *mahaa vaakya vichaara*.

In *aathma-anaathma-viveka:*, we have only separated *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa* ; *anaathmaa* has not been falsified. The 'falsification' is a very, very major step and that step is accomplished along with the claim of *Jeevaathma-paramaathma-eiykyam*. Then alone '*aham brahma sathyam asmi*' |

The *anaathmaa* being the *kaarya prapanchaa*, a product, it is *mithyaa*. Thus, of the three things, *anaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa* should be merged together to become *ekaathmaa* and *anaathmaa* should be falsified. Only then there is *advaita siddhi*. This is also what Sureswaraachaaryaa established, viz., "only after *jeevaathma-paramaathma* merger and *anaathma* falsification, the binary format '*aham sathyam* and *jagan mithyaa*'".

Without falsification of the world, binary format will be of no use. Binary format will be working only when, in the binary format, one (*aathmaa*) is *sathyam* and the other (*anaathmaa*) is *mithyaa*. This conviction, that, "I, the Observer is *sathyam* and the observed *anaathmaa*, consisting of the mind, the body, the family and property (all the four constituting *anaathmaa*) is *mithyaa*", must be well entrenched. This is the *Advaitic* approach.

On the other hand, the *saamkhyaa* philosopher claims "We can make it a simpler procedure; *aathma-anaathma-viveka* is more than sufficient for enjoying liberation". He wants to stop

with *thvam padhaartha vivekaa* only; he cuts off '*thath padhaartha eikyam*' from the Project and he wants to delete '*anaathma mithyaathva nischayathvam*' also from the programme.

According to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher: "'*anaathmaa mithyaathva nischayathvam*' and '*thath padhaartha eikyam*' and therefore, '*mahaavaakya vicharaa*' etc. are not required at all ; what is required is only *aathma anaathma viveka*: | 'I' am *Purusha*: and whatever is experienced by 'me' is *prakruthi*: | This *Purusha prakruthi viveka*:, will, by itself, give liberation."

Asked to explain as to how mere *Purusha prakruthi viveka*: alone can give liberation, the *saamkhyaa* philosopher responds: "*Purusha*:, the *aathmaa* is *asangha*: and this *asangha aathmaa* cannot and will not be affected by *prakruthi*:/ *anaathmaa*, even though *anaathmaa* is *sathyam*. *Asangha aathmaa* cannot be tainted by anything. *Purusha*: is *sathya*: ; let *prakruthi* also be *sathyam*; 'I' am *sathya purusha*: ; world is *sathya prakruthi*:| What is required is only 'discrimination'. You should not identify with *prakruthi*, the *sareeram*. The identification alone is the problem. 'Dis-identify' from *prakruthi*. *Mokshaa* is accomplished. *Advaitam* is not at all required."

The *saamkhyaa* philosopher goes further and says that *moolaavidhyaa* (a very important concept of *Advaita* philosophy) itself is not there.

Then, what is his view on 'ignorance'? The *saamkhyaa* philosopher replies: "'Ignorance' is there; but, 'ignorance' is not your *moolaavidhyaa*".

In other words, the *saamkhyaa* philosopher accepts the concept of 'ignorance'. But *his* 'ignorance' is different from the *moolaavidhyaa* of *Advaitam*.

Then, what is his definition of ignorance? According to him, '*anaathma abhimaanaa*' alone is 'ignorance', which he calls '*mithyaa jnaanam*'. *Ajnaanam* is not *moolaa avidhyaa*; but, *ajnaanam* is *mithyaa jnaanam*, meaning 'false identification'.

And, what type of false identification? He answers: A 'firmly rooted' false identification.

Reverting to the text, the statement of the *saamkhyaa* philosopher is:

- अज्ञानं - Ignorance (is)
- निस्संधिबन्धनं - the firmly rooted
- मिथ्याज्ञानं - false identification

- शरीर इन्द्रिय मनो बुद्धिषु अनात्मसु - of the body, sense organs, the mind and the intellect, which are all *anaathmaa / jada prakruthi*,
- आत्मा इति - as the Self , claiming that 'I' am them.

The term '*Nissandhi bhandhanam*' is adjective to '*mithyaa jnaanam*' and means 'well reinforced / firmly rooted / that which cannot be easily negated'. A commentator to *Naishkarmya Siddhi* translates '*nissandhi bhandhanam*' as '*bhaadaka prathyaya rahitham*', which means 'that, which cannot be easily negated or routed'.

This '*nissandhi bhandhanam*' nature is responsible for the triangular format; that we are not able to drop the triangular format is because of '*nissandhi bhandhanam*' – 'firm entrenchment'.

According to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher, such *mithyaa jnaanam* alone is *ajnaanam*.

The difference between *Saamkhyaa* and *Vedhaanthaa*, on this aspect, should be thoroughly understood. *Saamkhyaa* says "Because of *ajnaanam*, 'I' identify with the body, which body is also real", whereas *Vedhaanthaa* says "*Ajnaanam* is the producer of the false body itself"

Expressing this in other words: "*Vedhaanthic ajnaanam* is the creator of the *false* body. *Saamkyaa ajnaanam* is the 'cause of the false identification of the Self with the real body' or 'that *ajnaanam* which makes 'me' identify with the real body' ".

"*Mithya jnaanam eva ajnaanam*" is the stand of the *Saamkhyaa* philosopher. In this sentence, *Mithya jnaanam* is the subject ; *ajnaanam* is the subjective complement.

The *Saamkhyaa* philosopher thus holds: "This *mithya jnaanam* alone is 'ignorance'. There is no such thing called *moolaaavidhyaa* as the creator of *anaathmaa*".

- तन्निबन्धनः - Caused by the false identification,

'*nibhandhana:*' means 'caused by'; '*that*' means 'the false identification', which is 'ignorance', according to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher.

Caused by that 'false identification' alone,

- आत्मन :- for 'me' the aathmaa / for 'me' the Purusha:, who is asanghaChaithanyam,

Aathmaa is called Purusha thathvam, in saamkhyaa philosophy.

- अनेक अनर्थ संबन्ध(भवति) : - connection with several problems results.

'*Sambhandha*.' means 'connection' and '*anartha*' means 'problem'.

The *saamkyaa* philosopher says: "Just as a person, man or woman, who is free from problems before marriage, has to share the problems of the spouse after marriage, the *Purusha*:, free from problems, after false identification with the *prakruthi* (consisting of the world, body and mind), suffers the problems of *prakruthi*. This 'false identification' is *samsaaraa*. Therefore, the solution is *sanyaasa*: – renunciation of *prakruthi* / dropping of the false identification with *prakruthi*. This 'CLASP' (controllership and ownership) rejection is enough for *mokshaa*. *Anaathma mithyaathvam* is not required."

- तस्य च निरस्तत्वात् - Since that false identification is eliminated,
- अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां एव - merely by the rigorous practice of *anvaya vyathirekhalogic* (the enquiry through co-presence and co-absence),

'*Thasya*' means '*mithya jnaasya*'; '*nirasthathvam*' means 'elimination'. '*Mithya jnaanam*' refers to 'false identification'.

"The false identification is eliminated by *aathma anaathma viveka*:, at the end of which, I know 'I' am the *asangha aathmaa* ; let *anaathmaa*, the world, continue. Why I should I falsify the world? I have to only know that I have no *sanghaa* with that *anaathmaa*" is the *saamkhyaa* philosopher's stand.

- तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्यं - the mahaa vaakyani like 'thatthvamasii'
- निर्विषयं प्राप्तम् - become redundant / do not have any further subject matter to deal with.

According to *saamkhyaa* philosophy, after *aathma-anaathma viveka*:, there is no further effort required, either *anaathma-mithyathva-nischayam* or *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-aijkyam*. This belief of the *saamkhyaa* philosopher, is also because he does not have a *Paramaathmaa* separate from the *jeevathmaa*.

The *saamkhyaa* philosophy holds: "There are many *Purushaas* called *jeevaathmaas* and each *purushaa* is all-pervading. Each *purushaa* is *asangha*: and each *purushaa* is *muktha*: | There are as many *Purushaas*, as there are bodies. Each *purushaa* is *asangha*:, *chaithanya svaroopaa*:, *sarvagatha*: and *muktha*:| There is no *Paramaathmaa* separate from

Jeevathmaa. Only *Purusha* and *prakruthi* are there. When there is no *Paramaathmaa*, where is the question of *Jeevathma-Paramaathma-eikyam*? Where is the requirement of *mahaa vaakyam*? Where is the requirement of the falsification of the world? There is no need for all these”.

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- महिमा - the great role
- वाक्यस्य - of the mahaa vaakyam
- एषः - is the following :
- यःविभागःअयं आत्म अनात्मनो : - “merely the separation of the aathmaa, the Purushaa and anaathmaa , the prakruthi”.Vibhaaga: - separation.

What is the great role of the *mahaa vaakyam*? According to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher: “The role of the *mahaa vaakyam* is not *jeevaathma- paramaathma- eikyam*. The ‘separation of *aathmaa* and *anaathmaad*’ alone is the job of the *mahaa vaakyam*”.

- इति - In this manner (up to this is the *saamkhyaa*’s objection).

‘*Ithi*’ must be connected with the term ‘*saamkhyaa: chodhayanthi*’. ‘*Ithi saamkhyaa: chodhayanthi*’ means ‘In this manner, the *saamkhyaa*s raise objections’

- तन्निराकरणाय - To refute this *saamkhyaa* philosophy/ for negation of *dvaitham*,
Saamkhyaa is essentially *dvaitha* philosophy.
- इदं उच्यते - the following *sloka* is written.

Chapter III: Verse 6 –

भेदसंविदिदं जानं भेदाभावश्च साक्षिणि ।

कार्यमेतदविध्याया जात्मना त्याजयेद्वचः ॥ ६ ॥

This discriminative knowledge is apprehension of difference; but, in the witness, there is no difference. Apprehension of difference is the effect of nescience. The words of the scripture set it aside by focusing on the Self of the nature of pure consciousness.

The *saamkhyaa* philosophy can be refuted in two ways. One is based on reasoning. But, Sureswaraachaaryaa does not apply that method here, presumably because, that has been

done very elaborately in the *Brahma Sootraas*, in the second chapter, titled *Avirodhaadhyaya*; the *saamkhyaa* philosophy is very elaborately refuted, especially in the 2nd *paadhaa* of the 2nd chapter of *Brahma Sootraas*, where several *sootraas* are presented to show that, if *purushaa* and *prakruthi* are equally real, then *mokshaa* is never, never possible. In *Dvaitam*, *mokshaa* is never possible, because *dvaitam* means 'limitation'. Each one *Purushaa* will be limited by another *Purushaa*; *Purushaa* will be limited by *Prakruthi*. 'Time and space limitation' will cause '*punarapi jananam punarapi maranam*' cycle; thus, logically also, '*dvitheeyaath vai bhayam bhavathi*'. Duality and *mokshaa* can never co-exist. This reasoning method is found in *Brahma Sootraas*.

Whereas, in this particular context, Sureswaraachaaryaa, without resorting to the reasoning method, negates the *saamkhyaa* philosophy, based on *sruthi pramaanam*; because, fortunately, the *saamkhyaa* philosophy is an *aasthika darsanam*; the *saamkhyaa* philosopher accepts *veda* as *pramaanam*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "the essential teaching of *veda* is not *dvaitam*; but *advaitam* alone".

In the Upanishads, we can find that there are several statements, such as

- "*neha naanaasthi kinchana*" (*Katopanishad* II.I.11) – "there is no plurality at all, in all the three periods of time",
- "*yathra vaa asya sarvam aathmaivaabooth thath kena kam jigreth, thath kena kam pasyeth*" – (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* II.iv.14) – "When to the knower of Brahman everything has become the Self, then what should one smell and through what and what should one hear and through what" (iii) "*brahmaiva idham amritham purasthaath brahma paschaath brahma dakshinaath athascha uttharena*" - (*Mundaka Upanishad* II. 12) – "All this in front is the immortal *Brahman* alone; *Brahman* alone is behind; *Brahman* alone is on the right as well as on the left" (iv) "*na bhoomirapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha*" (*Kaivalya Upanishad - manthraa* 22) – "earth and water are not there for me; fire is not there; air is not there; space is also not there". Such statements consistently refute a 'second' entity, other than *aathmaa* or *Brahman*.

According to the *Aachaaryaa* and *Advaita* philosophy, *purusha-prakruthi-viveka* alone is not enough for *mokshaa* or liberation. *Prakruthi* will have to be falsified.

As already discussed in the earlier session, the entire humanity has its agenda as 'improvement of *anaathmaad*'; all mental preoccupations, tensions, fears and worries are results of this attempt to improve *prakruthi*, the *anaathmaa*.

Vedhaanthaa points out this fact and warns that as long as one's aim and Project is 'improvement of *prakruthi* / *anaathmaad*', peace of mind can never, never be attained.

As a solution, *Vedhaanthaa* suggests a different Project: "Falsify *prakruthi*. Replace the Project of '*prakruthi* improvement' by the Project of '*prakruthi* falsification". This is the primary theme of *Vedhaanthaa*.

Ironically, without understanding this message of *Vedhaanthaa*, people want to study *Vedhaanthaa* and **use** *Vedhaantha* itself for '*prakruthi* improvement'. But, using *Vedhaanthaa* for '*anaathmaa* improvement' will never work.

Of course, **after** falsification of *anaathmaa* and **after** internalizing this falsification, a seeker can come back to *prakruthi* and choose to work for its improvement as a hobby/ a sport / *leela*. When the seeker is already 'free', since he / she has to be engaged in activities till death comes, his / her activities may be directed towards improvement of *prakruthi*, as a healthy hobby. But, 'working for *prakruthi* improvement', as an important project or *saadhanaa*, will only cause *samsaaraa* and, therefore, no seeker should have the intention / plan of improving *prakruthi* and afterwards claiming *mokshaa* . This cannot be the agenda at all.

The *saamkhya* philosopher does not understand this. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- इदं ज्ञानं - This aathma-anaathma-viveka-jnaanam / purusha-prakruthi- viveka- jnaanam
- भेद संविद् (भवति) - is only dvaitha jnaanam .

'*Samvidh*' means '*jnaanam*'/ knowledge.

The *Aachaaryaa* tells the *saamkhya* philosopher: "This *aathma-anaathma-viveka-jnaanam*, which you claim as 'liberating knowledge' can never be a 'liberating knowledge', because this *jnaanam* is also only *dvaitha jnaanam*".

Why is this *jnaanam* considered *dvaitha jnaanam*? Because of the very term *aathma-anaathma-viveka* and the very word *viveka*, both of which mean that one is talking about two things. Even this marginal *dvaitha-bhaavanaa* is enough to cause *samsaara*.

Brahadhaarnyaka Upanishad goes one step further, by averring that even *Jeeva- Isvara-dvaitha-jnaanam* is a cause for *samsaaraa*. Majority of humanity are believers and think: "God / *Isvara* is my supporter and savior; and as long as *Isvara* is there for me, I am free from fear (अवनिर्मुक्तं पयमेन्?)".

But, Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad says: "Even that (devotion) will not give you liberation". The following is the relevant statement of Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad: "Ya: anyaam devathaam upaasathe anya: asau anya: aham asmi ithi, na sa: vedha, yathaa pasu: evam sa: devaanaam" (I.iv.10) – "He, who worships another god, thinking 'He is one and I am another', does not 'know'. He is like an animal to the gods".

The *Upanishad* implies: "Even *Bhagavaan* cannot save you, as long as this attitude of *Bhagavaan–bhaktha-dvaitam* is in your mind". What a bold statement?

The *Upanishad* gives to such a person, even though a devotee, the title '*devaanaam pasu:*', literally meaning 'animal to the gods' and implying '*mahaa asadu*'.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says '*idham jnaanam bedha samvidh'* – '(even) this discriminative knowledge' (*aathma-anaathma-viveka-jnaanam*) is only *dvaita jnaanam*.

- साक्षिणिः च भेद अभावः - (Whereas Upanishads loudly proclaim that) in Saakshi, there is no duality at all (not even purusha-prakruthi-bedha: or jeeva-Isvara-bedha:|)

The manthraa elaborating Bhooma Vidhyaa (VII. 24. 1), from Chaandhoghya Upanishad "Yathra naanyath pasyathi naanyath srnothi naanyath vijaanaathi sa: bhoomaa" – "The Infinite (Brahman) is that, where one does not see anything else, hear anything else and does not understand anything else", is relevant in this context.

- एतद् - This bedha jnaana / this aathma-anaathma-viveka / this purusha-prakruthi-viveka
- अविध्यायाकार्यः - is also a product of *avidhyaa* only.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says *aathma-anaathma-viveka-jnaanam* is also a product of ignorance.

In *Ashtaavakra Githa* it is said, that, whoever claims "I am a *sanyaasi*" is also ignorant. Normally, when one claims "I am a *sanyaasi*", the person who makes the claim tends to feel satisfied with himself; and others also respect him. Whereas, *Ashtaavakra Githa* says "If you claim that you are a *sanyaasi*, that claim shows that you are ignorant".

Why does it say so? Ans: A *sanyaasi* means a 'renouncer'. When a *sanyaasi* claims "I am a renouncer; I have renounced the world", that claim shows that he recognizes, that, there is a world to renounce and that he is the renouncer. Since, thus, he talks of *bedha* - the

duality of "the 'renounced' and the 'renouncer'" - he is in *dvaitham*, which is a product of ignorance and, is, therefore, 'ignorant'.

The *Aachaaryaa* is 'relentless' about *advaitam* and, therefore, looks upon *aathma-anaathma-viveka* also as a product of ignorance. In this situation, *mahaavaakyam* only should come for rescue and negate *aatha-anaathma-viveka-jnaanam* also. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- वचः - Mahaa vaakyam
- त्याजयेत् - makes/ helps/persuades the student negate *aathma-anaathma* duality,
- ज्ञात्मना - by teaching the knowledge of *advaita aathmaa*.

The term 'aathma-anaathma duality' is supplied; and, 'jnaathmana' means 'advaita aathma bodhanena'.

By teaching the *advaita aathmaa*, the *Upanishad* makes the student negate even the *aathma-anaathmaa* division. The advanced seeker should never talk about even that division.

In this context, the warning of *Dayananda Swamiji* is very relevant. He says "when we practice the meditation of *Nirvaana Shadkam*, we should be very, very careful. We say '*mano buddhi ahamkaara chitthaani naaham na cha srothra jihve chidhaananda roopa: sivo ham*'. When we practice this meditation we may conclude, that, there is a vast world which is different from me and I am the *chaitanyam* different from the world . Therefore, in this meditation also there is a big problem. We will think 'I am the Consciousness , different from Matter', resulting again in duality. Therefore, this meditation should be followed by another meditation. Whatever we have negated, we should bring back again and we should say 'I alone am appearing as whatever I have negated'. First, you say 'I am different from *aakaasaa* or *vaayu* etc'; later, you should say 'I only am in the form of *aakaasaa, vaayu* etc'. 'Withdrawal' ('I am different from everything') is the initial stage; 'expansion' ('I am everything') is the final stage. This *Sarvaathma bhaavaa* is very important. Otherwise the seeker will have an idea of 'isolation', which may result in a desire to withdraw from the world".

But, 'sitting in a cave, withdrawing from the world' is not *Vedhaanthaa*. On the other hand, the seeker has to 'expand', to claim (as in the *Thaitheeya Upanishad*): "*aham vrukshasya rerivaa (Seekshaavalli – manthraa 10); aham annam; aham annaadha:; aham slokkrith (Bhriguavalli – manthraa 10)*" – " I am the sustainer of the tree of the universe; I am the food; I am the food-eater; I am the combiner".

Mokshaa is **not** 'escaping the world'; **not** 'running away from the world, never to come back again'. Such ideas of 'escaping' should be dropped. There is neither 'going' nor 'coming'. "'I alone am appearing as *aathmaa*; 'I alone am appearing as *anaathmaa* also" should become the conviction of the seeker. This '*advaita siddhi*' is the aim of *Vedhaanthaa*.

The Aacharya declares (in this verse 6): "Vacha: chaithanya aathma bodhanena dvaitam thyaajayeth" – "The mahaavaakyam makes you 'negate' dvaitam, by teaching the knowledge of chaithanya aathmaa."

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 7:

जात्मना त्याजयेद्वचः इत्युपश्रुत्याह कश्चित् । मिथ्याज्ञान व्यतिरेकेणात्मानवबोधस्याभावात्किं वाक्येन निवर्त्यते । अज्ञानं हि नाम ज्ञानाभावः । तस्य चावस्तुस्वाभाव्यात्कृतः संसारकारणत्वं न ह्यसत्तः सज्जन्मेष्यते" कुतस्तु खलु सोम्येवं स्यात् "इति" कथमसत्तः सज्जायेत "इति श्रुतेरिति । अत्रोच्यते ।

Hearing that it is set aside by focusing on Self as the nature of consciousness, someone objects as follows: As there is no ignorance of Self other than false knowledge, what is it that is set aside by the Vedhaanthic proposition? By ignorance is meant the absence of knowledge. Since it is nothing positive, how can it be the cause of transmigratory existence? Surely nothing positive can originate from non-existence. Sruthi asks, "How can this be? How can Being take birth in Non-being?" (Chandoghya Upanishad VI. ii. 2). The reply is this:

In the previous portion, Sureswaraacharya differentiated the *ajnaanam* that is defined by *saamkhyaa* and the *ajnaanam* as defined by *Vedhaanthaa*; i.e. the 'subject matter' is *ajnaanam*. 'What is the *ajnaanam*?' is the subject matter.

On this subject matter, as was discussed, the *Saamkhyaa* philosophy and *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* have got totally different concepts.

Saamkyaa concept of *ajnaanam* is nothing but 'false identification with body', with the *saamkhyaa* philosopher otherwise calls *mithyaa jnaanam* ('*jnaanam*' meaning 'identification' and '*mithyaa*' meaning 'false'); which means, that, in the mind of the individual, there is a thought "I am the body".

To consolidate, according to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher: "'I', the *aathmaa* is already there, which is *sathyam*. *Anaathmaa* is also already there, which *anaathmaa* is also *sathyam*. *Purushaa* is *sathya*: | *Prakruthi* is also *sathyam*. As for 'ignorance', in the mind of the 'ignorant' individual, there is a wrong thought 'I am the body'. That wrong / false thought, *mithyaa jnaanam* **alone** is called *ajnaanam* or ignorance. There is no other ignorance."

Thus, according to the saamkhyaa philosopher, ignorance becomes 'a thought in the mind'. What type of thought? Ans: An erroneous / fallacious thought.

'Mithyaa jnaanam eva ajnaanam', according to saamkhyaa.

Whereas, what is *ajnaanam* according to *Advaitam*? Ans: The *Advaita Vedhaanthin* says '*ajnaanam*' is '*moolaa avidhyaa*', which is different from *aathmaa*; which is different from *prakruthi*, the *anaathmaa* also; which is different from the mind also; which is different from the above wrong thought (viz., 'I am the body') also. Even that wrong thought is **not** *Vedhaanthin's ajnaanam*. According to him, this wrong thought 'I am the body' is called *adhyaasa*: /

The wrong thought "I am the body" is *ajnaanam* according to the *saamkhyaa* philosopher. And, according to *Advaita Vedhaantha*, this wrong thought "I am the body" is *adhyaasa*: /

Vedhaanthic ajnaanam is different from even that wrong thought – the *mithyaa jnaanam*. Then what is it? Ans: *Moolaa avidhyaa aaha ithi*.

Moolaa vidhyaa is different from *aathmaa* / different from *anaathmaa* / different from mind / from the *mithyaa jnaanam* i.e., the fallacious thought 'I am the body'.

Then what **is** *moolaa avidhyaa*? The *Advaita Vedhaanthin* says that the *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause of all these – the mind, the body, the world and also the false thought.

Moolaavidhyaa ajnaanam is different from mind, body, world and false thoughts and is the cause / the material cause / the *upaadhaana kaaranam* of all these – the mind, false thought, the world etc. (Of course, it is not the 'cause' of *aathmaa*).

(There is a lot of repetition in the above portion, in order to stress / drive home the subject.)

Now, the *poorva pakshi* says "I am not able to accept an ignorance other than the 'false knowledge'. Let me explain. If, ignorance, which you call *moolaavidhyaa*, is something other than 'false knowledge', what can it be?"

The *poorva pakshi* proceeds: "Other than 'false knowledge', ignorance can be defined only as 'absence of knowledge'. If there is an ignorance, other than 'false knowledge', it can be only 'absence of knowledge'. For instance, in the conventional example of *rajju-sarpam*, if 'rope-snake' is 'false knowledge' and if there is an ignorance other than the 'rope snake',

what will be the nature of that ignorance? It should only be 'absence of rope-knowledge'. 'Absence of rope knowledge' can alone be called ignorance"

The *poorva pakshin's* next step is: "If ignorance is 'absence of knowledge', it has to be a negative entity only. It cannot be a positive entity; it cannot be a substance. 'Absence of knowledge' cannot be a substance. It has to be a negative *abhaava padhaartham* only / a non-existent entity only. Just as darkness is 'absence of light', an *abhaava padhaarthaa*, ignorance must be 'absence of knowledge' and therefore, an *abhaava padhaarthaa*".

Then, his *next* step is "If your (the *Advaita Vedhaanthin's*) 'ignorance', *moolaavidhyaa*, is 'absence of knowledge' and therefore, *abhaava padhaarthaa*, that *abhaava padhaarthaa* cannot be a cause for anything. The *abhaava padhaarthaa* cannot be the cause of anything, because, '*abhaavaath na bhaavothpatthi*.' (is an accepted maxim). Therefore, you cannot claim that, your *moolaavidhyaa*, other than 'false knowledge', is the cause of duality."

124. Chapter III, Verses 7 (03-01-2009)

In this portion Sureswaraachaaryaa is discussing a highly technical aspect of *Vedhaanthaa*. The topic is very rarely discussed, in *Vedhaanthic* texts. And, even when discussed, the discussions on the topic are found to be very brief. But, the *Aachaaryaa* chooses to discuss the topic elaborately.

The current question is asked by a *poorva pakshin*, based on the *saamkhyaa poorva pakshaa*, given in the previous portion. In the previous portion, the *Aachaaryaa* said "*athraapi chodhayanthi saamkhyaa:*", thus specifying the *poorvapakshin* as a *saamkhyaa* philosopher. But, in the current portion, the word *saamkhyaa* is not there; the *Aachaaryaa* only says "*kaschith aah*". '*Kaschith*' implies a general '*poorva pakshin*'; it is not specified as a question from the *saamkhyaa* philosopher, though an extension of the earlier discussion. '*Kaschith*' may be taken as an '*ekades*', which means one general *poorva pakshin*.

What is the topic discussed here? The topic can be understood with the popular example of the 'rope and snake'. As is well known, *Vedhaanthaa* does talk about the erroneous perception / projection of a 'snake' upon a 'rope'. It says that this error takes place because of 'rope ignorance', consequent on a rope lying in a place where there is no bright light, but, only partial light and partial darkness. Because of the *mandha anthakaaram*, while the viewer knows that there is something lying in the semi-darkness, he does not know what exactly it is. This is called 'rope ignorance'; and, because of this 'rope ignorance', the rope is mistaken for a snake by the viewer. In *Vedhaanthic* parlance, the 'rope-ignorance' is called *ajnaanam* and the erroneous / mistaken / wrong perception of snake is called *adhyaasa:*.| Another word for *adhyaasa:* is *mithyaa jnaanam*.

Thus, in the context of rope-snake, the student has to remember two concepts – one is '*ajnaanam*' and another is '*adhyaasa:*' or '*mithyaa jnaanam*' - 'ignorance' and 'error' respectively. *Vedhaanthaa* further says that *ajnaanam* is *kaaranam* and *mithyaa jnaanam* is *kaaryam*. Because of *ajnaanam* alone *adhyaasaa* has taken place. Obviously, therefore, *Adhyaasaa* or *mithyaa jnaanam* is *kaaryam* and *ajnaanam* is *kaaranam*.

Now, our further analysis is "What is the status of the *mithyaa jnaanam*? What is the status of the *ajnaanam*?".

What do we mean by the term 'status'? It can be understood by re-phrasing our above questions.

The first question will be rephrased as "Does *mithyaa jnaanam* come under *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam* or *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshana-anirvachaneeya-roopam*?" In other words, "Does it come under 'existent' category or 'non-existent' category or the mysterious category of 'unreality' or *anirvachaneeyam*?"

Sometimes *Vedhaantha* uses another language to ask the same question: '*sathroopam vaa asathroopam vaa sathasath roopam vad*? In this portion, Surewaraachaarya is using the words '*bhaava* , *abhaava* and *bhaava abhaava vilakshana*'. Both terminologies convey the same meaning.

What is the final conclusion of *Vedhaantha* on this? *Vedhaantha* says '*mithyaa jnaanam*' is '*bhaava abhaava vilakshana anirvachaneeya roopam*', i.e., '*Mithyaa jnaanam*' or '*adhyaasa*.' ('erroneous perception') will not come either under *bhaavam* or under *abhaavam*; but is '*bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*' or '*anirvachaneeyam*'.

Thus does Viveka Choodaamani (verse 109) talk about Maayaa: "Sannaapyasanaapyubhayaathmikaa no bhinnaapyabhinaapyubhayaathmikoo no saangaapyasangaahyubhayaathmikaa no mahaadhbhuthaa anirvachaneeya roopaa" (verse 109) - "(Maaya) is neither existent nor non-existent, nor both; neither same nor different nor both; neither made up of parts nor whole nor both. Most wonderful it is and beyond description in words".

Mithyaa jnaanam is bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam. And, this mithya jnaanam is a product, a kaaryam. What is the kaaranam of the mithya jnaanam? As pointed out earlier, Ajnaanam is the kaaranam.

The, the second question is "What is the status of the *kaarana ajnanam*?" i.e. "Is it *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam* or *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*?" *Advaitha* answers : "*Ajnaanam* is also exactly like *mithyaa jnaanam*. Just as *mithyaa jnaanam* is *anirvachaneeyam*, the *kaarana roopa ajnanam* also comes under *anirvachaneeya* status. In other words, it does not come under *bhaava roopam* (existent or present); it does not come under *abhaava roopam* (non-existent or absent) ; but, it comes under *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshana-roopam* ; it is different from 'existent' category and different from 'non-existent' category".

Thus, both mithya jnanam (kaaryam) and ajnaanam (kaaranam) are bhaava-abhaava-vilakshana-roopam.

This '*bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*' or '*anirvachaneeyam*' is also sometimes termed in *Advaitham*, as '*yath-kinchith-bhaava-roopam*', which also only means: "It is neither *bhaavam*

nor *abhaavam* but *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*". Thus, there are three terms, which are synonymous:

- (1) '*Bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*,
- (2) '*anirvachaneeyam*, and
- (3) '*yath- kinchith –bhaava-roopam*'.

To re-cap: Mithya jnaanam is also yathkinchith-bhaava-roopam; ajnaanam is also yathkinchith-bhaava-roopam. This is the siddhaanthaa / the final conclusion, of the Advaitin.

Sureswaraachaarya is extending these discussions to *moolaa vidhyaa* also. What was discussed so far, was "'rope-ignorance', as the cause of the 'erroneous perception of snake' ". Now, Sureswaraachaarya extends the same logic to "'self-ignorance', as the cause of the 'erroneous perception of the entire creation' ".

He says: The very prapancha dharsanam is mithyaa jnaanam; and the kaaranam for **this** mithyaa jnaanam is aathma ajnaanam.

This aathma ajnaanam is called moolaa avidhyaa. Anaathma / prapancha dharsanam is called mithyaa jnaanam.

Similar to the 'rope-snake' example, where 'rope-ignorance' is *kaaranam* and 'erroneous perception of snake' is *kaaryam*, in the context of '*prapancha dharsanam*' and '*aathma ajnaanam*', *prapancha / anaathma dharsanam* is product and *aathma ajnaanam* or *moolaa avidhyaa* is *kaaranam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that this prapancha dharsana mithyaa jnaanam comes under bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam or anirvachaneeyam or yath-kinchith bhaava-roopam and moolaa avidhyaa also comes under bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam or anirvachaneeyam or yath-kinchith-bhaava roopam. This is the Advaita Parama siddhaanthaa.

All these preliminary discussions are only part of the preparation for later discussions. The *poorva pakshaa* is yet to be stated. The object / attempt of these preliminary discussions, is to settle *Vedhaantha Siddhaanthaa* very clearly, before going into *poorva pakshaa* , in order to avoid any possible confusions.

To re-state the Vedhaantha Siddhaanthaa: Aathma avidhyaa is moolaa avidhyaa which is kinchith bhaava roopam. Prapancha dharsanam is mithyaa jnaanam which is also kinchith bhava roopam.

There is another important point to be noted. What is that? The *mithyaa jnaanam* which is *prapancha darsanam*, which is a product of *ajnaanam* and different from *ajnaanam*, is sometimes figuratively called *ajnaanam*, in *Vedhaanthic* discussions. Really speaking, it (*adhyaasa: / mithyaa jnaanam / prapancha dharsanam*) is not *ajnaanam*; it is only a product of *ajnaanam*; but, is, at times, 'figuratively' called *ajnaanam* in *Vedhaantha*, similar to a son being known, at times, by the name of his father.

In fact, in *Adhyaasa Bhashyam* (of *Brahma Soothraas*), *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* has himself done it. And, in *Katopanishad*, even *karma* itself, which is a product of ignorance, is called *ajnaanam*.

What is to be noted is, that, *mithyaa jnaanam* is **sometimes** called *ajnaanam*. *Mithyaa jnaanam* is 'figurative' *ajnaanam*; *moolaa avidhya* is 'real' *ajnaanam*; but, both are *bhaava-abhaava- vilakshanam*. This is the *Advaitha parama siddhantha*.

Now, what does the *poorva pakshin* say? He says: "Other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, there is no other *ajnaanam*, as the cause for *mithyaa jnaanam*". The first point of the *poorva pakshin*, is, thus, "***mithyaa jnaanam alone is ajnaanam***".

Then, as the second point, he states: "Since *Mithyaa jnaanam* (the erroneous perception of *aathmaa* as *anaathmaa*) alone is *ajnaanam*, which is the cause of *samsaaraa*, *mokshaa* requires only the removal of *mithyaa jnaanam*. Removal of *mithyaa jnaanam* is achieved by sorting out *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. This 'sorting out' is called *aathma-anaathma-viveka*; and, this '***aathma-anaathma-viveka*** is more than enough for liberation".

Proceeding further, the third point in the *poorva pakshin's* argument is based on an '*abhupethyam*' (a temporary acceptance of the opponent's / *Vedhaanthin's* view, only for the sake of argument / discussions). He says: "**Suppose** there is an *ajnaanam* other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, that *ajnaanam*, which is other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, has to be *abhaava roopam* only". (Whereas, *Vedhaantha* says *ajnaanam* is also *bhaava-abhaava- vilakshana – anirvachananeeyam*).

'*Abhaava roopam*' means 'non-existent' or 'absent'.

The fourth point of the *poorva pakshin* is: "If there is such an *abhaava-roopa-ajnaanam*, which you (the *Vedhaanthin*) claim as the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam*, that *abhaava-roopa-ajnaanam* cannot be the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam*."

These are all '*abhupethya*' (suppositional) arguments of the *poorva pakshin*, who insists "**If** there is an *ajnaanam*, that *ajnaanam* is *abhaava roopam*" and says "therefore, that *abhaava*

roopa ajnaanam cannot be the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam*". What is his logic for this statement? His logic is "abhaavam means non-existence; how can a non-existent thing enjoy the status of the 'cause' of something / the 'producer' of something? *Abhaavaath na kasyachana uthpatthi: |*"

The *poorva pakshin*, based on this logic, argues: " 'Abhaavaath' nothing can be produced. If at all *abhaavaa* can produce something (again *abhupedhyam*) *abhaavaa* can produce *abhaavaa* only. From 'nothing', only 'nothing' can / will come. Therefore, *abhaava roopa ajnaanathaa, mithyaa jnaanasya uthpatthi: na bhavathi*. Therefore, I cannot accept your *ajnaana / moolaa avidhyaa* as the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam*. Since, thus, *moolaa avidhyaa ajnaanam* is not possible, you have to accept **my** concept of *ajnaanam* alone – which '*ajnaanam*' is *mithyaa jnaanam* alone."

Expressed in Sanskrit, the *poorva pakshin's* objection / argument is: "Mithyaa jnaana vyathiriktha ajnaanam naasthi | Asthi cheth, thath abhaava roopameva syaath| Thadh abhaavarooopa ajnaanam mithyaa jnaanasya kaaranam bavithum naiva arhathi |".

And, in support of his argument, the *poorva pakshin* quotes the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad Vaakyam* (VI. ii. 2): "*katham asatha: sath jayetha*"- "How can Being take birth in Non-being?". Based on the strength of this *Upanishad Vaakyam*, the *poorva pakshin* asks: "How can anything be born, from a **non-existent** *ajnaanam*, including *mithyaa jnaana roopa prapancha dharsanam*?" This is the *poorva pakshaa*.

Reverting to the text:

- कश्चित् - A *poorva pakshin* (not necessarily a *saamkhyaa* philosopher, but, belonging to a similar group)
- 'जात्मना त्याजयेत् वचः' इति उपश्रुत्य - having heard our argument viz., '*mahaavaakyam*, by its teaching of *advaita aathmaa*, helps the seeker negate *aathma-anaathma* duality',
- आह - declares:
- आत्म अनवबोधस्य अभावात् - Since there is no such thing called 'self-ignorance', '*Anavabodha:*' means '*ajnaanam*'; '*abhaavaath*' means 'since not there'.
- मिथ्याज्ञानव्यतिरेकेण - other than *mithyaa jnaanam*,

What is the definition of *mithyaa jnaanam*? Ans: '*anaathmani aathma dharsanam / sareerey aham buddhi: / manasi aham buddhi:*' | That *anaathma abhimaana* misconception is *mithyaa jnaanam*. '*Vyathirekena*' means 'other than / apart from'.

- किं वाक्येन निवर्त्यते - which ignorance is to be eliminated through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*?

Vaakyena – mahaa vakkyena. Kim nivarthyathe – What are you going to eliminate?

The *poorva pakshin's* question to the *Advaithin* is: "Since, there is no other *ajnaanam* apart from *mithyaa jnaanam*, i.e., since 'your' *ajnaanam* / *moolaa avidhyaa* itself is not there, what ignorance are you going to eliminate through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*?"

The *poorva pakshin's* implication: "If you (the *Advaithin*) reply '*mahaa vaakya vichaara* eliminates *mithyaa jnaanam*', I will accept it. But, if you say '*maaha vaakya vichaara* eliminates an ignorance other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, I do not agree, since such an ignorance is not there at all".

- अज्ञानं हि नाम - *Suppose* there is an 'ignorance' other than erroneous perception,

The term 'other than erroneous perception' has to be supplied; i.e., '*ajnaanam naama*' should be understood as '*mithyaa jnaana vythiriktha ajnaanam naama*'.

This is an *abhyupethya vaadham*, as already indicated.

- ज्ञान अभावः - that 'ignorance' has to be 'absence of knowledge' alone.

'*Ajnaanam hi naama jnaana abhaava:*' may be treated as a separate and complete sentence. The essence of this statement / sentence: "If there is an ignorance, other than 'error', that ignorance has to be 'lack of knowledge' or 'absence of knowledge'."

Proceeding further, the *poorva pakshin* says:

- तस्य च अवस्तु स्वाभाव्यात् - Since that ignorance is of the nature of non-existence,

'*Thasya*' refers to 'ignorance'; according to the *poorva pakshin*, that 'ignorance', which is 'absence of knowledge' cannot be said to be an entity, because, 'absence of knowledge' means it is a form of non-existence and therefore, it cannot be a tangible, substantial entity.

- कुतः संसारकारणत्वं? - how can that ignorance be the cause of *samsaaraa*?

To consolidate the *poorva pakshin's* objection: " 'Ignorance', if not considered as an 'erroneous perception', can only be 'absence of knowledge'; 'absence of knowledge' is a 'form of non-existence'; how can that non-existence be the cause of *samsaaraa* or for that matter, cause of anything?"

The word '*kutha:*' is not a question, looking for an answer. It is '*aakshepaarthe kim*' – expressing objection, meaning "It cannot be the cause".

In the view of the *poorva pakshin*: "Ignorance is not the cause of any problem; error alone is the cause of every problem. There is no 'ignorance' other than 'error'".

The *poorva pakshin* justifies his question "*kutha: samsaara karanathvam?*" by the following logic:

- हि - Because,
- सज्जन्मा - origination (of anything – mithyaa jnaanam / prapanchaa / samsaaraa)
- असत्: - out of a non-existent entity ,
- न इष्यते - is not accepted by anybody / any philosopher.

It is only the *soonya vaadhi* philosopher, who says that everything comes from *soonyam*.

Generally, the *Advaita Vedhaantha* philosophers do not even talk about the *soonya vaadhi* philosopher, since, because the *soonya vaadhi* says everything is *soonyam*, the *Advaita Vedhaantha* philosophers consider the *soonya vaadhaa* philosophy itself, as '*soonyam*'. In the entire *Brahmasoothras*, there is no discussion by Vyaasaachaarya on *soonya vaadhaa*. In contrast, Vyaasaachaarya discusses philosophies such as *southraanthikaa*, *vaibhaashikaa* and *kshanika vijnaana vaadhaa* and negates them; presumably, he does not consider *soonya vaadhaa* even worth discussing. And, in *Panchadasi*, Swami Vidhyaranyaa is even more outright about the *soonya vaadhi*. He says "When *poorva pakshi* is *soonyam*, why should I answer him?"

Except the *soonya vaadhi*, no other philosopher suggests or accepts, that, origination is possible from *soonyam* – a non-existent entity. The *poorva pakshin* is referring to this fact, by the term – '*na ishyathe*'.

In support of his argument that 'only nothing can come from nothing', the *poorva pakshin* gives two *sruthi vaakyams*, from *Chaandhoghya Upanishad*. Both *sruthi vaakyams* are taken from the same *manthraa* (C.U. VI. ii. 2) only.

- "कुतस्तु खलु सोम्य एवं स्यात्" - Good looking one ! but, how is 'this' possible?

It is Udhhaalaka addressing his son and disciple, Svethakethu, as 'Soumya', in *Chaandhogya Upanishad*, asking "kutha: evam syaath?" – "how is this possible?"

To understand the import of this question/ sentence, the meaning of the pronoun 'this', in this *vaakyam*, should be known. And, from the context of the question / from the earlier *manthraa* , the student can understand that, the pronoun 'this' stands for 'origination of the world from non-existence'.

The other quotation is:

- "कथं असत् :सज्जायेत" - How can something be born out of nothing ?
- इति श्रुतेः - These are sruthi vaakyaani.
- इति - Up to this is the *poorva pakshin's* argument.

To sum up, the *poorva pakshin*, addressing the *Vedhaanthin*, says: "'Avidhya' means 'absence of knowledge', similar to 'darkness', which is 'absence of light'. 'Absence of knowledge' and 'absence of light' are forms of 'non-existence'. Therefore, 'moolaa avidhya' is a non-existent entity and therefore, cannot be the cause of Creation; and, therefore, it does not also require negation through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. In fact, why you are you discussing *moolaa vidhya*, a non-existent entity / something, which is not there at all, so elaborately?"

This gives raise to another interesting discussion, though not related to the current topic. Is darkness an existent entity or a non-existent entity? According to the view of the *poorva pakshin*, "'darkness' means 'absence of light' and 'absence' has to be a non-existent entity only". Whereas, Vedhaantha says: "'Darkness' is a positive substance; it is **not** absence of light; it is **not** *prakaasa abhaavam*; it is *prakaasa virodhi*".

For the *poorva pakshin*, darkness is *prakaasa abhaavaa*; for *Vedhaantha* , darkness is not *prakaasa abhaava* but *prakaasa virodhi*.

To revert to the main topic, *poorva pakshin*, thus, asks "where is *moolaa avidhya* problem at all?"

The *Aaachaaryaa* responds:

- अत्र उच्यते - When the *poorva pakshin* raises this question, I will answer here.

The answer is in the verse that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 7 –

अजात : एव सर्वोऽथ : प्राग्यतो बुद्धिजन्मन : ।

एकेनैव सता संश्रु सन्नजातो भवेत्तत : ॥ ७ ॥

All these things are unknown, before the coming into being of knowledge. They are, in that state, one with the pure secondless Being. It is Being that is unknown.

The gist of this *sloka* is given, before study of the meaning of the text is taken up:

Sureswaraacharya says : "*mithyaa jnaanam* is only figuratively called *ajnaanam*; and this *ajnaanam*, in the form of *mithyaa jnaanam*, is possible only where there is *thriputi* or duality. The *ajnaanam* that the *poorvapakshin* talks of, which is called *mithyaa jnaanam* or erroneous perception, i.e., the *mithyaa jnaana roopa ajnaanam* exists only during the presence of *srusht*, during *savikalpa avasthaa*, where the *aathmaa-anaathmaa* duality is present. But, imagine a state, where everything is resolved / any *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*. (*Nirvikalpaka avasthaa* means a state where there is no division at all – either *aathma-anaathma* division or *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi* division). At micro level, we experience such a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, when all divisions are absent, during *sushupthi* and at macro level, such a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* is called *pralayam*."

Sureswaraacharya is turning our attention to *sushupthi* and *pralayam*, which are *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*. And, in the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, one cannot talk about *mithyaa jnaanam* / erroneous perception, since there is no '**perception**' at all in the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*. Then, where is the question of '**erroneous perception**', at that time?

Similarly, in the *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*, one cannot talk about this '**deha aathma bhaava**' or '**identification with the body**', which is called *mithyaa jnaanam*, since, when the body itself is resolved during *sushupthi* and *pralayam*, where is the question of '**identification** with the **body**' or '*mithyaa jnaanam*'?

Thus, the first point that Sureswaraacharya wants to make, is: "At the time of *sushupthi* and *pralaya* – during *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*, *mithyaa jnaanam* cannot be talked about".

Then, the second point that the *Aachaaryaa* wants to make, is: "But, at the time of *sushupthi* and *pralaya* we do have ignorance ; total ignorance is there, during the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*. That's why, after *sushupthi*, we say '*sukam aham asvaapsam na kinchith avedhisham*' - 'I slept well; I did not know anything'. During the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* – whether it is micro or macro – there **is** *ajnaanam*. And, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* there is **no** *mithyaa jnaanam*. In other words, the *ajnaanam* obtaining in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* – *sushupthi* or *pralayaa* – has to be some *ajnaanam* **other than** *mithyaa jnaanam*."

To recap:

- (1) During the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, *mithyaa jnaanam* is not possible.
- (2) But, during *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, we do experience *ajnaanam*.
- (3) Therefore, this *ajnaanam* experienced in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* should be some *ajnaanam* **other than** *mithyaa jnaanam*.
- (4) Therefore, *mithyaa-jnaana-vyathiriktha-ajnaanam*, *nirvikalpaka avasthaayaam asthi*.

What is the definition of *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*? '*Thriputi-rahitha*' or '*dvaitha rahitha*' *avasthaa* is '*nirvikalpaka avasthaa*.'

'*Thathra mithyaa jnaana vyathiriktha ajnaanam asthi*' – 'In that *avasthaa*, there is an ignorance **other than** *mithyaa jnaanam*'.

Then the next question is: "That 'ignorance' is of what?" Granting that there is 'ignorance' i.e., granting '*ajnaanam asthi*', 'Ignorance of what?' is the question.

The answer: "The *ajnaanam* during *nirvikalpaka avastha* is '*sarva padhaartha ajnaanam*' or '*samastha prapancha ajnaanam*'. It is not the ignorance of a particular object or topic – say, physics or chemistry – but, it is the ignorance of the total creation".

Then the next point: In *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, the entire Creation is not in the 'Creation' form. It has been resolved; all the *naamaas* and *roopaas* have been resolved, because, when *thriputi* itself is not there, where is the question of *sabda jnaanam*, *sparsa jnaanam*, *roopa jnaanam*, *gandha jnaanam* etc.?. *thriputi* is resolved and therefore, all the *naama roopaas* are also resolved.

Therefore, it has to be said, that, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, the *prapanchaa* is existing in the form of *kaaranam Brahman* ; it is *kaarana avasthaa*, which is called *Sadh Brahman*. This is what Sage Uddhaalakaa is referring to, when he says, in the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* "*sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" (C.U. VI.2.1) – "Oh! Good

looking one ! In the beginning, this was Existence alone, One only, without a second". Before the *kaarya prapanchaa* came, the *kaaranam* was in the form of *Sadh Brahman*.

In *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, the '*ajnaanam*' **is** ignorance of total universe.

In the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* of *pralayam*, the Universe is not in 'Universe' form, but, is in the form of the *kaarana avasthaa* / *Sadh Brahman*.

At the micro level also, *Sadh aathmaa* alone exists during the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* of *sushupthi*, as is eloquently brought out by Sankara Bhagavadh Padhaa in his *Sri Dakshinaamoorthy Sthothram* (verse 6) – "*raahu-grastha divaakarendu sadruso mayaa samaachaadhanaath **sanmaathra**: kaaranopasamharanatho yo bhooth sushuptha: pumaan praagasvaapsamithi prabodha samaye ya: prathyabhijnyaayatthe.....*" - "On folding up all the functions of the senses, He who enters into a state of deep sleep and there becomes **Existence alone** veiled in *maayaa*, like the sun or moon during eclipse, and who, on waking remembers to have slept.....".

Because of the above facts, we can say, that, the *ajnaanam* in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* is '*Sadh Brahma ajnaanam*' or '*sadh aathma ajnaanam*'. It is not '*kaarya prapancha ajnaanam*' but '*kaarana Sadh Brahma / sadh aathma ajnaanam*'. And, in *Vedhaanthaa*, that *ajnaanam* is called *moolaa avidhyaa*.

To recap the above discussions:

- Step (1): Watch *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*.
- Step (2): *nirvikalpaka avasthaayaam mithyaa jnaanam naasthi* |
- Step (3): *nirvikalpaka avasthaayaam ajnaanam asthi* |
- Step (4): That *ajnaanam* in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, should be something other than *mithyaa jnaanam*.
- Step (5): That *ajnaanam* other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, which obtains in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* is the ignorance of *Sadh Brahman* or *sadh aathmaa*, which is the resolution of the whole universe.
- Step (6): This *ajnaanam* of *Sadh Brahman/ aathmaa*, which is different from *mithyaa jnaanam*, obtaining in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* is called *moolaa avidhyaa*.

In fact, this *moolaa avidhyaa* description has been given even in *Thathva Bodha*, while defining *kaarana sareeram*, as "*anirvaachya anaadhi avidhyaa roopam sareeradhvyasya kaaraana maathram sathsvaroopa ajnaanam nirvikalpakaroopam yadhasthi thath kaarana sareeram*". This *sathsvaroopa ajnaanam* alone is called *moolaa avidhyaa*, *kaarana sareeram* etc.

The next question: "What is the nature of this '*sathsvaroopam ajnaanam*', which is other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, obtaining in *sushupthi* and *pralaya*? Is it (i) *bhaava roopam* or (ii) *abhaava roopam* or (iii) *yathkinchith bhaava roopam*?"

For argument's sake (i.e., as an *abhyupethya vaadhaa*), let it be assumed that this *ajnaanam* obtaining in *sushupthi* and *pralaya* is *abhaava roopam*. What will be the consequence?

It will mean that during *sushupthi*, there is *Brahman* (*kaarana avasthaa* of the entire universe) and there is the ***abhaava roopa ajnaanam***. During *pralayam* also, there is *Brahman* and there is the ***abhaava roopa ajnaanam***.

This, in turn, will give rise to another question: "Since in *sushupthi* and *pralayam*, *Brahman* and *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* are both there, which one of these two is responsible for the creation of duality and *thriputi*?"

In other words, "Which one generates the *savikalpaka avasthaa*/ this entire creation / the *mithyaa jnaanam* / the *thriputi*? Does *Brahman* generate *savikalpaka avasthaa* or does *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* generate *savikalpaka avasthaa*?"

Brahman **cannot** generate *savikalpaka avasthaa*, because, by definition, *Brahman* is *kaarya kaarana vilakshanam* |

The *Brahadhaaranuaka Upanishad* declares (Madhu Kaandam – II.v.19): "Thadedath Brahma apoorvam anaparam anantharam abhaahyam ayam aathmaa brahma sarvaanubhoo:" – "That *Brahman* is without prior or posterior, without interior or exterior"; and *Katopanishad* (I.2.18) declares "Na jayathe mriyathe vaa vipa:schith naayam kutha:schith na bhaaboova kaschith" - "This omniscient one does not originate or die; it did not originate from anything; it did not become anything".

The *Brahman* obtaining in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* cannot produce anything.

Then, can it be said that the *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* produces *savikalpaka avasthaa*? The *Chaandoghya Upanishad* question "*Katham asatha: sajjayetha*?" will answer this. How can ***abhaava roopa ajnaanam*** produce anything? It also cannot.

But, *savikalpaka avasthaa* **is** produced out of *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*; *jaagarath avasthaa* comes after *sushupthi*, and the Universe comes after *pralayam*. Since, thus

-
- (i) the '*Brahman-ajnaanam*' mixture produces a Creation and
(ii) if *ajnaanam* is *abhaava roopam* Creation cannot be produced, the conclusion has to be, that, 'the *ajnaanam* obtaining in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* cannot be *abhaava roopam*'.

To repeat: If *ajnaanam* is *abhaava roopam*, it cannot produce the *savikalpaka*; and, it was seen, that, *Brahman* also cannot produce. In that case, Creation itself would not have come. Therefore, it has to be concluded that *ajnaanam* is *bhaava-abhaava-roopa-vilakshana-roopam* or *yathkinchith bhaava roopam*.

This is the essence of this *sloka*.

And, this topic being very important, it bears any number of repetitions, as condensed below:

- (1) During *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* - whether it is *sushupthi* or *pralayam* - there is *ajnaanam* and there is *Brahman* .
- (2) This *ajnaanam* is clearly experienced by us. What is the proof? Our own statement after waking up from *sushupthi*, viz., "*sukham api asvaapsam kinchith na veshidham*" is itself proof.
- (3) This experienced *ajnaanam* is different from *mithyaa jnaanam*.
- (4) This experienced *ajnaanam* cannot be *abhaava roopam*; it has to be understood as *anirvachaneeya roopam*
- (5) This *anirvachaneeya ajnaanam* alone is called *moolaa avidhyaa*.

And, through *mahaa vaakya vichaara*, the seeker is not attacking *mithyaa jnaanam* ; the seeker's direct attack is on *moolaa avidhyaa* alone; once this *moolaa avidhyaa* is handled through *mahaa vaakya vichaara*, *mithyaa jnaanam* also will be eliminated as a natural consequence / as an added benefit.

The *poorva pakshin* wrongly assumes that *mahaa vaakya vichaara* directly attacks *mithyaa jnaanam*. But, according to the *Vedhaanthin*, *mahaa vaakya vichaara* attacks only *moolaa avidhyaa* directly and attacks *mithyaa jnaanam* only indirectly.

125. Chapter III, Verses 7 and 8 (10-01-2009)

In this important verse (verse 7 – Chapter III) Sureswaraachaaryaa is 'establishing' the (concept of) *moolaa avidhyaa*, which *moolaa avidhyaa* is different from *mithyaa jnaanam*, but which *moolaa avidhyaa* is the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam* and, through *mithyaa jnaanam*, the cause of the entire *samsaaraa* also.

And, this he is keen to 'establish', because, there are some *poorva pakshins*, who claim that, *mithyaa jnaanam* alone is *ajnaanam* and that, there is no *ajnaanam* other than *mithyaa jnaanam*.

These *poorva pakshins* further argue that "**even if** there is an *ajnaanam* or *avidhyaa* other than *mithyaa jnaanam*, it cannot be the cause of anything – either *dvaitham* or *samsaaraa*. It is because, that *ajnaanam* or *avidhyaa* should be *abhaava roopam*, since '*ajnaanam*' means '*na jnaanam*' and '*avidhyaa*' means '*na vidhyaa*', in both of which, the prefix '*na*' conveys *abhaava artham*. Therefore, *avidhyaa* and *ajnaanam* can only be *abhaava roopam*, i.e. in the form of absence. Being ***abhaava roopam***, that *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* cannot be the cause of anything – either *dvaitham* or *samsaaraa*, since *abhaavam* cannot produce anything. Not only that. There is no need also for negation of *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* by *mahaa vaakya vichaaram*, since *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* is already *abhaavam* - non-existent."

Their argument, expressed, in Sanskrit, will run as follows: "Moolaa avidhyaa nasthi | Moolaa ajnaanam naasthi | Mithyaa jnaanam eva ajnaanam | Thadeva samsaara kaaranam | Thasmaath aathma-anaathma viveka dhwaara mithyaa jnaanasya nivritthi: eva karthavya: | 'Mahaa vaakya vichaaraath mithyaa jnaana vyathirikthasya ajaanasya nivritthi: bhavathi' ithi sthaapayithum naiva sakyathe thvayaa|"

Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving the answer to this. He wants to 'establish' an *ajnaanam* other than *mithyaa jnaanam*. That *ajnaanam* is otherwise called *moolaa avidhyaa*.

In this *sloka*, he is taking an experience of *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* – either in the form of *sushupthi*, or in the form of *moorchaa* (an unconscious state), or in the form of *maranam* or in the form of *pralayam* itself. *Sushupthi* is *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* at micro level; *pralayaa* is *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* at macro level. Both are *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, 'a state, where there is no duality or division'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says : "In the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, there is an *ajnaanam*, which is different from *mithyaa jnaanam*".

Why is that *ajnaanam* different from *mithyaa jnaanam* ? The reason is explained thus: "*Mithyaa jnaanam* requires duality. The very definition of *mithyaa jnaanam* is 'wrong identification with *anaathma'*, which means *mithyaa jnaanam* requires *aathmaa-anaathmaa-dvaitam*. But, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, there is no *dvaitam* at all, though, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* there **is** *ajnaanam*. Therefore, that *ajnaanam* obtaining in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* should be different from *mithyaa jnaanam*".

This is the first point that has to be studied and understood.

Referring to the *slokaa*:

- बुद्धिजन्मनः प्राक् - Before the rise of any specific knowledge or experience (in other words, during *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*),

In this context, the word '*buddhi:*' does not mean 'intellect'; it means '*visesha jnaanam*' or '*visesha anubhavaa*'. The '*visesha jnaanam*' / '*visesha anubhavaa*' requires '*thriputi*'. Therefore, '*buddhijanma*' means 'rise of *thriputi* and rise of *visesha jnaanam*'. When do they (viz. 'rise of *thriputi* and rise of *visesha jnaanam*') happen? Ans : In *jaagrath avasthaa* or *svapna avasthaa* – otherwise, in *savikalpaka avasthaa* alone, *thriputi* and *visesha jnaanam* are there.

'*Praagyathd*' should be split as '*praak + yatha:*' / The word '*praak*' means 'before'. What is the *avasthaa*, before the rise of *thriputi* and *visesha jnaanam* ? Ans: It is *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*.

Therefore, '*buddhi janmana: praak*' means 'before the rise of *savikalpaka avasthaa*', which finally means 'during *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*' or '*nirvikalpaka avasthaayaam*'.

What is there in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*?

- सर्वोऽर्थेव :अज्ञातः - everything in the Creation / the entire dualistic Creation is enveloped in ignorance.

'*Sarva: artha:*' means 'the entire universe', which includes the physical body, the mind, the thoughts, the *chidhaabhaasa* **and** the external universe. '*ajnaatha:*' means 'unknown' or 'enveloped in ignorance'. '*Sarva artha: ajnaatha:*' means 'the entire dualistic universe is enveloped in ignorance'.

And, because the duality is resolved in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, the *avasthaa* is called *kaarana avasthaa*. That's why, it is said, that, "in *sushupthi*, we are in *kaarana sareera* (at micro level) and in *pralayaa*, we are in *kaarana prapancham* (at macro level). *Sushupthi* and *pralayam* are *kaarana / nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, when everything is enveloped in ignorance.

Why is *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* said to be 'enveloped in ignorance'? Ans: Because of two reasons.

- Logically speaking, since *visesha jnaanam*s are not there in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, it must be a state of *ajnaanam*.
- Experientially also, whenever one goes to deep sleep, one's experience is 'I do not know anything', which 'ignorance' is recollected after waking up.

Thus, because of *sruthi*, *yukthi* and *prathyakshaa*, *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* means "potential universe + enveloping ignorance".

"During *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* the entire dualistic Creation is enveloped in ignorance" is, thus, the meaning of the first half of the verse.

In the second half of the verse, Sureswaraacharya says "In *kaarana avasthaa*, the whole universe is in potential form and that is nothing but *Brahman* only". Why is the 'potential form' of the universe, called *Brahman*? Because, the *kaaranam* of the whole creation is *Brahman* only. As quoted earlier, the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* declares : "*sadheva idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" (VI.2.1) - "before creation, the whole universe was in the form of *Brahman / undivided Existence / naama roopa rahitha Existence*". Therefore, *Kaarana avasthaa = Brahma avasthaa*.

Based on this *sruthi vaakyam*, Sureswaraacharya says:

- संध - That *Brahman* (in which form, the universe was existing in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*)
- एकेन एव सता - (is) of the nature of undivided Existence.

The word '*ekend*' means 'undivided' / '*akandend*' / '*adhvitheeyend*' / '*sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-bedha-rahithend*' and is adjective to the word '*sathaad*', '*sath*' meaning 'Existence'. '*Ekena eva sathaad*' , therefore, means 'in the form of undivided Existence'.

In *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, whether *sushupthi* or *pralayam*, the whole universe was in the form of 'undivided' Existence. Whereas, in *savikalpaka avasthaa*, existence is in the form of

'divided' Existence, in the forms of man / woman / *bhoomi* / *jalam* etc. In *savikalpka avasthaa*, 'man is', 'wall is', 'woman is' and so on. The 'isness' is in 'divided' form.

Savikalpka avasthaa means 'divided Existence'. Nirvikalpka avasthaa means 'undivided Existence'. That's why, the above quoted manthraa from Chaandhoghya Upanishad 'sadheve idham agra aaseeth' describes the 'sath' as 'ekam eva advittheeyam'.

In *nirvikalapaka avasthaa*, the world was existing as *Brahman*. What else was there in *nirvikalapaka avasthaa*, in addition to *Brahman*, (which *Brahman* is 'potential world')? Ans : According to *Vedhaantha*, 'enveloping ignorance' was there, in addition to *Brahman*, in *nirvikalapaka avasthaa*

Therefore, according to *Vedhaantha*, *sushupthi* = *Brahman* + enveloping ignorance. Instead of '*Brahman*', the word '*aathmaa*' also can be used

In the language of *Maandookya Upanishad*, the 'third quarter' is '*thureeyam*' + 'enveloping ignorance'.

And, according to *Maandookya Kaarika*:

- 'Agrahanam' + 'thureeyam' = 'kaarana avasthaa'
- 'Agrahanam and anyathaa grahanam' + 'thureeyam' = 'kaariya avasthaa'.

And, therefore, what is the conclusion?

- ततः - Therefore,
- सत् अज्ञातभवेत् : - it is Brahman which is unknown.

Nirvikalpka avasthaayaam / during *sushupthi* and *pralaya* (to be supplied from the first line) there are only two things.

What are they? Ans: *Brahman* and ignorance alone were there, in *nirvikalpka avasthaa*.

How does one arrive at this conclusion from this verse? Ans: '*Sat*' means '*Brahma*' / '*thadh roopa Brahma*'. '*Ajnaatha*:' means 'unknown'. '*San ajnaatha*:' means 'unknown Existence'; 'unknown Existence' means 'unknown *Brahma*' ; 'unknown *Brahma*' means '*Brahman* enveloped in ignorance'; '*Brahman* enveloped in ignorance' means '*Brahman* + ignorance'.

But, even as one accepts all these, one may wonder as to why Sureswaraachaarya says all these things? Ans: It is to establish, that, "in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, there **is** an enveloping ignorance, which is other than *mithyaa jnaanam*" - "*Nirvikalpaka avasthaayaam mithyaa jnaana vyathiriktha ajnaanam asthi*".

And, what type of *ajnaanam*? Ans: '*Aavaranaathmakam ajnaanam* / 'enveloping' ignorance is there, in *sushupthi* and *pralayam*.

This is point no. 1, viz., "Mithyaa jnaana vyathiriktha aavaranaathmaka ajnaanam asthi". And, that *ajnaanam* is called *moolaavidhya*.

Then, the next (2nd) point / question is: "Is this '*aavaranaathmaka ajnaanam*', *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam*? i.e. is this enveloping ignorance / concealing ignorance, of the nature of 'absence' or is it a 'positive entity?' "

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not explicitly answer this question, in this *sloka*. It has been indirectly answered. The indirect answer has to be extracted by the student.

That implicit answer was given in the earlier session also and is presented again:

"This *Brahman* enveloping ignorance, available in *sushupthi* or *pralayam*, cannot be *abhaava roopam*. And, that *Ajnaanam* cannot be accepted as *bhaava roopam* also".

Why cannot it be *abhaava roopam*? Several reasons can be given.

One reason is: "Whatever does the job of concealing or covering, cannot be *abhaava roopam*."

A non-existent thing cannot envelop or cover something. Can a non-existent dress cover one's body? The 'Story of the Emperor's clothes' is only too well known. If one's body has to be covered by something, that 'cover' will have to be 'existent'. The maxim '*abhaavasya aavrana sakthi: naasthi*' or '*abhaavam aavaranaathmakam na bhavathi*' cannot be disputed or questioned. Whereas, it is said "*ajnaanena aavrutham jnaanam*" (a very important *vaakyam* in this context) and since *ajnaanam* is 'covering' something, how can it be *abhaava roopam*?

A second reason (given already in the last session): "If *Brahman* is there in *kaarana avasthaa* and *abhaava roopa ajnaanam* is there in *kaarana avasthaa*, from that pair, a Creation cannot come. '*Brahman + abhaava roopa ajnaanam*' cannot produce a Creation".

Why not? Ans: "*Brahman* cannot produce a Creation, because *Saasthraas* clearly say that *Brahman* is *kaarya-kaarana-vilakshanam*. *Kevalam Brahman* cannot be a *Kaaranam*. Then, can the 'enveloping ignorance' produce? If, as claimed by the *poorva pakshin*, 'ignorance' is '*abhaava roopam*', that '*abhaava roopa* ignorance' also cannot produce anything, because "*abhaavaath na bhaavothpatthi*:"]

Thus, *Brahman* cannot be the cause; '*Abhaava roopa* ignorance' cannot be the cause; therefore, '*Brahman* + ignorance' also cannot become the cause of the universe, **if** the ignorance is *abhaava roopam*. But, we do find that '*Brahman* + *ajnaanam*' **is** the cause of Creation, because, from *sushupthi*, *jaagrath avasthaa* evolves; and, from *pralayam*, the *prapanchaa* evolves".

Therefore, the *ajnaanam* cannot be *abhaava roopam*.

Then, can that *ajnaanam* be considered *bhaava roopam*?

The opposite of '*abhaavam*' is '*bhaavam*'. '*Bhaava roopam*' means a 'positively existing' / 'independently existing' entity.

Can one say this about *ajnaanam*? That also cannot be said.

Why not? Again, there are several reasons.

One reason is: Since *Brahman* **is** a *bhaava roopa vasthu* and if *ajnaanam* is also a *bhaava roopam vasthu*, with the presence of two *bhaava roopa vasthus*, *Brahman* and *ajnaanam*, there will be *dvaitha*. Whereas, the Upanishad very clearly says '*sadeva idham agra aaseeth **ekam eva advitheeyam***'.

A second reason: Apart from this *dvaitha* problem, there will be another serious problem also. What is that? Ans: *Brahman* is *bhaava roopam* and therefore eternal and un-negatable. If *ajnaanam* is *bhaava roopam*, *ajnaanam* also, like *Brahman*, will become eternal and un-negatable. *Ajnaanam* also will be *abhaadhyam*, "*asachchen na pratheeyetha sachchen na baadhyetha*" *ithi nyaayaath*.

The fallacy in considering *ajnaanam* to be eternal, is obvious. If *ajnaanam* is *bhaavaroopam* and un-negatable like *Brahman*, *samsaaraa* caused by *ajnaanam* also will be eternal. Study of *Vedhaanthaa* and even successful assimilation of *Vedhaanthaa* will be of no use. Removal of ignorance and the consequent *samsaaraa* will become impossible. *Saasthraas* do not accept such a situation.

Therefore, *ajnaanam* cannot be accepted as *bhaava roopam* also.

Since, thus, *ajnaanam* cannot be accepted as *bhaava roopam* and it cannot be accepted as *abhaava roopam* also, it has to be accepted as '*bhaava-abhaava- vilakshana-roopam*' , which is also called '*yath kinchith bhaava roopam*' or '*mithyaa roopam*' or '*anirvachaneeya roopam*'.

The next and 3rd important point is that, "that *moola ajnaanam* alone is handled by *Mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. To express it differently, the object of *Mahaa vaakya vichaara* is to remove that *moola ajnaanam* only".

This statement may give rise to a doubt: If *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* removes only *moola avidhyaa*, then what about *mithyaa jnaanam*? Will that *mithyaa jnaanam* not produce *samsaaraa*? If *mahaa vaakya* removes only *moola avidhyaa*, who / what will take care of *mithyaa jnaanam*?

The answer to this doubt: "Kaarana naase kaarya naasa:' ithi nyaayaath ajnaana naase mithyaa jnaana naasa: bhavathi | Mithyaa jnaana naase samsaara naasa: cha bhavathi" – "By the logic 'if the cause is destroyed, the effect also will be destroyed', once *moola avidhyaa* is eliminated, the elimination of *mithyaa jnaanam* automatically takes place; once *mithyaa jnaanam* is eliminated, *samsaaraa* is also eliminated".

This argument can be more easily understood through the popular 'rope-snake' example, in which, the moment the 'rope-ignorance' is removed by 'rope-knowledge', the 'snake-misconception' goes away automatically. One need not separately remove 'snake-misconception'. One has to attack ignorance only; error need not be separately attacked.

Therefore, "(1) *Moolaavidhyaa* is there, other than *mithyaa jnaanam*. (2) It is *yath kinchith bhaava roopam* and (3) *maaha vaakyam* removes that *Moolaavidhyaa*" is Sureswaraachaaryaa's answer to the *poorva pakshin*.

This *sloka* is important for '*moolaa avidhyaayaa: sthaapanam*' – 'establishing *moolaa avidhyaad*', which is a very, very important topic in *Advaita Vedhaantha*.

An interesting aside: One particular *Aachaarya*, who came in the *Advaitic* tradition a few decades before, suddenly got separated from the *Advaitic* tradition, on this particular aspect. For ages, right from Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, *Advaita Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaas* have been talking of a *moolaa avidhyaa* **other than** *mithyaa jnaanam* and also holding that *moolaa avidhyaa* is *kinchith bhaava roopam*. But, that particular *Aachaaryaa*

from Karnataka, Sachchidhaanendra Saraswathi, who attained *siddhi* in the 1970s and was a prolific author in three languages - Sanskrit, Kannada and English, started arguing that

- there is no such thing as *moola avidhyaa*
- mithyaa jnaanam alone is ajnaanam and
- *Vedhaantha* is required to remove *mithyaa jnaanam* only.

In this *sloka*, the traditional *Advaitha Vedhaanthins* interpret a *moolaa avidhyaa* **other than** *mithyaa jnaanam*. Sachchidhaanendra Saraswathi has written a commentary on Naishkarmya Siddhi, called '*Klesaapahaarini*', and, in his commentary on this *sloka*, he has tried to establish the opposite view.

Thus, a new *prakriyaa* has come and is also spreading, creating some problems. But, this being an advanced topic, it is not discussed much.

And, in spite of these, the *Aachaaryaa*, Sachchidhaanendra Saraswathi, is considered an *Advaitha Aachaaryaa*, since he agrees on the fundamental beliefs of *Advaitha*, namely, "*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa jeevo brahmaiva naapara.*"|

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 8 – Chapter III:

सन्नजातो भवेत्त इत्युक्तमधस्तनेन श्लोकेन । कोऽसौ सन्नजात इत्यपेक्षायां तत्स्वरूपप्रतिपादनायाह ।

The previous verse has said 'It is Being that is unknown'. If it be asked, 'What is this unknown Being?' in reply, its nature is brought out:

- अधस्तनेन श्लोकेन - In the previous verse,
- इति उक्तं - it was stated that,
- 'सन्नजातो भवेत्त:-' '*Brahman* enveloped in ignorance' alone is available during *sushupthi* and *pralayam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: In the previous *sloka* (4th quarter), it was said by me "*sannajnaatho bhaveth'* – "*Brahman* enveloped in ignorance' alone is available during *sushupthi* and *pralayam*".

'*Adhasthana*' is a single word and should not be split as '*adha*: 'and '*thana*'. It is adjective to the word *sloka*; '*Adhasthana slokena*' means 'in the previous verse'.

But, in the previous verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa did not actually say that "*Brahman* enveloped in ignorance' alone is there in *sushupthi*".

Instead of using the word *Brahman*, he used the word **san**, meaning 'Pure Existence'. Therefore, the literal translation would read "During *sushupthi*, 'Pure Existence enveloped in ignorance' alone was there".

Enveloped in which ignorance? Ans: Moolaa avidhyaa. What type of moolaa avidhyaa? Ans: Yath kinchith bhaava roopa moolaa avidhyaa.

This alone Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa talks of, in his Sri Dakshinamurthy sthothram also, (in sloka no. 6) as "raahu grastha divaakarendu sadruso maayaa samaachchaadhanaath sanmaathra: karana: upasamharanatha: yo booth sushuptha: pumaan etc." - "On folding up all the functions of the senses, he who enters into a state of deep-sleep, and there becomes Pure Existence, veiled in maayaa, like the sun or the moon during eclipse etc."

Here, '*maayaa*' means '*yath kinchith bhaava roopa moolaa avidhyaa*', and '*samaachchaadhaanam*' means '*aavaranam* / veiling / enveloping / covering'. And, what is the 'form' in *sushupthi*, as given by this *sloka*? Ans: '*Sanmaathra:*' - 'Form of Pure Existence'.

Thus, this Sri Dakshinamurthy sthothram verse also says: "In *sushupthi*, Pure Existence alone is there, enveloped by *yath kinchith bhaava roopa moolaa avidhyaa*".

Now, Sureswaraacharya talks of the real nature of that 'Pure Existence'. During *sushupthi*, that 'Pure Existence' is covered / veiled by ignorance / *maayaa* / *moolaa avidhyaa* and because of that cover / veil, (*aavruthathvaath*), one is not able to understand that 'Pure Existence' during *sushupthi*. Then, can one recognize that 'Pure Existence' during *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaas*? If so, how? How is that 'Pure Existence' identifiable?

"If and when this question is raised" the *Aacharya* says "There is no problem at all. That 'Pure Existence' alone is available in *jaagrath avasthaa* as the 'Consciousness principle', because of which only, everything is awared".

He wants to say: "That 'Pure Existence' is available as 'Awarig Consciousness' in *jaagrath avasthaa*".

Therefore, he says:

- कोऽसौ सन्नजातइत्यपेक्षायां : - When there is a curiosity to know as to what is this 'Pure Existence enveloped in *moolaa avidhyaa*', that is available in *sushupthi*,

'*Apekshaa*' means 'curiosity to know'; '*asau*' means 'this' and is adjective to '*sannajnaatha:*', which means 'Pure Existence enveloped in *moolaa avidhyaa*'; '*ka:*' means 'what is that?'.

- तत्स्वरूपप्रतिपादनाय - to talk about its identifiable nature (in *jaagrath avasthaa*), '*Svaroopam*' means 'identifiable nature' and '*that*' refers to '*sath*'.
- आह - the following *sloka* is written.

Chapter III: Verse 8 –

प्रमित्सायां य आभाति स्वयं मात्रुप्रमाणयोः।

स्वमहिम्ना च यत्सिद्धः सोऽजातार्थोऽवसीयताम् ॥ ८ ॥

What shines forth by itself in the state of the desire for knowledge, in the knower and his knowing, and is the one, which is self-established i.e. the Self, let that be understood as the unknown Being.

This is another beautiful *sloka*.

- अजातार्थः - That unknown *kaaranaa avasthaa* called *sath* or 'Pure Existence', which is enveloped in ignorance / *moolaa avidhya* aavrutha *sath padhaartha*:
- सअवसीयताम् : - should be understood as 'that'.

What is '*sa*.' / 'that'?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "It is nothing but the Consciousness, because of which one is conscious of everything. But, that Consciousness also, is experienced, in two-fold form in the *jaagrath avasthaa*. One form is the 'divided Consciousness' and other is the rarely experienced form of 'undivided Consciousness'. The 'divided Consciousness' is quite well known and familiar. But the 'undivided Consciousness' requires study. Therefore, I am going to talk about a condition, in which one experiences the undivided Consciousness".

To start with, when does one experience 'divided Consciousness'? Whenever one knows or experiences something, there is the *thriputi* - *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. *Pramaathaa* is a sentient Subject associated with Consciousness, because of which only, it is a *pramaathaa*. *Pramaanam* is also associated with Consciousness ; then alone, it can reveal the *prameyam*. And, when the *pramaathaa* and *pramaanam* come in contact with the *prameyam* (the object), the *prameyam* is awared; the *prameyam* also gets associated with Consciousness. Thus, 'divided Consciousness' is experienced, whenever one has specific knowledge or specific experience. In other words, whenever there is a *thriputi* operation, culminating in specific knowledge or specific experience, one gets the experience of Consciousness, in its divided version. For instance, 'pot-knowledge' means 'Consciousness

associated with pot'. Similarly 'man-knowledge', 'woman-knowledge' etc. are all 'divided Consciousness', associated with the respective objects.

In fact, 'divided Consciousness' alone is named as 'knowledge' or 'experience'. Every particular knowledge or every particular experience is only the name of 'divided Consciousness'. Just as a wave is the name of 'divided water' / water divided by *naama roopa*, in the same manner, every specific knowledge and every specific experience is only the name of 'divided Consciousness' / Consciousness divided by *naama roopaa*.

Now (i.e. after having studied the concept of 'divided Consciousness'), the subject of 'undivided Consciousness' is taken up. When does one experience 'undivided Consciousness'? Sureswaraacharya says, that, it ('undivided Consciousness') is experienced 'when one is *about* to operate the *pramaanaa*'.

That short moment when one wants to know something / that moment, when one, as a *pramaathaa*, is anxious to know something, with one's *pramaanaas* fully alive and active / that anxious moment is called *pramithsaa avasthaa* .

'*Jignyaasaad*' is a better known word for '*pramithsaa*'. But, Sureswaraacharya chooses to use the word '*pramithsaa*'. '*Pramaathum icchad*' is '*pramithsaa*'.

When *pramaathaa* is desirous of knowing something and has opened up the *pramaanam*, at that time, there **is** Consciousness, but it has not crystallized into a particular knowledge. For instance, when a *pramaathaa* wants to 'hear' a speaker, the crystallization of knowledge takes place only when the speaker has spoken the word and the listener's (*pramaathaa's*) Consciousness has established contact with the word ; only at that time, the word gets crystallized into *sabda jnaanam*. But, *before* the crystallization of *sabda jnaanam* / when the anxiety to 'know' is alive, that type of *chaitanyam*, which is there in the *pramaathaa* and the *pramaanam*, is the 'undivided Consciousness'.

When a deer in the forest hears the feeble sound of the distant roar of a lion or tiger, its ears perk up, in the deer's anxiety to know where the roar comes from. (An interesting aside : It is believed, that the lion's roar is so ingeniously designed that the direction from which it comes, cannot be guessed. If the direction is clearly known, the deer can escape. But, because of this ingenious design of the roar, endowed by nature, the deer, very often, runs directly towards the direction of the lion and gets caught).

The example of the deer 'perking up its ears' is quoted just to show, that, while the 'perking up of the ears' of the deer exhibits the deer's anxiety to 'know' and a human does not have any recognized physical sign to exhibit his eagerness to 'know', a similar extreme anxiety /

eagerness is roused in a human also, at times, by events happening around him. The *chaithanyam* that is alive, at that moment of eagerness or anxiety to 'know', is *nirvikalpaka chaithanyam* or 'undivided Existence'. Even during that short period called *jignyaasaa (pramithsaa) avasthaa*, when the *pramaathaa* is not yet invoked, the *pramaanam* is not yet invoked and the *prameyam* is also not yet invoked, *chaithanyam* **is** very much there and that *chaithanyam* is *nirvikalpaka chaithanyam*.

Further, that *nirvikalpaka chaithanyam* in *jaagrath avasthaa* alone is *nirvikalpaka satthaa* in *sushupthi avasthaa*. *Sadhev chith; chideva sath*.

Reverting to the text:

- प्रमित्सायां - At the time of the desire to know,
- यस्वयं आभाति : - the Consciousness, which is self-effulgent / self- evident,

The word '*aabhaath/* literally means 'shines', but, implies the meaning 'evident'.

- मात्रुप्रमाणयो :- in the activated *pramaathaa* and *pramaanam*,

'Activated' *pramaathaa* means 'curious' *pramaathaa*; not in normal state; but, in a state of curiosity.

- यःस्वमहिम्ना सिद्ध : - which Consciousness / Awareness is proved by itself,

The 'proving' of the 'awareness' is by its own *svayam prakaasa mahimaa*. It does not need a second awareness to make it known, since, such an understanding will result in infinite regress – first awareness to be known by a second, the second to be known by a third and so on.

Manthraa VII.24.1 of *Chaandoghya Upanishad – Booma Vidhyaa* is relevant here, where, Sage Narada addresses his *guru* Sage *Sanathkumara* and asks : "*Sa: bhagava: kasmin prathishtitha:*" – "O venerable sir, on what is That (*Bhooma* or *Brahman*) established?" and Sage *Sanathkumara* answers : "*Sve mahimni (prathishtitha:)*" – "(Established) in Its own glory".

- सः - that 'undivided Consciousness' obtaining during 'undivided attention',
- अवसीयताम् - should be known / ascertained / understood / '*nischeeyathaam*'.

-
- अज्ञात अर्थः - as the undivided Existence available in *sushupthi*.

The example of an individual participating in a running race will make the above statement clearer. After taking his position on the running track, the 'start' is very important for the participant, especially in short sprints. Even a small delay in 'starting' will cost him the victor's prize. Therefore, the most important thing for the participant is to be extremely alert to the signaling whistle, at the time of starting, so as not to lose precious moments. *Before* the blowing of the whistle, the 'awareness' of the anxious participant is, therefore, fully active, with ears fully open ('all ears', as the usage goes); but, it is not 'divided Consciousness', because he is yet to hear the whistle; it is 'undivided attention/ Consciousness', activated in the curious / anxious *pramaathaa* and the curious / fully alert *pramaanam*, the ears.

126. Chapter III, Verses 8 and 9 (17-01-2009)

Sureswaraacharyaa is explaining the 'nature' of *moolaavidhyaa*. Already in the Introductory portion, the *Aachaaryaa* had talked about two aspects of *moolaavidhyaa*, viz., that

- (1). *moolaavidhyaa* is located in the *aathmaa* and, that
- (2). *moolaavidhyaa* is the ignorance about the *aathma*; i.e., he had stated, that *aathmaa* is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa* and *aathmaa* is the *vishayaa* also of *moolaavidhyaa*.

And, this *moolaavidhyaa* alone is the cause of the entire universe, including the individual *chidhaabhaasaas* which are generated. Even they (the individual *chidhaabhaasaas*) are products of *moolaavidhyaa* only; and the object of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is to tackle this *moolaavidhyaa*. These were further details we got in the introductory portion.

Now, in the current portions, the *Aachaaryaa* is giving a few more details. The *Aachaaryaa* does not give all the information on *moolaavidhyaa* at one stretch or in one stroke; but, presents them in several portions of the text. It is up to the students to keep track and consolidate all the information.

In this particular portion, the *Aachaaryaa* says: "*moolaavidhyaa* is not *bhaava* or *abhaava roopam*; but is *yath kinchith bhaava roopam*". In English, it can be interpreted as "it is not an 'absolutely positive' entity; but, is an 'empirically positive' or 'relatively positive' entity."

If *moolaavidhyaa* is considered as an 'absolutely positive' entity (as *bhaava roopam*), it would become equal to *Brahman*. But, obviously, it cannot be given a status equal to *Brahman*.

Moolaavidhyaa is also not (*ahaava roopam*) or 'absence of knowledge'; it is 'inimical' or 'opposed to' knowledge. It is not '*jnaana abhaava*'; but, '*jnaana virodhi*'.

In both the words *avidhyaa* and *ajnaanam*, there is the prefix '*a*'. The difference of opinion, between the *poorva pakshin* and the *Vedhaanthin*, is on what this prefix conveys. The *poorva pakshin* holds that '*a*' indicates *abhaavam* ('absence'); whereas, the *Vedhaanthin* says that the prefix indicates *virodhaa* ('inimical' or 'opposed to'). '*Abhaavaarthe akaara*.' is the *poorva pakshin's* stand ; '*virodhaarathe akaara*.' is the *siddhaanthin's* view.

Virodha: implies that '*moolaavidhyaa* is an entity, which is eliminated by knowledge'. In *Vedhaanthaa*, we say *avidhyaa* is removed by knowledge.

To consolidate the above *Vedhaanthic* views:

- (1) *avidhyaa* is opposed to knowledge
- (2) *avidhyaa* is removable by knowledge and
- (3) but, *avidhyaa* is not absence of knowledge.

Thereafter, Sureswaraachaaryaa said "Not only is *moolaavidhyaa* an 'empirically positive' entity, which is opposed to knowledge; *moolaavidhyaa* is different from *mithyaa jnaanam* or erroneous knowledge".

Moolaavidhyaa is not 'absence of knowledge'; *moolaavidhyaa* is not 'erroneous knowledge' also; *moolaavidhyaa* is different from 'erroneous knowledge' or *mithyaa jnaanam*. In fact, *moolaavidhyaa* is the cause of *mithyaa jnaanam*; but, is itself not *mithyaa jnaanam*.

Proceeding further, the *Aachaaryaa* reveals: "This *moolaavidhyaa* is experienced by us, in all the *nirvikalpaka avasthaas* / divisionless states".

The *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* may be in the form of *sushupthi*, in the form of *maranam*, in the form of *pralayam*, in the form of *moorchaa* or in the form of *samaadhi*. *Samaadhi*, *moorchaa*, *sushupthi*, *pralayam* and *maranam* are all *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*. In all such *avasthaas*, 'erroneous knowledge' is **not** what we experience; what we experience **is** *moolaavidhyaa*.

Therefore, taking the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* case study in the 7th verse, Sureswaraachaarya established *moolaavidhyaa* **is** experiencable.

And, in that *nirvikalapkaa avasthaa*, what is the function of *moolaavidhyaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* answers: "The function of *moolaavidhyaa* is 'enveloping the causal state of the universe (otherwise called *Brahman* state of the universe.)'".

The 'causal state' of the universe is called '*Brahman* state', because, the cause of the universe is *Brahman*.

The *Brahman* or 'causal' state is also called *saamaanya saththaa*, meaning 'undivided Existence'. Always, the 'Causal state' is 'undivided Existence'; only when 'effects' are born, it will become 'divided existence' – as *aakaasa: asthi, vaayu: asthi, jalam asthi, agni: asthi, pramaathaa asthi, pramaanam asthi, prameyam asthi* etc. "*Kaarya avasthaayaam visesha saththaa ; kaarana avasthaayaam saamaanya saththaa*".

To consolidate: "In all *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*, *moolaavidhyaa* **is** existing, 'enveloping the causal or Brahman state of the universe'. Conversely, "In *nirvikalpaka avasthaas*, there is *Brahman* in the form of 'undivided Existence', enveloped by *moolaavidhyaad*'.

As indicated in the earlier session, verse 6 of Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, refers only to this fact, by the terms " raahu grastha divaakarendu sadruso maayaa samaachchaadhanaath sanmaathra: karana: upasamharanatha: yo booth sushuptha: pumaan etc. " - " On folding up all the functions of the senses, he who enters into a state of deep-sleep, and there becomes Pure Existence, veiled in maayaa, like the sun or the moon during eclipse etc." In this verse of Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram , the word 'Maayaa' means 'moolaavidhyaa' and the word 'samaachaadhanaath' means 'enveloping'.

This is what is said up to the 7th verse of the 3rd chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Now, in the 8th verse, the *Aachaaryaa* is extending that idea.

In *sushupthi avasthaa*, we are experiencing *Brahman* enveloped in *moolaavidhyaa* ; *Brahman* is experienced in the form of *saamaanya satthaa* – only 'general Existence'; and that *saamaanya satthaa* itself is *saamaanya chaithanyam* also. The 'general Existence' is identical with 'general undivided *nirvikalpaka chith*' also. The *Thaithreeya Upanishad* declares "*sathyam-jnaanam-anantham-Brahma*".

But, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, the *saamanya satthaa* alone is prominent; the *saamanya chith* or *chaithanyam* (the Consciousness) is not to be experienced there.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out "Only, in the waking stage, we experience the *saamanya chaithanyam*".

For *saamanya **satthaa***, one should go to deep sleep state - *sushupthi avasthaa*. And, "for the experience of *saamaanya **chaithanyam***" Sureswaraachaaryaa says "you have to come to the 'waking' state ; that experience is also not had throughout the waking state; but, only during special moments, we experience the generalized Consciousness".

And, what are those 'special moments'? The *Aachaaryaa's* view and statement on this topic, are very, very beautiful. The student will not find this unique view, anywhere else in the *Vedhaanthic* scriptures. The *Aachaaryaa* answers this question (in verse no. 8) as "*Pramithsaayaam*" - "in *pramithsaa avasthaad*".

Other words for "*Pramithsaa*" are "*Jignyaasa*", "*Vividishaa*" and "*bubudhsaa*".

The term '*pramithsaa avasthaa*' indicates a state when the *pramaathaa* is curious to know something and therefore has activated the corresponding *pramaanam*, waiting for the *prameyam* (the object of knowledge) to arrive. In other words, in the '*pramithsaa avasthaa*', the *pramaathaa* is active with the curiosity to 'know' and has also activated / alerted the *pramaanam*; but, the *prameyam*, the object of knowledge, is yet to arrive.

In the last session, the example of a participant in a running race, waiting anxiously for the signaling whistle to be blown, was given to explain the '*pramithsaa avasthaa*'. Another example will be the state of a railway passenger waiting for an announcement in the railway station. Generally, before the announcement is made, there is a 'gong', to attract the attention of the passengers. Immediately *after* the 'gong' and *before* the actual announcement comes, the *pramaathaa* (the passenger) is active and anxiously activates the *pramaanam* (the ears). Therefore, 'Consciousness' or 'Awareness' is aroused 'as it were' (the term 'as it were' is important, because, in reality, 'Consciousness' has no modification) ; but, it has not become a 'particular awareness or knowledge'; it will become 'particular awareness or knowledge' or '*visesha chaithanyam*', only when the actual announcement is heard, conveying the information that is important for the passenger.

Only after the actual announcement, the 'awareness' will become a specific *sabda jnaanam*; but, even before the *sabda jnaanam* comes, the 'awareness' is there; and that awareness is the generalized 'awareness'; that *chaithanyam* is *Brahma chaithanyam*, which is *saamaanya chith* , as well as *saamanya sath* also, which is enveloped by *avidhya* – lack of 'particular knowledge'.

And, an important fact about that *saamaanya chaithanyam*: 'Experiencing the *saamaanya chaithanyam* requires only a little bit of attention. *Saamaanya chaithanyam* can be experienced by everyone, by paying attention, before 'knowing' anything.

Yoga saasthra talks about entering into *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* to pay special attention to the 'awareness' - *saamaanya chaithanyam*. But, *Vedhaantha* says: "If you want to go to *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, to pay special attention to the 'awareness'- *saamaanya chaithanyam*, you may do so. But, that is not compulsorily required. What is sufficient is 'paying attention' even in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, before seeing anything or hearing anything. That 'paying attention' is *nirvikalpaka* or *saamaanya chaithanyam*. That *anubhaava* is easily attainable".

Vedhaantha is not meant to give a seeker that *anubhaava*, since 'experience of *saamaanya chaithanyam*' is easily achievable by 'paying attention' and 'experience of *saamaanya saththa*' is easily achievable by going to 'deep sleep'. *Vedhaantha* seeks to give more information regarding that *saamaanya chaithanyam*.

In other words: *Brahma anubhavaa* is easily available; 'giving *Brahma anubhavaa* to the seeker' is not the aim of *Vedhaanthaa*; 'giving *Brahma jnaanam*' is its aim.

Nor is *Vedhaanthaa* required for the purpose of giving the experience of *saamaanya satthaa* and the *saamaanya chaithanyam* which are easily experienced.

But, *Vedhaanthaa* **is** required to understand the facts about *chaithanyam*, viz., that,

- (1) *chaithanyam* is not a part or product or property of matter;
- (2) *chaithanyam* is an independent entity that pervades matter;
- (3) *chaithanyam* is not limited by the boundaries of time or space, which belong to matter;
- (4) *chaithanyam* survives even after the disintegration of matter;
- (5) *chaithanyam* is beyond transaction, after matter dissolves; but, its 'non-transactability' does not mean it is absent; and finally and most importantly
- (6) that *saamaanya chaithanyam* is 'myself'; 'I' am not the body, with *saamaanya chaithanyam*; but I **am** that *saamaanya chaithanyam*,

This *Brahma jnaanam* is the aim of *Vedhaanthaa*. *Brahma anubhavaa* is relatively simpler. For the experience of *saamaanya satthaa*, one has to go to sleep and for the experience of *saamaanya chaithanyam* one has to 'pay attention', when you are **about** to listen to or experience something. (Being important, it is repeated).

Reverting to the *sloka*:

- प्रमित्सायां - Just before the rise of visesha jnaanam,
- यत् आभाति :- that general Consciousness which is aroused (or active),
- स्वयं - by itself,

The word '*svayam*' indicates that the general Consciousness is self evidently manifest.

When one says "I am paying undivided attention", the term 'undivided attention' indicates 'undivided Consciousness', because, at that particular moment of 'undivided attention', one is not even self-conscious as a particular individual / one is not even aware of oneself as an individual. An example of such a moment: Imagine a five-match series of the game of cricket, between India and Pakistan; each country has won two matches each, the final match is being played and the last ball of the match is about to be bowled with two runs for a win. Every ardent cricket fan, waiting for that final ball to be bowled and watching that final ball, pays 'undivided attention' and **is** actually in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*; though, it is a common error to believe that *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* is achieved only in *Padmaasanaa*.

'Undivided attention' is 'undivided Consciousness'. How is that 'undivided Consciousness' evident? Ans: It is self evident.

Where?

- मातृप्रमाणयोः - in the pramaathaa and pramaanam,

One cannot claim that Consciousness is aroused in 'inert' matter, for example, in a chair. Only in the *chethana* individual, the 'undivided Consciousness' is evident during 'undivided attention'.

- स्वमहिम्ना च यस्मिद् - and which is evident because of its own glory of *svayam prakaasathvam*,
- सः अज्ञात अर्थः - is 'chaithanyam enveloped in moola ajnaanam'.
- (इति) अवसीयताम् - (Thus) may you understand.

'ajnaathaa artha:' means 'ajnaanam brahman', which, in turn, means 'chaithanyam enveloped in moolaa ajnaanam'.

The word *ajnaathaa* should be translated as 'enveloped in *moolaavidhyaad*'. 'Artha:' means 'undivided Existence' and 'undivided Consciousness'.

'*Ajnaatha artha:*', therefore, means 'undivided Existence-Consciousness enveloped in *moolaavidhyaad*'.

When is one experiencing this? Whenever one is paying 'undivided attention'.

After this incidental topic, the student has to remind himself of the original topic. What is the original topic? Ans: It is this *moolaavidhyaad* which the seeker is trying to tackle with *mahaa vaakya vichaara*.

Samaadhi avasthaa / *samaadhi anubhavaa* can never falsify the world; it can only keep away the world and the consequent problems, for a few minutes. The *samaadhi anubhavaa* will not solve the problems permanently.

Then, what is required? It is "falsification of the world" that is required.

The advantage is, that, whether experienced or not experienced, a falsified world cannot threaten, whether one is sitting in *samaadhi* or interacting with the world.

To repeat: 'Forgetfulness of the world' is not the *Vedhaanthin's* aim; 'falsification of the world' is; and, that is possible only through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. This is the main topic, discussed by Sureswaraachaaryaa earlier.

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* wants to enter another topic, for the purpose of further establishing the relevance of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. It is another very, very important topic, that he is entering into.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 9:

अत्र केचिदाहुः । यत्किंचिदिह वाक्यं लौकिकं वैदिकं वा तत्सर्वं संसर्गात्मकमेव वाक्यार्थं गमयति । अतस्तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येभ्यः संसर्गात्मकमहं ब्रह्मेति विजायतावन्निदिध्यासीत् यावदवाक्यार्थात्मकः प्रयगात्मविषयोऽवबोधोऽहं ब्रह्मेति समभिजायते । तस्मादेव विज्ञानात्कैवल्यमाप्नोतीति तन्निराकरणायेदमुच्यते ।

Here, some thinkers maintain the following: "Every proposition, scriptural or worldly, conveys an import, which is a complex of many items. Therefore, after one gathers the complex import of *Vedhaanthic* propositions like 'That thou art' in the form of the judgment 'I am *Brahmar*', he must practice meditation on that theme, until an integral and non-verbal knowledge of the inmost Self emerges in the form of the direct experience 'I am *Brahmar*'. It is only through such a realization that liberation is achieved". To refute this view, the following is propounded:

Another serious and important discussion, which discussion is based on the views of two groups of *Advaitins*. Here, the debate is not between *advaitam* and *saamkyaa* or between *advaitam* and *yoga* or between *advaitam* and *visishtaadvaitam* etc. Within *advaitam* itself, there is this controversy, which the *Aachaaryaa* is raising here.

- अत्र केचित् आहुः - Even with regard to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, there is another view held by some people / some *Advaitins* hold this following view.

Before proceeding with the study of the text, it will help to study the background of the controversy, which is as follows:

Sureswaraachaaryaa holds that *mahaa vaakya vichaaram* generates *aathma jnaanam* / *brahma jnaanam* / *aathma brahma eiykya jnaanam*. That *jnaanam* is expected to tackle *moolaavidhyaa*, which is eliminated by that *jnaanam*.

The subject / import of 'this 'elimination' of *moolaavidhyaa*' has already been discussed and repeated below.

'Elimination' of *moolaavidhyaa* consists in 'removal' of *aavarana sakthi* and **falsification** of *vikshepa sakthi*. It should be noted that it is removal of only *aavarana sakthi*; but, **not** *vikshepa sakthi*, because if *vikshepa sakthi* is also removed, the world will disappear.

Therefore, "'elimination' of *moolaavidhyaa*" is 'removal of *aavarana sakthi*' and only 'falsification of *vikshepa sakthi*' and not elimination of *vikshepa sakthi*.

What will be the advantage? The world will continue but it will be a falsified world. The 5th capsule of *Vedhaanthaa* (as codified by Swamiji) should be remembered here:

"For a person who remembers the true nature of the world, life is an entertainment; for a person who forgets the nature, life becomes a struggle".

Therefore, even after elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*, the world will continue as a falsified world; but the *aavarana sakthi* is gone. And, this is called liberation. Liberation is attained by the knowledge generated by *mahaa vaakya vichaaram*.

Now, what is the controversy, even among *Advaitins*? Ans: The controversy is on the answer to the question "Is this liberating knowledge produced at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam* / *vicharaa* itself or is this knowledge produced only during *nidhidhyaasanam* / meditation during *nirvikalpaka samaadh*?"

To repeat the same question, in other words: "Is this liberating knowledge produced even at the time of study of *mahaa vaakya* or is it produced only later, during meditation?"

In Sanskrit, the question is: "Sravanam jnaanam janayathi vaa; dhyaanam jnaanam janayathi vaa?"

The *poorva pakshin*, who is introduced in this paragraph, argues: "Only during meditation, the liberating knowledge is produced"; i.e. this *poorva pakshaa* holds: "Meditation alone produces liberating knowledge. *Sravanam* does produce knowledge but not liberating knowledge". Thus, the *poorva pakshin* classifies the knowledge into two, viz., 'liberating knowledge' and 'non-liberating knowledge'.

Then the subsequent question arises: What is the difference between the two? The *poorva pakshin* replies: "During *sravanam*, the seeker gets knowledge, which knowledge may be called secondary knowledge or book knowledge or intellectual knowledge or indirect knowledge. Even the most qualified disciple, even under the guidance of the best *guru*, can attain only this knowledge. Any amount of *sravanam* or any amount of *mananam* done by the student, will produce only this secondary knowledge. The student, subsequently, has to

go to meditation; in meditation alone, because of sustained repetition (*aavrutthi:*) of the 'secondary knowledge', the secondary knowledge will get more and more ripened and at a particular time, it will produce the 'primary knowledge', also called by other names - 'direct knowledge, 'experiential knowledge', '*saakshaathkaara:*', 'realization', 'enlightenment' etc. At that 'flashpoint' alone, the 'liberating knowledge' is generated. The seeker may do any amount of *sravanam* or *mananam*. But, they will not do; he has to practice meditation, initially for a short period; gradually increasing the period of meditation, at a particular stage he will attain the 'liberating knowledge'".

Sureswaraachaaryaa strongly refutes this viewpoint. He says: "Primary knowledge **is** generated during *mahaa vaakya vichaara* or *sravanam* itself".

He does recognize a differentiation between a 'primary' and a 'secondary' knowledge, but of a different type. What is that?

The explanation is as follows:

In this context, it is important for the student to note the difference between the terms, *avaanthara vaakyam* and *mahaa vaakyam*, which topic is specifically covered during the study of the *Panchadasee* by *Swami Vidhyaaranyaa*.

'Avaanthara vaakyaani' are Upanishadic statements, which define Brahman, such as "Brahman is nirgunam, niraarkaaram, jagath kaaranam, sathyam-jnaanam- anantham etc.", but, without saying that "that Brahman is 'you'".

Examples of such vaakyaani are (i) "sathyam jnaanam anantham Brahma" (Thaithreeya Upanishad – Brahma valli – manthraa 1) - "Brahman is infinite Existence-Awareness" and (ii) "yath thadh adresyam agrahyam agothram avarnam achakshu:rothram thadapaanipaadam nithyam vibhum sarvagatham sushookshmam thadavyayam yad bhoothayonim" - (Mundaka Upanishad – I.1.6) – "that which cannot be perceived, which cannot be grasped, which is without a source, without properties, without eyes and ears, without hands and legs, which is timeless, all-pervading, very subtle, which becomes many , which is imperishable and which is the cause of all the beings".

Vichaaraa or enquiry into such statements giving definitions of *Brahman*, leaving aside the *mahaa vaakyam*, is "*avaanthara vaakya vichaara*" or "*avaanthara vaakya sravanam*".

According to the *Aachaaryaa's* viewpoint, that knowledge which is attained during *avaanthara vaakya vichaara* or *sravanam*, is known as 'secondary knowledge' or '*paroksha jnaanam*'.

Further in the *Aachaaryaa's* view, after attaining this *paroksha jnaanam* through the *avaanthara vaakyaani*, the seeker should not go to meditation for 'primary knowledge'. He should continue the *sravanam* and in the *sravanam*, he should move from *avaanthara vaakyaani* to *mahaavaakyaani* such as "*thath thvam asi*", "*aham brahma asmI*" etc. And this *mahaavaakya saravanam* generates '*aparoksha jnaanam*' or 'primary knowledge'.

In short, "*Sravanam / vicharraa* of *avaanthara vaakyaani* will produce 'secondary knowledge'; but, *mahaavaakya vicharaa* itself **will produce** 'primary knowledge'" is the *Aachaaryaa's* stand.

Thus, in Sureswaraachaaryaa's view, both 'secondary knowledge' and 'primary knowledge' are produced in *sravanam*; but, for the *poorva pakshin*, 'secondary knowledge' is produced in *sravanam* and the 'primary knowledge' is produced in meditation - in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, by constant 'repetition' and that too in a 'flash'. This is the topic, that is being discussed in these portions.

An incidental but, relevant doubt is also to be clarified, at this stage:

In the above discussion, the *Vedhaanthic* teacher has said that 'liberating knowledge' is produced during *sravana-mananam* itself and that *nidhidhyaasanam* is not expected to produce 'liberating knowledge' and obviously, therefore, *nidhidhyaasanam* is not expected to give *mokshaa* also.

Thus, if both 'liberating knowledge' and '*mokshaa*' are achieved in *sravana mananam* and not during *nidhidhyaasanam*, then why is *nidhidhyaasanam* prescribed in the *saasthras*? In other words: If 'liberating knowledge' does not require *nidhidhyaasanam*, since *Vedhaanthic* study itself can give it, why *nidhidhyaasanam* at all?

The answer to this doubt: *Nidhidhyaasanam* is required neither for knowledge nor *mokshaa*; it is only meant for negating / erasing the seeker's 'triangular format orientation', 'which orientation is: "I am a victim of *karma*; *karma* and the world victimize me; and *Bhagavaan* is the only Saviour"'.

All the *bakthi* literature, *slokas* and songs, in any language, will repeatedly plead to God: "I am helpless; You are my Saviour".

But, the fact is, that, 'I' am already free. Therefore, 'I' should not revive or perpetuate the 'triangular format',

Nidhidhyaasanam is only deliberate negation of this triangular format / *vipareetha bhaavana* / *vaasanaa*. A *Vedhaantic* seeker has to take a vow, that, during his day-to-day transactions also, he will not slip into 'triangular format'. As can be readily appreciated, a habit will have to be deliberately broken. That 'habit-breaking' exercise is *nidhidhyaasanam*; the 'orientation-neutralization' exercise is *nidhidhyaasanam*. It is not meant for a new 'enlightenment' or a new 'realization', as no new realization can arrive in *nidhidhyaasanam*.

'Realization' has to come only through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, *mahaa vaakyani* being the only *pramaanam*.

And, if some *saadhakaas* claim that they had extraordinary experiences in meditation, the *Vedhaantha* philosopher does not dispute the claim. In fact, he has no right to. He only points out that those experiences have nothing to do, either with realization or liberation. Those experiences may be there; but, similar to visiting the US and watching the Niagara falls, they are / may be fantastic experiences; but they have nothing to do with 'binary format'. Those experiences will not help the seeker to come to 'binary format'.

The seeker has to understand clearly: "'I' was, 'I' am and 'I' ever will be free; 'I' am never a victim; 'I' do not require a savior".

Dayaananda Swamiji was once asked "What is your New Year message"? Swamiji jokingly, but, significantly replied "O God! Save me from the saviours".

There may be a further reaction to this approach. The question "Then, is not God required at all?" may be raised. The *Vedhaanthin's* answer will be: "God is not required as a saviour. God, as *Viswaroopa Isvara*, is available as a master-entertainer; a wonderful *Viswaroopa* drama is on; enjoy the drama by the *viswaroopa Isvara*." The *Vedhaanthin* will never negate *Isvara*. He will only say that it is not a victimizing *Isvara* or a saviour *Isvara*.

In a nutshell, is *nidhidhyaasanam* required or not? *Vedhaanthin's* Answer: It **is** required; but, not for realization, but for dismantling 'triangular format'.

Reverting to the text: The *poorva pakshin* says,

- यत् किञ्चित् इह वाक्यं तत् सर्व - Every proposition,
- लौकिकं वैदिकं वा - whether worldly or scriptural,
- वाक्यार्थं गमयति - conveys an import,
- संसर्गात्मकमेव - which is a complex of many items.

The *poorva pakshin*, in this portion, is giving a grammatical reason to establish that the *mahaa vaakyam* cannot produce *advaita jnaanam*. According to him: "Only meditation can produce *advaita jnaanam*; *mahaa vaakyam* cannot."

Incidentally, this topic has been discussed earlier in this treatise itself, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 67, of Chapter I (Page 30 of the Text Book in use in the class – lines 5 to 8).

The view of the *poorva pakshin* is "Sentences cannot give *advaita jnaanam*".

And, he substantiates his view as follows.

He says: "Leave alone *mahaa vaakyam*. Let us generally analyze any sentence – worldly or *saasthric* sentence – *loukika vaakyam vaa vaidhika vaakyam vaa saasthreeya vaakyam vaa*. Any sentence will have several words, because, a sentence, by definition, is a group of words, of course, arranged in a proper manner and connected syntactically. Every sentence will have several words and every word will have its corresponding object. Taking the sentence 'Rama is driving a vehicle' for analysis, there are two nouns in the sentence – 'Rama' and 'vehicle'. Analyzing another example : 'I am writing a letter with a pen', there are three nouns – 'I', 'letter' and 'pen'. The noun may refer to the 'subject' of the sentence or 'object' or 'instrument' or 'location' . But, every *kaaraka padham* will reveal a *kaaraka padhaartha*. Thus, a sentence will reveal only plurality. A sentence can never reveal *advaitam*".

This is the *poorva pakshin's* first argument.

His second argument is: "Even if there is a sentence, in which one word reveals an object and all other words are descriptions of that object, the sentence reveals *visishta advaitam* only".

To understand this argument, the *Githa Dhyana Sloka* - "*prapanna paarijaathaaya thothra vethraika paanaye jnaanamudhraaya krishnaaya geethmruthaduhe nama:*" may be considered. In this sentence, there are five nouns, but they are not revealing five objects. They reveal only one Krishna. Even though they are revealing one Krishna, the nouns other than '*Krishnaaya*' are revealing various attributes of Krishna. Therefore, they are revealing *visista advaitam* only – a Krishna with various attributes.

Thus, according to the *poorva pakshin*, a sentence can reveal only *dvaitam* or *visishta advaitam*.

In English, his argument may be stated as: "A sentence will reveal either 'plurality of objects' or it will reveal 'one entity with several attributes' / 'an attributed entity'. A *nirvishesha advaitham* – a 'non-duality without an attribute', can never be revealed by a sentence." Or, in other words, the *poorva pakshin's* argument may be stated as: "A sentence will reveal many things or it will reveal one thing with many attributes, one word revealing the noun and the other words its attributes. The 'one, single entity, without attributes' can never be revealed by any sentence".

And, how is *Brahman* defined? Ans: "As a single Entity, without any attributes".

"So" the *poorva pakshin* argues "*Brahman* being 'attributeless, single entity', it can never be revealed by any sentence, whether it is *loukika vaakyam* or *vaidhika vaakyam*, whether it is *karma kaanda vaakyam* or *jnaana kaanda vaakyam* or whether it is *avaanthara vaakyam* or *mahaa vaakyam*."

The *poorva pakshin* makes a *vyaapthi*: "Vaakyam nirvishesha advaitha bhinna padhaartha bodhakam" meaning "a vaakyam reveals a thing, which is other than attributeless single entity". Also, "nirvishesha advaitha bhinaa bodhakam vaakyathvaath, 'raama: lekanyaa likathi' ithi loukika vaakyavath".

"Therefore, you may study any amount of *Vedhaanthaa*; but, you will get only book knowledge. If you want to know or experience that 'attributeless entity' you have to go to meditation" is the *poorva pakshaa*.

127. Chapter III, Verse 9 (24-01-2009)

In this *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 9, Sureswaraachaarya is introducing a *poorva pakshin*, who is also only an *Advaitin*.

Therefore, i.e., being an *Advaitin*, according to this *poorva pakshin* also, just as all *Advaitins* believe, “*aham brahma asmi' ithi jnaanam'*” alone is the ‘liberating knowledge’ and this “*aham brahma asmi' ithi jnaanam'*” is in the form of ‘*nirguna advaita jnaanam'*’, otherwise called ‘*nirvishesha advaita jnaanam'*’. The non-dual Reality, which is without any attribute, is known in this knowledge.

But, where this *poorva pakshin* differs, is, that, while Sureswaraachaaryaa holds that this *nirguna advaita jnaanam* is generated by *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* (consisting of *sravanam* and *mananam*) itself, this *poorva pakshin* says: “*Mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* generates only a secondary knowledge. Thereafter, i.e. after the *vichaaraa*, the aspirant should go to meditation. In this meditation or *nidhidhyaasanam*, the aspirant should repeat the *mahaa vaakya vritthi*. As a result of this repetition, *bhaavanaa upajaya:* takes place. (*Bhaavanaa upajaya:* means some kind of a ‘ripening’ process). As a result of this ‘ripening’, which happens because of continuous meditation or *nidhidhyaasanam*, another knowledge takes place, which knowledge alone is primary knowledge / liberating knowledge / *saakshaathkaara jnaanam* or *aparoksha anubhava jnaanam*. That *jnaanam* alone is the ‘liberating knowledge’ and that knowledge alone is *nirguna nirvishesha advaita jnaanam*. This ‘liberating knowledge’ cannot be produced by *mahaa vaakyam* itself. *Mahaa vaakyam* generates only a ‘secondary knowledge’, also known as working knowledge, intellectual knowledge etc. That ‘intellectual knowledge’ alone *mahaavaakyam* can generate. Therefore, *sravanam* or *vichaaraa*, by itself, **cannot** produce ‘liberating knowledge’. Meditation alone generates ‘liberating knowledge’ ”. This is the contention of this *poorva pakshin*, known as *Vedhaantha Ekadesi*.

The champion of this *poorva pakshaa* is also a great *Aacharyaa*, known as Vaachaspathy Misra:, who is also the author of *Bhamathi*, a commentary on *Brahma Sootra Sankara Bhashyam*, because of which, Vaachaspathy Misra: is known as *Bhamathikaaraa* and this approach is called *Bhamathi prakriyaa*.

According to this *Bhamathi prakriyaa*, meditation alone generates ‘liberating knowledge’.

In turn, Sureswaraachaarya is equally vehement in his opposition to this *prakriyaa*. He firmly establishes that *mahaa vaakya sravanam* or *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* can itself generate this ‘liberating *nirvishesha advaita jnaanam'*’ and that, ‘*nirvishesha advaita jnaanam'*’ does not

require the separate process called *nidhidhyaasanam* or meditation. According to **his prakriyaa**, *nidhidhyaasanam* **is** required, but, it is neither meant for knowledge nor for realization; neither for enlightenment nor for mystical experiences; nor is it meant for liberation ; according to him, *nidhidhyaasanam* is meant for only removing the habit of 'triangular format'. This 'triangular format' habit is the orientation to pray during crisis "O! God! Save me". Breaking this habitual orientation is the purpose of *nidhidhyaasanam*. "Liberating knowledge' can certainly be achieved during *maaha vaakya sravanam* itself. *Maha vaakyam* certainly has the power to do that" is his stand.

With the intention of establishing his view and refuting this *poorva pakshaa*, Sureswaraacharya introduces the *poorva pakshin* here.

As discussed in the earlier session, the *poorva pakshin* gives a grammatical reason to show that *maha vaakyam* cannot give *nirguna advaita jnaanam*. His reasoning is: "Any *vaakyam*, whether it is a secular statement or a sacred statement, consists of many words; and, 'many words' can reveal not *advaitam* ; but only *dvaita padhaarthaa:* | The *dvaita padhaani* / *naanaa padhaani*, in a sentence can reveal only *dvaita padhaarthaa: / naanaa padhaarthaa: | Advaitam* cannot be revealed by a group of words."

The *poorva pakshin's* further argument is: "Even if there is a sentence which reveals only one object - an *eka vasthu* - that *eka vasthu* will be *saguna vasthu / savishesha vasthu* only, one word of the sentence revealing the object and the other words revealing the attributes of that object". The earlier example given, for such sentences, was the *sloka* '*prapanna paarijaathaaya thothra vethraika panaye jnaanamudhraaya Krishnaaya githaamruthaduhe nama:'* , which *sloka* reveals one Krishna, but not *nirguna* Krishna, but One who has got several attributes - '*Prapaana parijaathathvam*', '*thothra vethraika panithvam*' etc.

Of course, it is an acceptable fact, that, if, in a sentence

- (i) the different nouns do not reveal different objects or
- (ii) if the nouns other than the noun revealing an object, do not reveal the attributes of the object also, then, the nouns themselves will become redundant.

"Therefore, the different nouns in a sentence should reveal either different objects or they should reveal one object *and* the attributes of that object. In other words, a sentence itself can reveal only *aneka vasthu* or *savishesha eka vasthu*. A sentence can never reveal *nirvishesha / nirguna eka vasthu*" is the view of the *poorva pakshin*.

"And, therefore" the *poorva pakshin* continues "*nirvishesha eka vasthu jnaanam* is revealed mystically in *nirvikalapa samaadhi* only. A mystic experience takes place and only in that

experience, *nirvishesha advaita vasthu* 'flashes'; it is an inexplicable experience; and, after that experience, 'liberation' dawns".

Another school of aspirants connect '*nirvishesha eka vasthu jnaanam*' with the 'rising' of '*kundalini*'; they say: "Automatically, whether the seeker engaged in 'meditation', specifically works for it or not, *kundalini* 'rises' as a by-product, travels upwards through *sushumna naadi* and 'hits' *sahasraara chakram*, where the *Paramaathmaa* is seated. The *jeevaathmaa*, travelling upwards through the *sushumna naadi* 'hits' the *Paramaathmaa*, 'sitting' (the irony is that the *Paramaathmaa* is 'all-pervading') in the *sahasraaraa*; 'hitting the sitting *Paramaathma*', the *jeevaathmaa* and the *Paramaathmaa* will 'merge' in that junction. Thereafter, there will be *amrutha dhaara pravaaham* from the top of the skull and the seeker will feel the liquid *amritham* flowing down also". In support, this group quotes the *sloka 9* from *Adi Sankara's Soundarya Lahari*: "*mahim moolaadhaare kamapi manipoore huthavaham sthitham svaadhishtaane hrudhi marutham aakaasam upari manopi bhrhumadhye sakalamapi bhithvaa kulapatham sahasraare padme saha rahasi pathyaa vikarase*"|

Thus, all kinds of 'mystical' dimensions are given to *advaita jnaanam*, by different schools of thought. But, Sureswaraachaarya says: "No mysticism is required; no '*kundalini* raising' is required; study *mahaa vaakyaa* properly. '*Nirvishesha advaita jnaanam*', in the form of clear understanding, is achieved. I will show how it is possible, in the following verses".

To continue with the *poorva pakshin's* statement (in the introduction to verse 9):

- यत् किञ्चित् इह वाक्यं - Sentences in the world,
- लौकिकं वैदिकं वा - whether secular or sacred / pourusheya or apourusheya,
- तत् सर्वं - all those sentences
- वाक्यार्थं गमयति - reveal a meaning,
- संसर्गात्मकं एव - which is in the form of a relational sense.

'*Samsargam*' means 'relational'. The use of the term '*Samsargaathmakam*' implies "several objects which are interconnected' or 'one object with several attributes which are connected' / 'several connected objects' or 'one object and several connected attributes' / '*aneka saguna padhaarthaan*' or '*eka saguna padhaartha*'. Therefore, it further implies "never can *nirguna padhaartha* be revealed".

'*Samasargaathmakam*' is translated as 'of relational sense' '*Gamayathi*' means '*bodhayathi*'.

"And, therefore, any amount of the study of *prakaranaas* like *Naishkarmya Siddhi* will give only 'book knowledge'. To attain *nirvishesha advaita jnaanam*, one has to practice hours of meditation" is the *poorva pakshin's* averment (which follows).

- अतः - Therefore,
- संसर्गात्मात्कं विज्ञाय - having gained the 'secondary knowledge' / 'book knowledge' / 'intellectual knowledge', which is of the nature of 'relational knowledge',

The term '*samsargaathmakam*' is adverbial to '*vignyaaya*'; therefore, '*samsargaathmakam vignyaaya*' means, 'relationally having known'.

- अहं ब्रह्म (अस्मि) - that 'I am Brahman',

Normally '*brahma jagath kaaranam asth*' is considered as *paroksha jnaanam*; but, this *poorva pakshin* considers even '*aham brahma asmi jnaanam*', **gained by Vedhaanthic study**, as only relational knowledge / secondary knowledge/ *paroksha jnaanam* .

- तावत् - initially,
- तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्येभ्यः - from the mahaa vaakyaani like 'thathvamasi',

According to the *poorva pakshin*, the main *saadhanaa* is not the study of *mahaa vaakyaa* / *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. The main *saadhanaa* should start *after* the *vichaaraa*, in a secluded place.

- निदिध्यासीत् - the aspirant should practice intense meditation,

'Nidhidhyaaseetha' is verbal form, meaning 'should meditate' / 'nidhidhyaasanam kuryaath' / 'aham brahma asmi' ithi dhyaanam kuryaath.'

How long should one meditate / practice *nidhidhyaasanam*?

- यावत् - until,

The *poorva pakshin* talks of another knowledge, in addition to the knowledge acquired through *sravana-mananam*, which 'addirional knowledge', he calls enlightenment / realization / *aparoksha saakshaathkaara* / a mystical 'flash'. And, according to him,, one should continue *nidhidhyaasanam*, until that 'flash' arrives.

- अवबोधः - another superior 'realization',

'Avabodha:' means 'realization', which the *poorva pakshin* differentiates from the previous knowledge.

What does this 'realization' deal with?

- प्रत्यक् आत्म विषयः - dealing with advaita aathmaa / the inner Self,

And, what is the uniqueness of this higher 'realization'?

- अवाक्यार्थात्मक :- (and) of the nature of 'non- relational knowledge' / 'non- sentential knowledge' / direct experience,

According to the *poorva pakshin*, the 'earlier' knowledge was '*savishesha jnaanam*'. This latter 'realization' is the '*nirvishesha jnaanam*'. And, therefore, the seeker's job is to get into and continue the meditation.

But, for how long? How does the seeker know that he has gained the 'realization'? According to the *poorva pakshin*, he has to wait for the 'extra-ordinary' experience. But, there may be several extra-ordinary experiences; because, the *saamkhyaa* philosophers and also the *Yoga* philosopher Patanjali, talk of *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, when the aspirant gets an extra-ordinary experience – but, both philosophies talk only of *dvaitham* . Therefore, how does the seeker identify that particular experience which is 'realization'? How is he to know that he has got the right extra-ordinary experience of *nirvishesha advaita jnaanam*? The *poorva pakshin* has no reply for this. He only says that the seeker himself, at the appropriate time, will know that 'self-proving' mystical experience. Till such time, he should continue the meditation, also gradually increasing the duration of the meditation.

- अहं ब्रह्मेति समभिजायते - that 'I am Brahman', emerges / rises.

The *poorva pakshin* continues:

- तस्मात् विज्ञात् एव - Only through that mystical saakshaathkaara,
- कैवल्यं आप्नोति - the liberation is achieved.
- इति - Up to this, is the *poorva pakshin's* statement of his theory.

Sureswaraacharya responds:

- तत् निराकरणाय - To negate this theory,
- इदं उच्यते - the following *sloka* is given.

Chapter III: Verse 9 –

सामानाधिकरण्यादेर्घटितरखयोरिव।

व्यावृत्ते ॥ ९ ॥ :साक्षान्नस्तत्त्वमर्थयोः स्यादवाक्यार्थः :

According to us, the relations i.e. co-ordination, subject-predicate relation and indirect indication, connecting words, their meanings and the Self, bring out directly the non-verbal import of 'That thou art', like the identity of space through the cancellation of the different adjuncts.

Sureswaraacharya is answering the *poorva pakshin's* contention, that, a sentence can reveal only *savishesha eka vasthu*. As already discussed in detail, according to the *poorva pakshin*: "If a sentence is revealing a single object, then, one word in the sentence will be revealing the object and the other words will be revealing its attributes; then the single object revealed will be only an attributed object ; an attributeless object cannot be revealed by a sentence". This is his contention.

In reply, Sureswaraacharya says: "That need not be; what you say is generally true. Wherever there are *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyaani*, the *vaakyaani* (like the example given earlier, viz., the *sloka 'prapanna paarijaathaya'*, which is a *saamaanaadhikaranya vaakyam*) will reveal one object with its attributes. We do agree, that, this is the general rule. But, we have exceptions to that rule also. Exceptional sentences can be ingeniously composed. These exceptional sentences are called 'equation sentences' – '*eiyyka vaakyaani*' -, in which sentences, two objects are equated as one single object. An 'equation sentence / statement' will talk about two objects – but, by equation, the two objects are reduced into one object. Therefore, the sentence, ultimately, is revealing only one object."

How does this happen? When two objects are equated, the two objects are introduced before equation. Both of them have got attributes. The first object that is introduced, has attributes; in the same manner, the second object that is introduced also, has attributes. These two 'introduced-attributed-objects' are equated and when the equation takes place, the sentence is constructed in such a way that these two attributes get mutually cancelled. To repeat: The sentence is made in such a way, that, in the beginning of the equation object no. 1 also has got attributes and object no. 2 also has got attributes; but, at the time of equation, the first set of attributes belonging to object 1, cancels the second set of

attributes belonging to object 2 and, likewise, the second set of attributes belonging to object no. 2, cancels the first set of attributes belonging to object no. 1.

This logic / argument is called *sundha-upasundha-nyaaya*: |

The name is based on a *puranic* story. *Sundha* and *Upasundha* were two loving and friendly brothers, but, together striking terror in the *devas* and the humans. *Bhagavaan* decided to eliminate them; He took the form of a very beautiful girl and appeared before them; both got infatuated with the girl, who promised to marry any one of them, if the other was also made to agree. For the sake of the girl, the brothers fought and killed each other, leaving behind only the 'girl'.

Based on this logic of *sundha-upasundha-nyaaya*:, in the mahaa vaakyam equation, the jeevaathma viseshanaani and the Paramaathma viseshanaani cancel each other, leaving out one Padhaartha - the eka aathmaa.

To convey this idea, in *Advaita Vedhaanthee*, an example is commonly given: "*Soyam Devadattha*". This statement alludes to the following imagery: An individual has seen the person *Devadatta* years before and sees him again after a long gap of time, but, fails to recognize him, because the physical features of the past *Devadattha* and the physical features of the present *Devadatha* are so much different. But, when a third person points out to him "*Soyam Devadattha*:" - "It is the same *Devadattha*, whom you have seen earlier; **that** *Devadattha* is **this** *Devadattha*", recognition of *Devadattha*, dawns on the individual.

To drive home the point, Swamiji recalled a similar incident that happened a few years before. Swamiji's disciple Swami Omkaaraananda joined Swamiji for a *Puja* in *Asthika Samajam*. He had come to Chennai after a long gap of time. During this period, his physical appearance had changed, since he had been requested to take over as the head of an existing Mutt, which position required a particular type of tuft and beard. He had also lost weight. Quite a number of participants in the *Puja* - Swamiji's students - had known Swami Omkaaraananda earlier, having attended Swamiji's *Saadhanaa* camps, where Swami Omkaaraananda also had conducted classes, and the students had listened to him. In spite of this, during almost a full hour of the *Puja* time, they had not recognized Swami Omkaaraananda. Later, after the *Puja*, when Swamiji presented Swami Omkaaraananda to the gathering, they recognized him and exclaimed: "Oh! Yes! That Omkaaraananda is this *Swami*; **that** *Swami* is **this** *Swami*".

What is happening in these 'equation statements'? It is a very big enquiry in *Vedhaanthee*. How many people does one understand through each of these statements? The statements

contain many words; for instance, "*That Swami is this Swami*" is a sentence with many words. Even so, the listeners are recognizing only one Swami.

Now, in the *Saasthras*, they ask the question: "When you recognize the Swami through this equation, at the time of recognition of this 'oneness', do you keep in your mind his past physical features or his present physical features?". And, also give the answer: "If you are holding on to the past physical features, the equation will not tally, because the past physical features contradict the present physical features. If you are retaining the present physical features also, the equation will not tally, since the present physical features contradict the past physical features.

"Therefore, when you are 'grasp'ing the Swami, intellectually you are dropping (not physically removing) both the past and present features. Intellectually, an extraordinary phenomenon takes place. Intellect *can* do that. What is that extraordinary phenomenon? You are 'grasp'ing a Swami, who is stripped of both the past attributes and the present attributes.

"If you are holding on to any one set of the attributes, the sentence will be illogical / will have no sense. If the sentence has to have a sense and you have to 'grasp' that sense, you should understand that, the past Swami had past attributes and the present Swami has got present attributes, but, the 'grasp'ed Swami is stripped of both his past and present attributes".

The *Sasthraas* have a name for this knowledge. They call it '*vyakthi maathra jnaanam*'. '*Vyakthi*' means 'individual'; '*maathra*' means 'only'; '*vyakthi maathra*' | 'only that individual' means 'without *bootha gunaa*: (past attributes) and *varthamaana gunaa*: (present attributes)'. The knowledge that takes place is: "*bootha varthamaana guna rahitha kevala vyakthi maathra jnaanam*".

Thus, in the 'equation statements', both past and present attributes are mutually cancelled.

The difference between the *saamaanaadhikaranya* vaakyani and the 'equation statements' should thus be clearly understood. In the sloka, "prapanna parijaathaaya thothra vetraika paanaye jnaamudhraaya Krishnaaya Geethaamruthaduhe nama:", each word is cumulatively adding an attribute to Krishna and therefore, at the end of the sloka, one gets to know a Krishna, who has got added attributes. In contrast, in the sentence, "Soyam Devadattha:" the 'many words' have not added any attribute; on the other hand, the word 'sa:' and the word 'ayam' have cancelled the attributes of each other and the listener gets *vyakthi maathra bodha*: | And, that vaakyam is called *vyakthi maathra bodhaka vaakyam*.

Thus, we have got certain unique sentences.

There is another sentence also, on which a very big analysis is done in *Vedhaanthaa: "Prakrushta prakaasa: Chandra:"* | Pages and pages have been written on this *vaakyaa*. For *Brahma Soothra Chathussoothri*, there is a *Teeka*, known as '*Poornaanandeeya Teeka*'; and there is a text known as '*samkshepa saareerakaad*', authored by *Sarvangyaathmendra Sarwawathi*. Both these, viz., '*Poornaanandeeya Teeka*' and '*samkshepa saareerakaad*' discuss this sentence, in detail.

The two sentences '*Soyam Devadhatta:*' and '*Prakrushta Prakaasa: Chandra:*' are examples of rare 'equation sentences', where the sentence can reveal an entity without attributes.

And, how do they reveal an entity without attributes? As explained earlier, through an ingenious method, by which, one word reveals one set of attributes and a second word reveals another set of attributes, but, both mutually cancel each other. In a similar manner, in the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*thathvamasi*', the word '*thath*' reveals a *Paramaathmaa*, with one set of attributes; the word '*thvam*' reveals the *jeevaathmaa*, with another set of attributes; the word '*as*' joins them; and, at the time of the joining, the seeker 'grasps' an '*eka aathmaa*', without any attribute. The example of the incident involving *Swami Omkaaraananda*, given earlier, may be recalled. The 'external' past *Swami* had past attributes; the 'external' present *Swami* has present attributes; but, the 'grasped' 'internal' *Swami* has no attributes.

Similarly, from the *mahaa vaakyam*, the intellect can 'grasp' an *aathmaa*, which does not have either *thath padha gunaa:* or *thvam padha gunaa:*; *thvam padha gunaa:* will cancel *thath padha gunaa:* and *thath padha gunaa:* will cancel *thvam padha gunaa:* | Contrasting attributes such as *alpagnthvam* and *sarvagnthvam*, *alpasakthimathvam* and *sarvasakthimathvam* etc., will all get stripped and the seeker can understand the fact: "*aham nirvishesha nirguna chaithanyam asmi*" - " 'I' am the *eka aatjmaa*,, without *alpagnthvam* and *sarvagnthvam*, *alpasakthimathvam* and *sarvasakthimathvam* etc.". | It is possible.

And, in order to establish this view, instead of citing the two sentences given as examples earlier, viz., "*Soyam Devadhatta:*" and "*Prakrushta Prakaasa: Chandra:*", *Sureswaraachaarya* is taking up yet another sentence: "*Ghataakaasa: Mahaakaasa: asthi*", meaning "Pot-space is identical with the total space".

This sentence has got many words. Initially it reveals two entities, '*ghataakaasa*' and '*mahaakaasaad*' and by using the verb '*asthi*', the sentence declares that, both of them are identical. When, thus, both of them are declared identical or equal, the listener 'grasps' an

aakaasa: / What type of *aakaasa* is 'grasped' by the intellect? '*Ghataaakaasa*' has got '*alpathva guna:*', while *mahaakaasaa* has got '*mahathva guna:*', two contradicting attributes. And, when the equation is done, if the listener is retaining any one of the *gunaas*, *alpathvam* or *mahathvam*, the equation will not tally, because they are contradictory to each other and neither of them can apply to both *mahaakaasaa* and *ghataaakaasaa*. Therefore, the 'grasped' *aakaasaa* cannot have either *alpathva guna:* or *mahathva guna:* / Thus, the sentence is presented in such a way that both attributes – '*sundha upasundha nyaayena*' – are mutually knocked off. And, this unique sentence is able to reveal an *aakaasaa*, which is free from all these attributes – *ghataaakaasasya alpathvam* and *mahaakaasasya mahathvam* etc.

"In a similar manner", Sureswaraachaaryaa says "the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*thathvamas'* **can** reveal the fact: '*aham nirvishesham Brahma asmi*". And, is this *saakshaathkaaraa* or not? The *Aachaaryaa* asserts: "This understanding **is** *saakshaathkaara*, the other term for *saakshaathkaara* being *aparoksha jnaanam*. This is the 'right understanding' / 'knowledge' / 'Realization'. No other separate meditation or mystical experience is required, because, when I know 'I' am *nirvishesham Brahman*, I am liberated".

The *Aachaaryaa* further implies: "If a seeker says: 'I have understood 'I' am *nirvishesha Brahman*; but, I am waiting for liberation', his statement is wrong. Such a situation is not possible. *Sraavana eva saakshaathkaara: sambhavathi* | Do not condemn the knowledge attained through *sravanam* as 'book-knowledge'. You do not have book knowledge alone; you have got 'real knowledge' only. Therefore, come to 'binary' format, immediately after *sravanam* / *vicharaa*; do not wait or look for a mystical experience to change the format from 'triangular' to 'binary'".

Getting back to the verse:

- घट इतर खयोइव : - As in the case of '*ghataaakaasaa* – *mahaakaasaa*' equation,

'*Kham'* means '*aakaasam*'; '*ghata:*' means 'pot'; '*ithara:*' means 'the other one' and, in this context, implies '*mahaa*'. The word '*kham*' should be joined with both '*ghata*' and '*ithara*'; '*ghata kham*' means '*ghataaakaasaa*'; '*ithara kham*' means '*mahaakaasaa*'. When the two are referred to together, in *shashti dvivachanam*, it becomes '*ghata ithara khayo :*' and '***Ghata ithara khayo: iva***' conveys the meaning 'Like the equation of *ghataaakaasa- mahaakaasaa* pair'.

- सामानाधिकरण्यादे: - the usage of *saamaandhikaranyam* etc., (in the *mahaa vaakya*),

Here, by using the word '*saamaandhikaranyaadhe:*', Sureswaraachaaryaa wants the students to remember the three *sambhandhaas*, which he had already talked about, in verse no.3 of the current chapter.

In other words, '**saamaandhikaranyaadhe:**' means 'thridha sambhandhasya' – 'for the threefold relationship, viz., saamanaadhikaranyam, viseshana-viseshyathaa and lakshya-lakshana sambhandha:' |

- तत्त्वमर्थयोः - for the thath padhaartha and thvam padhaartha,
- व्यावृत्तेः - since the attributes are mutually cancelled,

'*Vyavrutthe:*' actually means '*visesha vyaavrutthe:*' (the word '*visesha*' is to be supplied).

And, '**Thaththvamarthayo: (visesha) vyaavrutthe:**' means 'since the attributes of *thath padhaartha paramaathmaa* and *thvam padhaartha jeevaathmaa*, which are contradictory attributes, get mutually cancelled' / 'because of the mutual nullification of the attributes of *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa*.

It may be recollected again, that, in the *sloka*, '*prapanna paarijaathaaya thothra vethraika paanaye jnaana mudhraaya Krishnaaya Geethamruthaduhe nama:*', the attributes do not cancel each other. On the other hand, they get added. Whereas, in the sentence '*soyam devadhattha:*', the attributes do not get added; but, they cancel each other. That's why '*lakshya-lakshana-sambhanda:*' is introduced after the cancellation of attributes.

- अवाक्यार्थसाक्षात् स्यात् : - a non-sentential / non relational meaning is grasped directly.

What is that non-relational meaning? Ans: '*Nirvisham chaithanyam / aathma*'.

This *nirvishesha aathmaa* cannot be called *jeeva-aathmaa*, because if the adjective '*jeeva*' is added, one set of attributes will have to be accepted; in the same manner, addition of the adjective '*parama*' will result in acceptance of another set of attributes.

Therefore, what the seeker grasps from the mahaa vaakyaa is '*paramathva jeevathva rahitha nirvishesha advaita sajaatheeya vijaatheeya svagatha bedha rahitha aathmaa*'; and, this jnaanam is called *avaakyartha:*, in this verse.

The use of the word '*saakshaath*' emphasizes that the knowledge can be grasped 'directly', at the time of *sravanam* itself.

This is exactly like 'grasping' the Swamiji, in the incident involving Swami Omkaaraanandaa, quoted earlier. When it was pointed out that, '**that** Swamiji is **this** Swamiji', a 'mysterious' Swamiji was 'grasped' and, at the time of 'grasping' the Swamiji did not have past or present physical features. That recognition is called '*vyakthi maathra jnaanam*'.

In the same manner, 'chaithnya maathra jnaanam syaadeva' - 'chaithaya maathra jnaanam is definitely possible'.

The fact that should encourage the student is that many seekers **have gained** that knowledge. If asked, Sureswaraachaarya will answer confidently: 'Yes, I have understood'. So many have gathered this knowledge; and in *Kenopanishad* the student straightaway said: "*Naaham manye suvedheti, no na vedhethi vedha cha/ yo nasthadvedha thath vedha, no na vedhethi vedha cha/*" (II. 2) "I do not think that I know *Brahman* well. Not that I do not know *Brahman*. I know and I do not know. Among us, the one who knows that statement 'Not that I don't know. I know and I don't know' knows that *Brahman*".

And, therefore, it (chaithnaya maathra jnaanam) is possible (from mere mahaa vaakya sravanam / vichaaraa).

128. Chapter III, Verse 9 to 11 (31-01-2009)

In this portion (verse 9 – Ch. III), Sureswaraacharya is referring to a debate, which is there, between two groups of *advaitins* themselves.

One group of *advaitins* claim: "Sravanam gives only secondary 'book-knowledge'. Only through subsequent meditation and *samaadhi*, 'direct knowledge' / 'direct experience' / *saakshaathkaaraa* / 'realization' / 'liberating knowledge' is possible".

Sureswaraacharya does not accept this theory; he says: "*Mahaa vaakyam* itself has the capacity to give *advaita jnaanam* / *aparoksha jnaanam*. If a person wants meditation to prepare the mind, it is wonderful; meditation can be utilized for removing obstacles; but, even if one practices meditation and *samaadhi* for removal of obstacles, one has to come to *mahaavaakyam* alone for 'liberating knowledge', since *mahaa vaakyam* is the only source of *aparoksha jnaanam*."

This debate is the *Aacharya's* topic now, in these portions.

As already pointed out, Sureswaraacharya had referred to this *poorva pakshaa* earlier also, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 67, of Chapter I. The relevant portion is "*apare thu bhroovathe vedhaanthavaakya janitham 'aham brahmethi' vijnaanam samsargaathmakavaath aathmavasthu yaathaathmya avaghaahyeva na bhavati | Kim tharhi | Ethadeva Gangaasrothovath sathatham abhyastha: anyadeva avaakyaarthaathmakam vijnaanaantharam uthpadhyathe | Thadeva asesha ajnaana thimirothsaari ithi |*" - "Others, again, say : 'The knowledge of the form 'I am *Brahma*' signifies a complex whole of associated parts and therefore does not constitute a correct apprehension of the Self at all. What then ? In the mind of an aspirant, who practices continuously this knowledge itself, like the flow of the Ganga, a new type of knowledge arises, which is an integral apprehension transcending verbal cognition. It is this new knowledge alone that expels all darkness of ignorance' ".

Sureswaraacharya refutes the *poorva pakshin*, in this *sloka* (verse 9 – Chapter III), completed in the earlier session. The *Aacharya* says: "In an 'equation sentence' – '*aiykya vakyam*', - there can be mutual cancellation of the attributes of two introduced objects and ultimately one attributeless entity can be revealed through the equation. In the *mahaa vaakyaas*, when *jeevaathmaa* and *paramaathmaa* are equated, one *aathmaa*, which is free from the *jeevathvam* attributes , as well as the *paramathvam* attributes, is revealed. An attributeless, non-dual *aathmaa* can be revealed through a sentence. Even though a sentence has many words, ultimately many words can reveal the non-dual reality".

Examples of such sentences in Vedhaanthea, viz., (i) Soyam Devadhattha: (ii) Prakrushta prakaasa: Chandra: and (iii) ghataakaasa: mahaakaasa: asthi etc., were discussed earlier.

Not only in *Vedhaanthea*, but, in other areas also, this view, viz., "In an 'equation sentence' - '*aiykya vaakyam*' - , there can be mutual cancellation of the attributes of the introduced objects and ultimately one attributeless entity can be revealed through the equation" is equally true.

'Equation' need not be there when two things are evidently the same and 'equation' cannot be there, when two things are basically and evidently different. For instance, in Arithmetic, nobody will say " $8 = 8$ ", since it is an obvious fact; nobody will say " $8 = 9$ " also, because the two numerals are obviously different.

Then, when is an 'equation' done or necessary? Ans : "When two things are *superficially* different but *essentially* the same, 'equation' becomes necessary".

To understand this better, again an example from Arithmetic may be considered: " $5 + 3 = 9 - 1$ " is an 'equation'. The numbers on the left side are different from the numbers on the right side; the arithmetical signs on the two sides also are different. There is a 'plus' sign (+) on the left side; and, a 'minus' sign (-) on the right side. Thus, one's eyes are visually perceiving differences. But, behind the visible differences, one discerns the invisible number '8'. Having discerned the invisible '8' from the left side, one removes / eliminates the visible (5 + 3), which is only an 'incidental' attribute of the number '8'. Similarly, from the right side, the intellect again discerns the invisible '8', rejecting the visible (9-1), which is also only an incidental attribute of 8. Thus, the visible attributes on both sides are eliminated and the invisible number '8' (not written in the equation) is 'grasped' on either side. Thus, in the first stage, there are two '8's ; on the left hand side, there is an '8' ; on the right hand side also there is an '8'. In the middle, there is an 'equation'. Then, by seeing the 'equation', one combines both the invisible '8's and removes the equation sign also. Thus, the numbers 5, 3, 9 and 1 and the signs '+', '-' and '=' are all eliminated ; all plurality disappears. What is left out is only one *akanda aksharam* - the number '8'.

In the same manner, in the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thathvamasI, jeevathvam*' attributes are removed from '*thvam*' and *paramathvam* attributes are removed from '*thatth*' and one attributeless, non-dual *Brahman* or *aathmaa* alone remains. This is called *avaakyarthha*: - non-sentential / non-relational meaning.

This may give rise to another doubt : "If all the *jeevaas*' attributes and all the *Paramaathmaa's* attributes are removed, there is nothing left behind".

This is the typical doubt raised by the *visishtaadvathin*, because, he does not accept a *nirguna vasthu*. According to him, "Since there can be no *nirguna vasthu*, if all the attributes are removed, there can be nothing".

To this doubt, Swami Vidhyaaranyaa gives a nice answer, through an example, in his treatise, *Panchadasee*. He asks: "If you go through a room, where everything including air, has been removed, and if a question is asked of you 'What is there in the room?' your normal answer will be 'there is nothing' ". Swami Vidhyaaranyaa proceeds : "If you say 'there is nothing', what is the meaning of that word 'nothing'?" And, points out: "Even though you use the word 'nothing', that word means only 'space' or 'pure *aakaasaa*' – an *aakaasaa*, from which everything that is removable has been removed. When everything removable has been removed, what remains is 'objectless *aakaasaa*', which alone you are referring to as 'nothing'. And, 'pure *aakaasaa* is a positive entity. It is not *abhaava roopam*; but, is a *bhaava roopal* positive / existent entity, which is, in fact, one of the *pancha mahaa boothaas*. The subtlest matter is *aakaasaa* and you have referred to that 'pure *aakaasaa*' as 'nothing'. Just as in this worldly context, 'nothing' actually means 'pure *aakaasaa*', which is a positive entity, in *mahaa vaakyaa*, that 'nothing'(after elimination of *jeevathva* and *paramathva* attributes) actually would mean 'Pure Existence- Consciousness, which is also a *bhaava roopa padhaartha* / an entity".

Vedhaantha , further, exhorts the seeker : " Therefore, you have to 'know' this 'nothing' . That 'nothing' is the ultimate reality, knowing which, you are going to get liberated. The 'nothing', in this context, means 'Pure Existence-Consciousness', called *aathmaa*, which is free from *jeevathva* attributes and *paramathva* attributes.

"And, this 'Pure Existence-Consciousness', **can** be revealed through *mahaavaakyam*. When? During *sravanam* itself, when both *jeevathva* attributes and *paramathva* attributes get mutually cancelled. For that purpose, you need not sit in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. If, during the course of your *saadhanaas*, you enjoy the state of *samaadhi*, we do not ban it. But, *samaadhi* or meditation is **not** required / **not** essential for he *advaita jnaanam- aham brahma asmi*."

This is what is said, by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in the *sloka* (verse 9 – Chapter III).

The *anvayaa* of the *sloka* is tricky and is given below:

- घटेतरखयो :इव सामानाधिकरण्यादे) :तत्त्वमर्थयो :विरुद्धाम्श (व्यावृत्ते :न :अवाक्यार्थ :साक्षात् स्यात्।

The term '*vridhaamsa*' meaning 'contradictory attributes', is supplied. '*Avaakyārtha*.' means '*aparoksha jñānam*'. The term '*saakshaath*' means 'directly possible'. When? During *sravanam* itself.

This theory is called '*saabhda aparoksha vaadha*.' which is a teaching, which claims "*Aparoksha jñānam* can be gained during *sravanam* itself and not in meditation or *samaadhi*." | The word '*Na*.' means '*asmaakam pakshhe*' / 'according to our theory, viz., *saabhda aparoksha vaadha*.'

'*Saakshaannasthaththvamarthayo*.' should be split as '*saakshaath + na: + thaththvamarthayo*;', the term '*thaththvamarthayo*.' itself being a compound word.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 10:

कुतोऽवाक्यार्थोऽवसीयत इति चेत्तत्रप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं विशेषणविशेष्ययोः सामर्थ्योक्तिः । :

How is the non-verbal import understood? To answer this, the efficacy of subject-predicate relation is explained.

Here Sureswaraachaaryaa is referring to an idea given in the 2nd verse of this chapter; he is repeating that idea to go further on it. And, that idea is: "mutual cancellation of the contradictory attributes". The *Aachaaryaa* wants to explain here as to 'which cancels which'. He says:

- "कुत" अवसीयते :अवाक्यार्थः - "How is the 'non-sentential' meaning arrived at?" / "How do you arrive at the attributeless Consciousness?"

'*Avaakyārtha*.' is an unique expression in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. The literal translation of the expression is 'non-sentential meaning', which, the *Aachaaryaa* uses, to give the meaning 'the attributeless Consciousness'. Therefore, the question "*Kutha: vaakyārtha: avaseeyathe*" is to be interpreted as "How do you arrive at the attributeless Consciousness?"

'*Avaseeyathe*' is the verb, in passive voice, meaning 'is arrived at'.

While the *poorva pakshi* group lead by *Aachaaryaa* Vaachaspathi Misra, holds that the attributeless Consciousness cannot be understood during *sravanam* and that, only during *nirvikalpa samaadhi* it can be understood, Sureswaraachaarya firmly says "No, during *sravanam* itself, it can be understood".

If asked, 'how is it 'grasped'? – '*kutha: avaseeyathe*?':

- इति चेत् - If such a question is raised,
- तत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थ - to answer that question,
- विशेषण विशेष्ययोःसामर्थ्य उक्ति : - the extraordinary function of the *viseshanam* and *viseshyam*, is being explained.

'*Saamarthyam*' means 'extraordinary function'; '*ukthi:*' means 'explanation'.

This is the second stage of the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

The three stages of the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* have been dealt with, earlier. '*Saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa*' is the first stage; '*viseshana-viseshya bhaava sambhandhaa*' is the second stage. '*Lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa*' is the third stage.

Here, Sureswaraacharya is dwelling upon the 2nd stage, '*viseshana viseshya bhaava sambhandhaa*'. When the seeker listens to the '*jeevaathma - Paramaathma-eikyam*', initially, '*jeevaathma*' becomes an adjective of '*Paramaathma*' and later, '*Paramaathma*' becomes an adjective of '*jeevaathma*'. This is the direct / primary meaning that comes out of the '*eikyam*'. '*Jeevaathma*' status is given to '*Paramaathma*' and '*Paramaathma*' status is given to '*jeevaathma*'. When '*jeevaathma*' status is given to '*Paramaathma*', '*jeevaathma*' becomes '*viseshanam*' and '*Paramaathma*' becomes '*viseshyam*'; when '*Paramaathma*' status is given to '*jeevaathma*', '*Paramaathma*' becomes '*viseshanam*' and '*jeevaathma*' becomes '*viseshyam*'. Thus, the statuses are mutually exchanged. And, when the statuses are mutually exchanged, some of the attributes will have to be 'knocked off'.

And, what are those 'knocked-off' attributes?

Sureswaraacharya is about to explain the functions of the *viseshanams* - how they 'knock off' the contradictory attributes. That "knock-off" power to eliminate" is referred to as '*saamarthyam*', in this context, by the *Aacharya*. The word '*ukthi:*' means 'is being described / explained'.

Chapter III: Verse 10 -

निर्दुःखित्वं त्वमर्थस्य तदर्थेन विशेषणात् ।

प्रत्यक्ता च तदर्थस्य त्वंपदेनास्य संनिधे ॥ १० ॥ :

The meaning of 'Thou' is construed as free from sorrow owing to the predication of the meaning of 'That'. The meaning of 'That' receives the sense of immediacy, owing to the syntactical apposition to 'Thou'.

As was mentioned earlier, this is almost the repetition of the 2nd verse of this 3rd chapter and with the intention of progressing further on the same topic, the *Aachaaryaa* is repeating the idea.

Initially '*jeevaathmaa*' is serving as the noun – i.e. the *viseshyam* and '*Paramaathmaa*' comes as the adjective / the *viseshanam*. In other words, the '*Paramaathmaa*' status as a *viseshanam*, joins the '*jeevaathmaa*'. This is similar to saying 'blue lotus', where, the 'blueness' as *viseshanam*, is joining the substance / noun, the lotus. Similarly, the '*jeevaathmaa*', at the time of the *sravanam* of the *mahaavaakyam*, is approached by '*Paramaathmaa*' as the *viseshanam* and the '*Paramaathmaa*' status joins the '*jeevaathmaa*'.

Of course, the words '*Paramaathmaa*' and '*jeevaathmaa*' are not used in the *mahaavaakyam* '*thaththvamsi*'. '*Paramaathmaa*' is referred to by the word '*thath*', and the '*jeevaathmaa*' by the word '*thvam*'.

When that '*thath*' word is approaching '*thvam*', the *jeevaathmaa*, the most important feature of '*thath*' should join the *jeevaathmaa* and 'knock off' something else.

What is the most important status / feature of '*Paramaathmaa*', the '*thath*' padham? The Bhruguvalli of the Thaitheeya Upanishad (Manthra 6) answers this:

"Aanandho brahmethi vyajaanaath" – "(Sage Bhrugu) concluded that aanandhaa is Brahman".

During the process of *sravanam* itself, the '**Original Aanandhaa**', – **not** reflected *aanandhaa* – which is the intrinsic attribute / essential nature of *Brahman*, joins 'me', the *jeevaathmaa* and that powerful '*sathya aanandhaa*' must knock off the contradictory attribute '*dhu:kham*' or misery, from 'me', the *jeevaathmaa*. And, after taking away from 'me' - the **Aathmaa** -, the '*dhu:kham*' attribute must be handed over / transferred to *anaathmaa* – either *sthoola sareeram* or *sookshma sareeram* or *kaarana sareeram*.

The seeker (on *sravanam*) should move to the 'Binary format', handing over '*dhu:kham*' as an attribute of the *mithyaa anaathmaa*. 'Binary format' means 'Clasp Reduction' (i.e. reduction of 'claiming ownership and controllership' and of 'special prayers'), which means : "*dhu:kham* should be handed over to *anaathmaa*".

And, what about 'I'? Ans: 'I' am only the Witness of the *dhu:kam* of *anaathmaa* ; 'I', myself, am **ever** the "Aanandha aathmaa. Brahma puchchaam prathishta" – "Aanandhaa is the Self. Brahman is the tail, which is the support" , as the *Brahma Valli* of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* (*manthraa* 5) declares confidently.

Thus, the seeker should never say thereafter (i.e. after *mahaa vaakyam sravanam*) " I am miserable", because, 'misery' has been knocked off from 'me' ; 'I' am no more in 'triangular' format, praying to God to remove 'my' sorrow, since, 'I' have no sorrow at all, to be removed from 'me'.

This is what Sureswaraacharya says here (in this verse):

- तदर्थेन विशेषणात् - Because of the attribute provided by the adjective '*Paramaathmaa*' (the meaning of the word '*thath*'),

To elaborate: "Because of the qualification of *jeevaathmaa* with *Paramaathmaa* status, which is provided by the word *thath*, occurring in the *mahaa vaakyam*, in *saamaanaadhikaranyam* with *thvam padha*".

What is 'knocked off', because of this?

- निर्दुःखित्वं - the *dhu:khee* status is knocked off,
- त्वमर्थस्य - for the *jeevaathmaa* (which is the meaning of *thvam*),

After listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, the seeker should never say "I am sorrowful/ I am miserable / I am a *samsaari* etc." This attitude is called the 'binary format'. When does this happen? Ans: It happens when '*Paramaathmaa*' status is *viseshanam* and '*jeevaathmaa*' is the *viseshyam*.

Thereafter, the process is reversed. '*Paramaathmaa*' becomes *viseshyam* and '*jeevaathmaa*' status becomes *viseshanam*.

When '*jeevaathmaa*' becomes the adjective of '*Paramaathmaa*', through "joining the *jeevaathmaa* status by '*Paramaathmaa*' " some attributes of '*Paramaathmaa*' have to be 'knocked off'. According to *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*, '*Paramaathmaa*', though, in reality, is free of any attribute, is wrongly accorded a few unwanted attributes, which make '*me*' a *samsaari*.

What are those unwanted attributes? Ans: '*Paramaathmaa*' is a '**remote**' '**object**' to be '**reached**'.

We have given these attributes to '*Paramaathmaa*', viz., that, (i) "'*Paramaathmaa*' is an object different from 'me' ; (ii) '*Paramaathmaa*' is 'remote', located in *Vaikuntam/ Kailaasam* ; (iii) I have to go through *svarga vaasal*, travel through *sukhla gathi* and, after long travel, I have to 'reach' '*Paramaathmaa*'.

'Remoteness' is, thus, one unwanted status; 'object'ness', namely, that the '*Paramaathmaa*' is an 'object' other than 'me' , is another unwanted status. 'Goal'ness", resulting from the misconceived belief, that one has to 'travel and 'reach' '*Paramaathmaa*' is the third unwanted status. These three are incidental statuses given to '*Paramaathmaa*', because of ignorance.

The *Upanishads* exclaim: "What a blunder you are committing?"

Chaandoghya Upanishad declares: '*Eithaadhmyam idhagum sarvam thathsathyam sa aathmaa thaththvamasī*' – "All this has got That as the Self. That is the Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That". The *Upanishad* does not say: " It (*Paramaathmaa*) is inside you"; nor does it say "It (*Pramaathmaa*) is near you". There is no preposition in this *mahaa vaakyam*. *Paramaathmaa* is not inside you as *antharyaami* ; *Paramaathmaa* is not proximate to you. The *Upanishad* declares "*Paramaathmaa is you*" – "*thaththvamasī*".

If the statement is made only once, the student may take it as casual statement. It is repeated nine times, to stress "Drop the idea that *Paramaathmaa* is your goal".

When the '*Paramaathmaa*' becomes a '*viseshyam*', with *jeevaathmaa* status as a *viseshanam*, it 'knocks off' these three wrong attributes viz., "That *Paramaathmaa* is a goal; that '*Paramaathmaa*' is remote ; and that *Paramaathmaa* is an object".

The seeker 'knocks off' all these attributes and claims " 'I' **am** '*Paramaathmaa*' ; 'I' **am** *aanandhaa*; 'I' **am** *muktha*: ; *mokshaa* is **not** a goal for me. Hereafter, I shall never look upon 'my'self as a *saadhakaa* or a *mumukshu*".

Saadhakathva nivritthi should take place. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- त्वम्पदेन अस्य संनिधे: - Because of the qualification of '*jeevaathmaa*' status (being the meaning of '*thvam padhaa*')

- तदर्थस्य - for the '*Paramaathmaa*' (meant by the word '*thath*'),

'*Jeevaathmaa*' status becomes *viseshanam* and '*Paramaathmaa*' becomes *viseshyam*. Because of this, viz., 'the *jeevaathmaa* status attribute joining *Paramaathmaa*', at once, the three attributes are 'knocked off'.

- प्रत्यक्ता च - '*selfhood*' / intimacy / 'one'ness / *eykyam* takes place.

'*Prathyakthaad*' literally means 'inwardness'. Earlier, i.e., before *maahaa vaakya sravanam*, the seeker was looking up, appealing to *Bhaghavaan*: "I am facing a number of unsolvable problems ; therefore, take me to You". In reality, there is no question of *Bhaghavaan* 'taking' the seeker with Him. Therefore, the *Upanishads* exhort: "Do not look outwards". The *Katopanishad* points out: "*Kaschith dheera: prathyagaathmaanam aikshath aavrutthachakshu: amrithathvam icchar*" - "Desiring immortality, a rare discriminative one turns away his eyes and sees the inner Self" (II.1.1).

'*Prathyakthaad*' indicates that '*Paramaathmaa*' "becomes" 'me'.

Thus, the 'remoteness' of '*Paramaathmaa*' is removed; *samsaaraa* of *jeevaathmaa* is also removed. And, the non-remote, *asamsaari* 'I' is alone left behind.

And, how many 'I's? Ans: *Advaitam* (only one 'I').

Sureswaraachaaryaa expresses his surprise that there should be any confusion at all, on this fact.

Of course, an important problem is to be accepted / granted. When in the worldly example described earlier, the answer 'nothing' (to the question as to what was there in an empty room) actually means 'space', 'understanding' the space as a positive substance requires *sookshma buddhi* – a sharp intellect.

Space is a non-tangible, non-visible, formless, colourless, soundless and an extremely subtle entity. But, when the answer 'nothing' is made, that 'nothing' cannot be accepted in its literal sense. The listener's mind should be sensitized by him, to recognize that 'space', which is called 'nothing', in this context .

"Similarly" the *Vedhaanthin* says "in the *Vedhaanthic* context also, the 'nothing' **is** something which is called pure, objectless, attributeless Existence - Consciousness". Comprehension of the space, when it is called 'nothing' (in the worldly example) requires time and effort on the

part of the listener. Similarly comprehension of 'Pure Existence-Consciousness' will also require a sharp intellect. "*Dhrusyathe thu agriyaa buddhya*" - "It is understood by a sharp intellect" is an *Upanishadic* quotation.

"Therefore", the *Aachaaryaa* appeals "Do not reject my teaching as 'meaningless' and give up *Vedhaantha Vichaaraa*. Kindly be with me for some more time. You will understand that 'nothing' as 'something' and you will understand, that, in fact, that something is the 'only thing'. That 'thing' is 'I', *Brahman*, and it is worth knowing because that is *mokshaa* ; that, it (*Brahman*) is 'my'self.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 11 – Chapter III:

उक्तं सामानाधिकरण्यं विशेषणविशेष्यभावश्च संक्षेपतोऽथ लक्ष्यलक्षणव्याख्यानायाह।

Thus the co-ordination of terms and the subject-predicate relation of their meanings have been stated briefly. In interpretation of the indicator-indicated relation, the following is said:

Here, Sureswraachaaryaa says "Of these three stages of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, I have explained the two stages *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa* and *viseshana-viseshya sambhandhaa*. Now, I want to dwell on the *lakshana-lakshya-sambhandhaa*. I want to explain as to how it works".

As may be recollected, these three stages were mentioned in verse no. 3. Because of which, verse no. 3 is considered as *soothra sloka*:, while all these subsequent verses are considered *vyaakyaana sloka*: | That *soothra sloka* is considered to be extremely important. A number of *Vedhaantic Aachaaryas* have quoted the verse, in their expositions.

These three stages, *Saamaadhikaranya sambhandhaa*, *viseshana-viseshya sambhandhaa* and *lakshana-lakshya sambhaandhaa* should be carefully remembered by a serious student of *Vedhaantha*. These were more elaborately discussed, with specific emphasis on how they function, in *Vedhaantha Saaraah* classes, conducted earlier, with a number of examples also.

- सामानाधिकरण्यं - The relationship between the words, called *saamaanadhikaranyam*,
- विशेषणविशेष्यभावश्च - and also the relationship obtaining between the meanings of the words, in the form of adjective and substance / attribute and noun, called *viseshana-viseshya bhaava*:

'Noun-adjective' relationships is between words. 'Substance-attribute' relationship is between the meanings of the words.

- उक्तं - have been stated by me,
- संक्षेपतः - briefly.
- अथ – Hereafter,
- लक्ष्य लक्षण व्याख्यानाय - for the elucidation / commentary upon the lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa,
- आह - the following is said.

Lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa is the relationship between *lakshyam* and *lakshanam* / the 'indicated' and the 'indicator' / the *lakshyaartha* and *vaachyaartha* / the secondary and primary meanings of a word.

Going back to the example from arithmetic viz., the equation given earlier, ($5 + 3 = 9 - 1$), the numerals '5' and '3' and the symbol '+' are the visible components on the left hand side of the equation, and '8' is the non-visible component.

Similarly, '9 - 1' is the visible component on the right hand side and '8' is the invisible component.

The 'visible component' ($5 + 3$) or ($9 - 1$) is the '*vaachyaartha*'. What is the *lakshyaartha* of '5 + 3' or '9-1'? It is the invisible, unwritten '8'.

And, what is the relationship between the visible '5 + 3' and '8' or '9-1' and the invisible '8'? It is *lakshana lakshya sambhandhaa*.

The mathematics teacher does not want his student to remain on the visible components. He desires, that, even as the student's eyes perceive the visible components ($5 + 3$) or ($9 - 1$), his mind or his 'understanding' should not stay put with the visible components alone, but grasp the invisible, unwritten '8'.

Similarly, there is the visible *jeevaathmaa* (*thvam*), with inferior attributes and visible '*Paramaathma*' (*that*) with superior attributes; a diligent seeker should not stop with these two *vaachyaarthaas*. With the guidance of the *mahaa vaakyam*, he should proceed to the non-visible, attributeless, *eka aathmaa*, which is the *lakshyaartha*. This is the *lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa* between *lakshyaartha* and *vaachyaartha*.

The Aachaaryaa says:

Aaha – I am going to comment (upon the relationship between *vaachyaarthaa* and *lakshyaarthaa*).

Why do we require an elaboration? Ans: Because, there is a law of language, which, Sureswaraachaarya wants to apply here; since, otherwise, the *poorva pakshins*, who are experts in language and grammar analysis, may raise many objections.

Since Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to firmly establish the *Vedhaanthic* views, he desires to foresee and introduce all possible objections and to answer them suitably. Such a detailed study may not be required for an ordinary student of *Vedhaantha*; but, is a 'must' for advanced students.

The *vaachyaartham* and *lakshyaartham* of any word, must have some connection or other; from *vaachyaartham*, one can never understand an unconnected *lakshyaartham*. This fact was studied in an earlier context also, at the time of discussing the *jahathi lakshanaa*, the *ajahathi lakshanaa* and the *bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa*.

A simple worldly example will make this clearer. If it is said "There is a concert to-day, by Maharajapuram", how is the statement to be understood? 'Maharajapuram' is the name of a place. Obviously, the place cannot give a concert. So, the listener has to understand that a concert is to be given by someone connected with the place, Maharajapuram. In this example, the 'place' is the *vaachyaartham*; the listener should ignore the *vaachyaartham*, since, if the sentence is taken literally, it is meaningless. The listener has to understand the sentence as "There is a concert to-day given by someone connected to Maharajapuram", since only a person can give a concert; and, that 'someone' becomes the *lakshyaartham* of the word 'Maharajapuram'. Obviously, the listener cannot also understand the musician as a person totally unconnected with 'Maharajapuram'. The person has to be connected to the place 'Maharajapuram', either as a native or through some other well-known manner.

Thus, there is a law given in interpretation: "When you give up *vaachyaarthaa* and come to *lakshyaarthaa*, the *vaachyaarthaa* and *lakshyaarthaa* cannot be anything that you like. They are not subject to your whims and fancies. There must be relationship".

Here, in the *mahaa vaakya vichaara*, for the *vaachyaarthaa jeevaathmaa*, we are arriving at the *lakshyaarthaa aathmaa*, the attributeless One; and, similarly for the *vaachyaarthaa Paramaathmaa* also, endowed with *anantha kalyaana guna ghanaas*, we are arriving at the *lakshyaarthaa* – the attributeless *aathmaa*. This attributeless *aathmaa*, the *lakshyaarthaa*, should have connection with the *vaachyaarthaa* of *jeevaathmaa* and the *vaachyaarthaa* of *Paramaathmaa*.

(Just as a reminder: the word '*vaachyaartha*' is used here to mean 'primary meaning' and the word '*lakshyaartha*' to mean 'secondary meaning').

The 'secondary meaning' ('*lakshyaartha*') *aathmaa*, should be connected / related to the 'primary meaning' *jeevaathmaa* and also *Paramaathmaa*. Then alone, from the attributed ones, *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, we can go to the attributeless One.

The *poorva pakshin* raises an objection. He says: "You cannot arrive at *aathmaa* or *Brahman* as a *laksyaartha* at all". This objection is referred to, by *Swami Vidhyaraanaya*, in his *prakaranam - Panchadasee*, Ch. I., during his discussions on the *mananam* topic. The *poorva pakshin* says: "You cannot arrive at the *Brahman*, as *lakshyaartha* in the *mahaa vaakyam*; because, to arrive at a *lakshyaartha*, it should be connected to the *vaachyaartha*. But, you say that *Brahman* is *asanghasvaroopam* – 'relationless'. 'Relationsless' means 'no connection with anything'. How can a thing which has no connection, be revealed as *lakshyaartham* of either *jeevaathma vaachyaartha* or *Paramaathma vaachyaartha*? For either of them, *Brahman* cannot be said to be the *lakshyaartha*, because, the moment you say *Brahman* is *laksyaartha*, *Brahman* will have a connection. Once you say there is a connection, *Brahman* will no more be *asanghaa*. In the process, you will convert *asangham Brahman* into *sasangham Brahman*, having *lakshya-lakshana sambhandha*: | Therefore, *lakshyaartha* is not possible. If you still say it is possible, you will have to explain, as to how it is possible".

Sureswaraachaaryaa is answering this *poorva pakshin* in this *sloka*. He will point out "There is a peculiar relationship between *Brahman*, the *adhishtaanam*, and the *saguna jeevaathmaa*; and, similarly between the *saguna Paramaathma* and the *nirguna Paramaathmaa*. Once you understand that peculiar relationship, you can happily arrive at the *lakshyaartha*".

This is the discussion that follows.

129. Chapter III, Verse 11 to 13 (07-02-2009)

Chapter III: Verse 11 -

कूटस्थबोधप्रत्यक्त्वनिमित्तं सदात्मनः ।

बोद्धताहंतयोर्हेतुस्ताभ्यां तेनोपलक्ष्यते ॥ ११ ॥

The unchanging immediate awareness, that is self-existent, is the nature of the real Self. This is the cause of the mind's cognizing power and the immediacy that its ego-hood enjoys. Therefore, by virtue of this cognizing power and immediacy of the mind being causally dependent on the Self, the latter is indicated by them.

In these verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is explaining the soothra sloka, which was given as the third verse of this chapter, viz.

"Saamaanaadhikaranyam cha viseshana viseshyathaa |
Lakshya lakshana sambhandha: padhaarthaprathyagaathmanaam".

That *soothra sloka* is being explained here, in these portions.

That *soothra sloka* reveals the three stages of comprehending the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., (1) *Saamaanaadhikaranyam* (2) *Viseshana-viseshyathaa* and (3) *Lakshya lakshana sambhandhaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa's contention is: "If a person goes through these three stages, then *aparoksha jnaanam* is possible, at the time of *sravanam* itself. No separate exercise like meditation is required for gaining *aparoksha jnaanam*".

Of these three stages, the *Aachaaryaa* had explained the first two stages:

(1) the first stage, as in the form of *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, the words 'thath' and 'thvam' being in the same case, in the *mahaa vaakyam* 'thath thvam asi'.

(2) the second stage, as the consequent viseshana-viseshya bhaava sambhandhaa, where, 'thath', the Paramaathmaa is the viseshanam for 'thvam', the jeevaathmaa and, similarly 'thvam', the jeevaathmaa, is the viseshanam for 'thath', the Paramaathmaa, thus serving mutually as viseshana viseshyaani.

How is the student to understand this *viseshana- viseshya sambhandhaa*? Ans: When it is said that *jeevaathmaa* is the *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa*, it means the *jeevaathmaa* status qualifies the *Paramaathmaa*; in other words, the *jeevaathmaa* status is an attribute of *Paramaathmaa*. Similarly, when it is said *Paramaathmaa* is the *viseshanam*, the *Paramaathmaa* status qualifies the *jeevaathmaa*, i.e., the *Paramaathmaa* status is an

attribute of *jeevaathmaa*. Thus, both statuses qualify both of them mutually. This is the *viseshana - viseshya bhaava sambhandhaa*.

Hereafter, the student has to go the *lakshya-lakshana-bhaava sambhandhaa*. Why should the study proceed to this third *sambhandhaa*? Ans: It is necessitated because, when the *jeevaathmaa* status is given to *Paramaathmaa* and also when the *Paramaathmaa* status is given to *jeevaathmaa*, there are contradictions; there are doubts arising in the intellect.

The first doubt is, since, sorrow or *samsaarithvam* is one of the statuses of *jeevaathmaa* – in fact, the main status - and, on the other hand, *Paramaathmaa* is known as *nithya muktha*: (ever free from *samsaarithvam*), how can the *jeevaathmaa* status qualify the *Paramaathmaa*? This seems to be one evident contradiction.

In the same manner, when the *Paramaathmaa* status qualifies *jeevaathmaa*, again there appears to be a contradiction; because, *Paramaathmaa* is always seen as something 'remote' in terms of space and time - especially as 'remote in time', because *Paramaathmaa* is defined as *jagath kaaranam*; and, *kaaranam* is always 'distanced' from '*kaaryam*', in terms of time.

To explain: Since *Paramaathmaa* is considered *jagath kaaranam*, *Paramaathmaa* must have been there in existence, before the generation of creation. '*Kaaranam*' is always 'past' and '*kaaryam*' is always 'present'. How can the past *Paramaathmaa*, having 'past'ness as its status, qualify the *jeevaathmaa*, who has got 'present'ness (*varthamaanathvam*) as the current status? How can '*boothathvam*' and '*varthamaanathvam*' / '*kaaranathvam*' and '*kaaryathvam*' be equated? '*Kaarana Paramaathmaa* status' cannot be there for '*kaarya jeevaathmaad*'.

Thus, when both these statuses qualify each other, we are experiencing logical problems of mutually contradicting attributes. Therefore, we are forced to go to the third stage.

And, what do we do, in the third stage? Ans : We will 'knock off' from the *jeevaathmaa*, those attributes which are contradicting the *Paramaathmaa* status and we will 'knock off' from *Paramaathmaa* also, those attributes which contradict the *jeevaathmaa* status.

From *Paramaathmaa*, the 'remoteness' / 'remoteness' in terms of time must be removed. This would mean that '*kaaranathvam*' should be removed, since, as long as one retains the '*kaaranam*' status for *Paramaathmaa*, the 'remoteness' status will also remain. Similarly, from the *jeevaathmaa*, *dhu:kithvam* must be removed.

Thus, after knocking of the attributes, we should come to new secondary meanings for both the words *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*. The primary meanings of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* should be changed to secondary meanings, in which, some of the attributes must be 'stripped off'.

This is done for both *thvam padhaartha*, the *jeevaathmaa* . and *that padhaartha*, the *Paramaathmaa*. The secondary meanings are called '*lakshyaarthaas*'.

But, while travelling from '*vaachyaartha*' to '*lakshyaartha*', we should find the *lakshya-lakshana sambhandha*. In other words, the *vaachyaartha* and the *lakshyaartha* – the primary meaning and secondary meaning - should have some *sambhandha* / relationship.

This was explained in the earlier session with the example of the statement "Maharajapuram is giving a concert to-day, with Lalgudi and Kaaraikuddi as accompaniments". When this statement is made, people in the know of *Carnatic* music and musicians , will immediately recognize the names of the musicians from the places indicated. The musicians are the *lakshyaarthaas* and the places are the *vaachyaarthaas*, in this context. For this to happen, obviously the 'place' and the 'musician' should have some connection.

For instance, the name 'Maharajapuram' cannot be understood as 'Michael Jackson', since there is no connection / *sambhandha* / relationship between the place 'Maharajapuram' and the person 'Michael Jackson'. When 'Maharajapuram' is understood as 'Santhanam' , 'Lalgudi' as 'Jayaraman' and 'Kaaraikkudi' as 'Mani', '*Aasraya aasritha sambhandha* / *janya janaka sambhandha* is there, between the places indicated and the musicians meant.

In the *mahaa vaakya vichaara* also, the student is expected to come from the *vaachyaartha* of '*that*' and '*thvam*', to the *lakshyaartha*, which *lakshyaartha* of both, is 'the pure *aathmaa*', without the limiting attributes. This is considered the third stage in the process of understanding the *mahaa vaakyaa*.

But, here, we meet with the following problem: "As explained earlier, to move from *vaachyaartha* to *lakshyaartha*, there has to be a *sambhandha* / relationship between the two. But, because *aathmaa* cannot have *sambhandha* with anything in creation, how can *aathmaa* be the *lakshyaartha* of anything ? How can *aathmaa*, the pure Consciousness, be arrived at, as *lakshyaartha*, since, if *aathmaa* has to become *lakshyaartha*, it should have connection with *vaachyaartha*, whatever the *vaachyaartha* is".

This is what the *poorva pakshi* also says : "*Aathmaa* being *asangha svaroopaa*., it cannot have *sambhandha* with **any** *vaachyaartha* in the Creation. Therefore, you cannot arrive at *nirguna, nirvishesha, asangha aathmaa*, through *mahaa vaakyam*".

This question alone is raised as the poorva pakshaa in Chapter I of Swami Vidhyaaranyaa's Panchadasee as : "savikalpasya lakshyathve lakshyasya syaadhavasthuthaa nirvikalpasya lakshyathvam na cha sambhaveeth"]

To counter this question, Sureswaraachaaryaa plans to talk about the *sambhandhaa*, in these portions.

Before actually entering the text, a broad, general explanation of the *Aachaaryaa's* approach will be helpful and is therefore, given first.

Sureswaraachaaryaa's arguments will be on the following lines: *Aathmaa*, the *asangha nirvikaara chaithanyam*, has got two essential features. One feature is, that, 'it is of the nature of Consciousness'. And, the other essential feature is that 'it is the innermost entity', which can be called 'Selfhood'. Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the word '*prathyakthvam*'. '*Prathyakthvam*' means 'inwardness' or 'intimacy'.

To explain '*prathyakthvam*' : Compared to the external world, an individual is closer to his physical body; i.e. one's physical body is 'internal' / 'inward', compared to the external world; but, compared to one's body, one's mind is 'internal' / 'inward'; similarly, compared to one's mind, the Consciousness is more 'internal' / 'inward'. But, beyond this, it can never be claimed that something else is even more 'inward', compared to Consciousness. In other words, *aathmaa* is the ultimate innermost entity. Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, uses the word '*prathyakthvam*', meaning inwardness / intimacy / real Selfhood, to describe this essential feature of *aathmaa*

And, *aathmaa* has got 'Consciousness' as its other essential feature. '*Kootastha bodha:*' is the word used by the *Aachaaryaa* here, in this verse, to denote this. '*Kootastha bodha:*' means 'changeless Consciousness'.

'*Kootastha bodham*' ('changeless Consciousness') and '*prathyakthvam*' ('real Selfhood') are the two essential features of *aathmaa*.

And, it is this *aathmaa*, which the *mahaavaakyam* wants to reveal through the word '*thvam*' i.e., when *sruthi* says '*thvam*', *sruthi* wants to reveal this *aathmaa*, which has got 'real Selfhood' and 'changeless Consciousness' as its nature. But, the *Upanishad* does not / is not able to, really and directly reveal this *aathmaa*. Therefore, it reveals the mind first as the *vaachyaartyhaa* / the primary meaning of the word '*thvam*'.

And, what type of mind? Ans: The mind which also has got two features.

What are the two features?

Ans : One feature / attribute is 'relative interior'ness', when compared to the external world and physical body. This is not 'absolute interior'ness', which only *aathmaa* has, but *relative interior'ness*, which may be termed as 'pseudo-selfhood'. This is called the 'ego' or '*ahamkaaraa*'; expressing the same idea in the inverse manner, 'ego' or '*ahamkaaraa*' is nothing but the mind, which enjoys 'pseudo selfhood' or 'relative interior'ness'. In common parlance, whenever anybody uses the word 'I', he / she is referring to this pseudo self / the mind only and not to the absolute Self, which is *aathmaa*. In statements such as "I am disturbed", the mind alone is being referred to, by the word 'I'. Even in religious beliefs such as "I am going to travel after death" or prayers such as "I do not want *punar janmaa*" etc., the word 'I' refers to the mind alone. Ironically, even after coming to *Vedhanthaa*, if and when a *Vedhaanthic* student says "I want to escape the world, never to come back again", the student obviously means the mind alone, referring to it, as 'I'. All these show that the mind has got 'pseudo selfhood' and 'relative interior'ness.

In contrast, the *aathmaa* has got 'absolute interior'ness' and 'real selfhood'.

The second attribute of mind: Earlier it was pointed out, that, the second feature of *aathmaa* / real nature is '*kootastha bodha*', meaning 'changeless Consciousness'. In contrast, the mind has got 'changing Consciousness' as its second attribute. *Aathma* has got 'changeless Consciousness' as its nature and the mind has got 'changing Consciousness' as its attribute. 'Changing Consciousness' means '*chidhaabhaasad* / reflected Consciousness.

Thus, the mind also has got two attributes, 'pseudo selfhood' and 'changing Consciousness', while *aathmaa* has 'absolute Selfhood' and 'changeless Consciousness' as its features. The *Upanishad*, in the first stage, reveals the 'pseudo self' with 'changing Consciousness', as the primary meaning of '*thvam*'; i.e., through the word '*thvam*', the *Upanishad* is revealing the mind which is the 'pseudo self', endowed with 'changing Consciousness' as its attribute.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, in the *mahaa vaakyam*, the mind is only the *vaachyaartham* of '*thvam*' and *aathmaa* is the *lakshyaartham* and, that, from the *vaachyaartham*, the student should go to the *aathmaa*, which is the 'real Self', with the 'changeless Consciousness' as its nature.

Thus, the travel has to be from the 'pseudo-self' to 'real Self' / from 'changing Consciousness' to 'changeless Consciousness' / from '*ahamkaaraa*' to '*saakshi*' / from '*chidhaabhaasaa*' to '*chith*'.

But, if, thus, mind / the *ahamkaara* is the *vaachyaartha* and *aathmaa* / the *saakshi*, is the *lakshyaartha*, there must be some *sambhandhaa* between the mind and the *aathmaa*. What is that *sambhandhaa*?

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the *sambhandhaa* is, that, the *aathmaa* alone converts the mind into the 'pseudo-I', by 'lend'ing Consciousness to the mind.

The mind, by itself, has no power to become the false 'I'. It is 'I', the *aathmaa* alone, which lends power to the mind to become the false 'I'.

How does it do that? Sureswaraachaaryaa is analyzing this process.

He points out, that, the 'mind' does not have the natural capacity to become 'I', the Self, because the mind is an external entity, being an object of 'my' experience. Mind, like any other object in the world, is also only an experienced entity; therefore, being an object / being *anaathmaa*, it does not have the capacity to become the 'I', by itself.

'That it is an object' is its first disqualification. I cannot claim any experienced object as myself. Mind is intimately experienced, but, it *is* an object only.

Not only is mind an experienced object, but it is also subject to appearance in *jaagrath avasthaa* and disappearance in *sushupthi avasthaa*.

This mind, which is *anaathmaa*, does not have the power to become 'I'.

The second fact is that the mind is an inert material, made up of *pancha bhoothaas*. Scientifically also, it is made up of *pancha bhoothaas* only, since science does not accept any 'mind' other than 'brain' i.e., since mind is considered only as the material 'brain' by Science .

Therefore, whether one scientifically sees the mind as 'brain' or *saasthricaly* sees the mind as a product of '*pancha bhoothaas*', mind is inert ; and therefore, by itself, it does not have the capacity to become the pseudo 'I'.

And, what do 'I' do, in the circumstances? In 'my' greatness, 'I' lend '*chidhaabhaasa*' to the mind. And, because of the 'borrowed *chidhaabhaasa*', the mind becomes sentient like 'I', the *aathmaa*. The non-sentient mind becomes sentient like 'me'. Therefore, it has a resemblance to 'me'.

(Pointing to the clip and the book on the desk in front, *Swamiji* says): "This clip does not have a resemblance to 'me', because it is insentient ; this book does not have a resemblance to 'me', because it is insentient. 'Mind' has a resemblance to 'me', because mind has got 'sentiency' ".

But, who has given it the sentiency and the resemblance to 'me'. It is 'I', who has given it both - the 'sentiency' and the 'resemblance to 'me' '. As discussed earlier, mind, when compared to the body is 'interior'; and, therefore, because of (i) its resemblance to 'me' (ii) its 'interior'ness and (iii) its sentiency, mind is elevated to the position of 'I'. And, this elevation is possible only because of 'me'.

Now, based on the above analysis, what is the connection between the *aathmaa* and the *ahamkaaraa*? Ans : They have the 'cause - effect' relationship ; the real 'I' is the producer of the 'pseudo 'I' '.

And, (to repeat) how does the real 'I' produce the pseudo I? Ans : By converting the mind into a sentient entity.

Thus, they have a *sambhandhaa – janya janaka sambhandhaa*. Therefore, the product 'pseudo 'I' ' can be the *vaachyaartha* and the producer 'real 'I' ' can be the *lakshyaartha*.

This gives rise to a question from the *poorva pakshin*. He asks the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* : "If the 'real 'I' ' is accepted as a producer or a *kaaranam*, problems arise. Elsewhere, you say that *aathmaa* is 'kaarya kaarana vilakshanam svayam ' ; you have said that it is not a *kaaranam*; but, now you claim that *aathmaa* is the producer of the pseudo – 'I' / *ahamkaaraa*. How is that possible?"

For this, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* gives his explanation. He says "When we say that *aathmaa* is a *kaaranam*, we mean it only as a **figurative** *kaaranam* and not a real *kaaranam*; because, to produce the 'pseudo 'I' ', *aathmaa* does **not 'do'** any action. By *aathmaa's* mere presence, mind is converted into the 'pseudo 'I' ', because of the mind's 'interior'ness and because of its borrowed Consciousness. It is not because of any extra or special attempt made by 'I', the *aathmaa*. *Saannidhya maathrena aathmaa kaaranam bhavathi*. Therefore, we call it *adhishtaana kaaranam* or *vivartha kaaranam*. It is not a real *kaaranam*, in the sense of doing some action. It does not even say 'Oh mind! May you become sentient. I am blessing you'. Ever since the mind is produced out of *pancha boothas*, the 'reflection' is automatically formed".

"Therefore", Sureswaraacharya says "from *ahamkaaraa*, the student should come to the changeless *kootastha bodha*; the really 'inward' *aathmaa*, by *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa* of

dropping *ahamkaaraa*. Once *ahamkaaraa* is dropped, limitations also go away, because *ahamkaaraa* is 'located' ; but the *kootastha chaithanyam* does not have 'location' ".

This is what Sureswaraacharya is trying to communicate, through this verse.

सदात्मनः - For the *sadhaathmaa*, the real 'I',

The term '*sadhaathmaa*' can be split in two ways. One is as '*sadhaa + aathmaa*' meaning "the real 'I', in all three *avasthaas*". The pseudo-I does not continue to exist in all the three *avasthaas*. In *sushupthi*, the false 'I' disappears. In contrast, the *aathmaa* is ***sadhaa*** (always) *aathmaa*. The term can also be split as '*sath + aathmaa*' ("***Sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekameva adhvitheeyam***" - "o good looking one ! In the beginning, this was Existence alone, One only, without a second" - *Chaandoghya Upanishad* – VI.2.1) . The second manner of splitting i.e., as '*sath + aathmaa*' is more preferable.

कूटस्थबोधः - 'changeless Consciousness' is one feature / attribute / nature;

प्रत्यक्त्वं - 'real inwardness' / 'absolute inwardness' / 'real selfhood' is the second nature .

And, these two features of *aathmaa* are:

अनिमित्तं - Non- conditional / of intrinsic nature.

'Non - Conditional' means 'not borrowed from outside'. The heat in hot water is 'conditional', borrowed and temporary. The heat in fire is 'non-conditional', un-borrowed and permanent. '*Animittham*' means unconditional / un-borrowed / permanent / intrinsic etc., 'intrinsic' being the best interpretation.

'Consciousness' and 'selfhood' are intrinsic to *aathmaa*. But, they are not intrinsic to the mind. Mind cannot have 'selfhood', because it is only an object of experience. Mind does not have 'Consciousness' also intrinsically. This is said in the second line of the verse. The contrast can be understood better by reading the two lines together as: ""बोद्धताहंतयोर्हेतुः कूटस्थबोधप्रत्यक्त्वमनिमित्तं सदात्मनः" - "*Aathmaa* has got both 'Consciousness' and 'selfhood' intrinsically (*animittham*), whereas the mind has got both of them, 'borrowed' from *aathmaa*, the *hethu*:".

The *Aachaaryaa* says (in the second line of the verse):

हेतुः - *Aathmaa* is the cause for

बोद्धता - the 'changing Consciousness' of the mind

'*Bodhruthaa*' literally means 'knowerhood', which, in turn, means 'changing Consciousness'. This has to be carefully assimilated. Mind is able to know things, only because of the changing Consciousness / awareness. When different objects such as *ghata*, *pata* etc. are mentioned, awareness of the different objects, viz., *ghata jnaanam*, *pata jnaanam* etc. are possible in that order, only because of the shifting of the Consciousness / awareness from one object to another / one thought to another. The mind changes; it has to; the *chidhaabhaasaa* / reflected Consciousness also changes; it also has to. If they do not change / shift, the listener will be stuck with the first word, while the speaker will be moving from word to word.

अहंता - and the pseudo Self hood of the mind.

'Pseudo selfhood' means the 'ego status' / the *ahamkaaraa* status, which belongs to the mind. In fact, mind alone is called *ahamkaaraa*.

Both of them viz., the 'changing Consciousness' and the 'selfhood' result from 'me', the *aathmaa* alone. In a purely hypothetical situation of the absence (which is not possible) of 'I', the mind will be the inert brain, without any 'selfhood' and / or 'Consciousness'.

Both the 'pseudo selfhood' and the 'changing / knowing Consciousness' are lent to the mind – '*antha:karanam*' - by 'I', the *aathmaa*. Therefore, 'I' am the '*hethu:*'.

The subject of the sentence is '*sadhaathmana: animittham kootasthabodha prathyakthvam*' – 'the intrinsic changeless Consciousness and real Selfhood of the *aathmaa*- the real 'I' '.

The word '*antha:karanasya*' is to be supplied, and this portion of the verse read as "*sadhaathmana: animittham kootasthabodha prathyakthvam antha:karanasya bodhruthaa ahamthayo: hethu: (bhavathi)*"- "*kootasthabodha prathyakthvam* of *aathmaa*, the real 'I', is the cause for the *bodhruthaa ahamthaa* of the mind .

And, how ? Ans: By 'my' mere presence, 'I' bless.

Therefore, there is a *sambhandhaa* between *aathmaa* and *antha:karanam*.

तेन - Therefore,

ताभ्यां - through the false selfhood and the changing Consciousness,

उपलक्ष्यते - (the real Self and the changeless Consciousness) is indirectly revealed.

'False Self' and 'changing Consciousness' are directly revealed; 'real Self and changeless Consciousness' are indirectly revealed. In other words, "'False Self' and 'changing

Consciousness' " is *vaachyaartha* and "real Self and changeless Consciousness' " is *lakshyaartha*. And, those two have got a connection – '*kaarya kaarana sambhandha*' is there. Pseudo self is generated by the real Self.

'False self' is called *lakshanam* and 'real Self' is called *lakshyam*. '*Lakshya lakshana sambhandha*' is also there between the 'pseudo 'I' ' and the 'real 'I' ' / between the ego and the '*saakshi* Witness'.

The following simple analogy will help in easier understanding of the *sambhandha* between the *vaachyaartha* and the *lakshyaartha*: " Suppose I stand in front of a mirror. And, I look into the mirror. I am looking at the reflection of my face in the mirror; but, I cannot look at my own face; obviously, my real face is not seeable by me / not to be objectified by me, with any amount of effort. Even if I take millions of births, I can never see my own real face. Therefore, what do I do? I see the mirror ; I bless the mirror by my mere *saannidhyam*; I bless the mirror with the reflection of my face ; that means a pseudo face has been generated by me, on the mirror and I am directly experiencing the pseudo 'I' in front of me, when I am looking at the mirror. How does the reflection in the mirror get the status of 'I', even if pseudo? It gets that respectful status, only because, **I** have blessed it with that status.

"But, even though I am looking at my pseudo face, I am understanding my real face only, because, when I want to apply a *thilakam* to my face, I look at the pseudo face, but apply the *thilakam* on my real face and not on the mirror.

"I experience the pseudo face in the mirror (which may be likened to *vaachyaartha*) and I understand my real face (which may be likened to the *lakshyaartha*) without objectification. *Aparoksha jnaanam* of the face takes place, even though I am looking at my pseudo face only".

Similarly, in common parlance, when an individual uses the term 'I', he / she is generally referring only to the changing Conscious being / the pseudo I, as, for example, in the statement "I am getting old". The noun 'I', in this statement, no doubt, refers to the changing, ageing Conscious being called *ahamkaara*. But, when the *Upanishad* says "*thaththvamas'*", the seeker should shift his / her focus from the 'changing Conscious being' to the 'changeless Conscious being'. The 'changing Conscious being' is the product and the 'changeless Conscious Being' is the producer. 'I' am that *kaaranam*. This is indicated by the word '*upalakshyathe*', meaning 'indirectly revealed'.

The *Aachaaryaa* exhorts the student: "At the time of *sravanam* itself, switch over, from 'changing Consciousness' to 'changeless Consciousness'".

And, we are experiencing this 'changeless Consciousness' every day. When? Ans: During *sushupthi*.

During *sushupthi*, we are remaining only as the 'changeless Consciousness principle'. But, during our 'waking' state, we want to transact with the world and therefore generate the 'changing Consciousness being', called 'ego'. We put on the *ahamkaara kanchukam* for transactions, since, without the 'ego', transactions are not possible.

During *sushupthi*, the ego is gone. What is mistaken as 'blankness' in *sushupthi*, is, in reality, not total blankness; - but, 'I', the *kootastha bodha*: | This can be experienced in *sushupthi* /

It may be remembered, that, Sureswaraachaarya, earlier (in verse 8) , gave another occasion also, when 'I' remain only as the 'changeless Consciousness' – which occasion, he called by the term "*Pramithsaa*", viz., that particular moment, when one is about to know something and when the ego is not fully operational. During that moment- "*Pramithsaa*"- also, 'I' am only the 'changeless Consciousness'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 12 – Chapter III:

बुद्धेः कूटस्थबोधप्रत्यक्त्वनिमित्ते बोद्धृताप्रत्यक्त्वे ये त्वसाधारणे तयोः विशेषवचनम् ।

The mind's cognizing power and immediacy are grounded in the unchanging awareness and immediate self-certitude of the Self. These qualities are explained to show how they inhere in the Self and in the mind and how as inhering thus in the latter, they have some speciality.

Now that Sureswaraachaaryaa has introduced two selfhoods – one 'false' and the other 'real' – he wants to differentiate between these two. *Buddhi* enjoys 'false selfhood' and also 'changing Consciousness'. *Aathmaa* has got 'real selfhood' and 'changeless Consciousness'.

(Ideally, the adjectives 'false' and 'real' and the adjectives 'changing' and 'changeless' should not be added at this stage of the discussion, but, in order to avoid any confusion, they have been applied, even at this stage. This discussion should ideally run:)

Mind has got 'Consciousness' and 'selfhood'; *aathmaa* also has got 'Consciousness' and 'selfhood'. What is the difference between the 'selfhood' of the mind and the 'selfhood' of the *aathmaa*? Similarly, what is the difference between the 'Consciousness' of the mind and the 'Consciousness' of the *aathmaa*?

(We have already discussed these differences, namely, that, the selfhood of the mind is 'false' selfhood, while the selfhood of the *aathmaa* is 'real' selfhood and that, the Consciousness of the mind is 'changing', while the Consciousness of the *aathmaa* is 'changeless'. Though we have discussed the differences earlier, the text is covering the topic only now, in these portions).

The *Aachaaryaa* wants to talk about the difference between the 'selfhood' of the mind and the 'selfhood' of the *aathmaa* ; and, similarly, the difference between the 'Consciousness' of the mind and the 'Consciousness' of the *aathmaa*. Therefore, he says:

- ये बोद्धृताप्रत्यक्त्वे - The 'Consciousness' and the 'selfhood' belonging to the mind, '*Bodhruthaa*' means 'Consciousness' and '*prathyakthvam*' means 'selfhood'.
- निमित्ते - which are generated / caused by
- कूटस्थबोधप्रत्यक्त्वं - the 'Consciousness' and 'selfhood' of the *aathmaa*,

This is exactly like the fire generating the brightness and the heat in a red hot iron ball / bar, in a forge shop. In a similar manner, the 'selfhood' and 'Consciousness' of the *aathmaa* generate the 'selfhood' and 'Consciousness' of the mind.

- असाधारणे - are distinct (from each other).

One belongs to the mind and the other belongs to the *aathmaa*

- तयोः विशेषवचनम् - The distinctions / differences between the two are to be pointed out (in the following portion).

Once the seeker knows the differences between the 'Consciousness' and 'Selfhood' of the *aathmaa* and those of the mind, he / she can smoothly and confidently move from the *vaachyaartha* to *lakshyaartha*; and, also, inversely from the *lakshyaartha* to the *vaachyaartha* , when the situation demands viz., for the purpose of transactions.

The seeker should be clear on these.

The seeker should learn to switch over from the 'pseudo 'I' ', to the 'real 'I'', when *samsaaraa* thought becomes oppressive. There is no other solution to *samsaaraa*. 'Pseudo 'I' ' is eternal *samsaari*, while the 'real 'I' ' has no *samsaaraa* at all.

But, the `pseudo `I" is also a necessity; it has to be used as a *kanchukam*, whenever required, since transactions, including *Vedhaanthic* study will not be possible without it.

130. Chapter III, Verse 11 to 13 (14-02-2009)

What Sureswaraachaaryaa is aiming to teach, in these portions, conveyed in simple language (the Aachaaryaa is presenting it in a technical and involved language) will be as follows:

The *Aachaaryaa* wants to say that the 'mind' alone is serving as an empirical self, or the worldly 'I', for the sake of all transactions / worldly *vyavahaaraas*, even though it does not really deserve to serve as 'I'.

The mind does not deserve to be 'I', because of two main reasons, firstly because it is an object of experience and secondly because it is inert in nature. But, even though the inert, external mind does not deserve to be 'I', it is 'raised' / 'elevated' to the level of 'I', the *aham*, for all worldly transactional purposes.

How does this happen? How does the mind, which does not deserve to be 'I', get that power to be 'I'? Sureswaraachaaryaa says it is because of the 'blessing' of the *aathmaa*; *aathmaa*, by its mere presence, converts the mind into an empirical 'I', meaning, that, for all worldly transactions, the mind is serving as 'I' / the *aham* / the subject.

Then this question may be asked: "If the mind is only an empirical 'I', raised to the level of the 'I' for worldly purposes, then who is the real 'I'?" Sureswaraachaaryaa answers: "It is *Aathmaa*, which alone deserves to be the real or absolute 'I'".

Thus, the *Aachaaryaa* has introduced *aathmaa* as the absolute 'I' and the mind as the empirical 'I'.

And, it is the *Aathma* which has blessed the mind to become the empirical 'I' for all transactional purposes. Even during the course of the *Vedhaanthic* class, the student is using his / her empirical 'I' alone as listener and the teacher also is using his empirical 'I' alone as the speaker.

For all transactional purposes, mind has become the empirical 'I', blessed by the *aathmaa*. It naturally follows, that, since *aathmaa* has blessed the mind to become the empirical 'I', the *aathmaa*, the absolute 'I', is the 'generator' of *ahamkaaraa*, the empirical 'I'.

Thus, *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* have got *kaarya-kaarana* / generator-generated / 'parent'-'child' relationship. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* is trying to establish first. Once he has established this relationship, thereafter, he can say that, though the word *aham* primarily

means the empirical 'I', the *ahamkaaraa*, which is the 'child' and which is used for all the transactions, in *Vedhaanthic* context, the word 'I' should not refer to empirical 'I', but to the 'parent' only, viz. the *aathmaa*, the absolute 'I'.

Also, the informed seeker should be able to differentiate between the two contexts: viz., (i) when the word means the empirical 'I' and (ii) when it means the absolute 'I'.

The *Aachaaryaa* wants to present all these facts in a technical manner. What is the method he is using?

The absolute 'I', the *aathmaa*, has got two essential features viz., 'absolute Selfhood', termed by him as '*prathyakthvam*' and 'absolute Consciousness', termed '*kootastha bodham*'. This *aathmaa* is 'bless'ing the inert mind with 'empirical selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness'.

And, once the mind has received these two attributes of 'empirical selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness', the mind has **now** become empirical Self, which is called the *ahamkaaraa* / the pseudo 'I' / the ego. This was the idea given in the eleventh *sloka*.

Now, in the following portion, what is the discussion?

We have seen that, *aathmaa* is endowed with 'absolute Selfhood' (*prathyakthvam*) and 'absolute Consciousness' (*kootastha bodham*) and that, mind is endowed with 'empirical selfhood' (*ahamthaa*) and 'empirical Consciousness' (*bodhruthaa*).

The set of attributes belonging to *aathmaa* is *paaramaarthikaa* and the other set of attributes belonging to the mind is *vyaavahaarikaa*. Therefore, it may also be said that *aathmaa* has got *paaramaarthika bodhruthaa* and *paaramaarthika prathyakthaa*, while the mind has got *vyaavahaarika bodhruthaa* and *vyaavahaarika prathyakthaa*.

The discussion that follows is: "What is the difference between the *paaramaarthika prathyakthaa* and *bodhruthaa*, belonging to *aathmaa* and the *vyaavahaarika prathyakthaa* and *bodhruthaa*, belonging to the mind?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa says (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 12):

- बुद्धेबोद्धता प्रत्यक्त्वे : - The *bodhruthaa* and *prathyakthaa* belonging to the mind, '*budhe:*' means 'of the mind'.
- निमित्ते - are caused by,

- कूटस्थबोधप्रत्यक्ते - the paaramaarthika prathyakthaa and boddhruthaa, belonging to the *aathmaa*.
- ये तु - But, these two pairs (viz., the vyavahaarika prathyakthaa and boddhruthaa belonging to the mind, and the *paaramaarthika prathyakthaa* and *boddhruthaa* belonging to the *aathmaa*)
- असाधारणे - are different.

One is the 'cause'; the other is the 'effect'. The *Paaramaarthikaa* pair is the cause for the *vyavaahaarika* pair. They are mutually distinct.

- तयोविशेष वचनम् : - The distinction between the first pair and the second pair is to be stated (in the following *sloka*).

'*Visesha*.' means 'distinction' or 'difference' ; '*vachanam*' means 'is to be stated'.

Chapter III: Verse 12 –

बोद्धता कर्तृता बुद्धे :कर्मता स्यादहंतया ।

तयोरैक्यं यथा बुद्धौ पूर्वयोरेवमात्मनि ॥ १२ ॥

The mind's agency is its cognizing power and its becoming an object is by virtue of its 'ego'hood. As they are blended in the mind, the features in the Self responsible for this cognizing power and the ego-hood are also blended in essence.

- बुद्धे(भवति) बोद्धता कर्तृता : - The empirical Consciousness of the mind becomes the empirical 'knower', which is subject to change.

'*Buddhe: bodhruthaa*' means 'the empirical Consciousness of the mind', which is nothing else, but, what is known as *chidhaabhaasaa*.

'*Bodhruthaa*' literally means 'knowerhood' and 'knowerhood' should be understood as 'Consciousness', in this context.

Similarly, '*karthruthaa*' literally means 'doership'; and 'doership' should be understood as 'changing in nature', in this context; i.e. *karthruthaa* (in this context) means *parinaami* / 'subject to change'.

The 'empirical Consciousness' belonging to the mind, because of which, the mind becomes the empirical Self, **as** 'empirical Consciousness' is subject to modification. Mind being

parinaami all the time, the 'empirical Consciousness' also is *parinaami*. An example is the *Vedhaanthic* class itself, where, in general, in the initial few minutes, the student's mind is bright and the Consciousness is also bright; but, after some time, the mind becomes tired and the empirical Consciousness becomes dull.

Not only is 'empirical Consciousness' subject to change when changing from dullness to brightness or *vice versa*, but, even when it is bright also, it is 'changing', because of its association with external objects. The 'empirical Consciousness' alone becomes *ghata jnaanam, pata jnaanam, mata jnaanam, vruksha jnaanam* etc.

Associated with various objects the 'empirical Consciousness' is subject to change.

And it is this 'empirical Consciousness' that the scientists are analyzing as the neuronal phenomenon, which, they claim, is subject to generation when the neurons are firing and subject to destruction when the neurons stop firing. When the scientists are talking about Consciousness being 'generated' in evolution, that evolutionary Consciousness talked about by them, is the 'empirical Consciousness', generated in the brain through an electrical phenomenon and which is responsible for the awareness of the external world.

Sureswaraacharya says the 'empirical Consciousness' of the mind is '*karthruthaa*'; it is the 'empirical knower' which is subject to change. In other words, it is a 'changing knowerhood'.

The 'empirical Consciousness' has thus been discussed. And, what about the other feature of the mind, viz., the 'empirical Selfhood'? That 'empirical Selfhood', the *vyaavahaarika prathyakthaa*, has to be discussed now. This term '*vyaavahaarika prathyakthaa*' has to be supplied in this verse.

- अहंतया कर्मता स्यात् (व्यावहारिक प्रत्यक्ता) - the empirical Selfhood of the mind is being the object of the word 'I', used in empirical transactions.

The empirical Selfhood of the mind is nothing but being the object of the word 'I', during empirical transactions. To express the same idea in other words: "In empirical transactions, when the word 'I' is used, the word does not refer to the *sacchidhaanandha aathmaa* but it is referring only to the empirical Self, which is 'mind + *chidhaabaasad*.'" Therefore, the translation (of this portion) is as above, viz., "The empirical Selfhood of the mind is nothing but being the object of the word 'I', in / during empirical transactions to the mind". That is what is being conveyed here as '*ahamthayaa karmathaa syaath*'. The essence (to repeat) is: "In worldly transactions, whenever you use the word 'I', the object of the word is not the absolute 'I', but the empirical 'I' only".

Moving to the third quarter of the verse:

- तयोबुद्धौ ऐक्यं : - Both these attributes, viz., 'the empirical Consciousness and the empirical Selfhood' or 'the *vyavahaarika boddhruthaa* and *vyavahaarika prathyaktha'* are non-separate from the mind,

Both of them (the 'empirical Consciousness' and the 'empirical Selfhood') are inseparable attributes of the mind.

- यथा - in the same manner as,
- पूर्वयोआत्मनि एवं : - their 'parents' (i.e. parents of 'empirical Consciousness' and 'empirical Selfhood' viz., the 'absolute Consciousness and absolute Selfhood / *paaramaarthika boddhruthaa* and *paaramaarthika prathyaktha'*) are non-separate from *aathmaa*.

The 'absolute' features are non-separate from *aathmaa*; the 'relative' features are non-separate from the mind.

'Purvayo:' means 'paaramaarthika boddhruthaa prathyakthvayo:'; 'evam (bhavathi)' conveys the meaning 'eiykyam (bhavathi)'.

Having said this, Sureswaraacharya, then, says "This can create a problem. And, therefore, I have to clarify the problem."

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 13 – Chapter III:

यथा बुद्धौ पूर्वयोरेवमात्मनीत्यतिदेशेन बुद्धिसाधर्म्यविधानान्नानात्वप्रसक्तौ तदपवादार्थमाह ।

The analogy with the mind might create the presumption that the two features might be conceived as forming attributive distinctions within the Self. That is repudiated in the next verse.

So, what is the problem? It can be explained as follows: Mind has got 'empirical Selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness', as its attributes. Technically, the mind is called the 'substance' and has 'empirical Selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness' as its attributes. When it is thus said that "mind is endowed with 'empirical Selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness' ", what is the relationship between the two? Obviously, it is understood as 'substance-attribute-relationship'.

Sureswaraacharya concedes this: "If you understand the relationship between the mind and its attributes, in this manner viz., as 'substance–attribute– relationship', it is perfectly all right. There is no problem".

Now, talking of the *aathmaa*, which has got 'absolute Selfhood' and 'absolute Consciousness', when it is said "*aathmaa* is endowed with 'absolute Selfhood' and 'absolute Consciousness'", what is the relationship between the two? What is the substance and what is the attribute? Can it be said that '*aathmaa* is the substance and Consciousness is the attribute' or should it be said that, 'Consciousness is the substance and *aathmaa* the attribute'? "What is the substance and what is the attribute here?" will be the natural question.

And, to this, Sureswaraacharya wants to say: "When you come to *aathmaa* and Consciousness, you should never bring in either of the words 'substance' or 'attribute'. This language of 'substance and attribute' fails when you talk about the relationship between *aathmaa* and Consciousness. Consciousness cannot be called 'substance'; Consciousness cannot be called 'attribute' either. In the same manner, *aathmaa* cannot be called 'substance' nor 'attribute'. Both these words fail in the case of *aathmaa*; and, both these words fail in the case of Consciousness also. In short, the conventional language cannot be used".

Now the question is "why"? Explanation follows:

The significance of the word 'substance' and the significance of the word 'attribute' have been analyzed in '*tharka saasthraa*'.

The *Achaaryaa* assumes that his readers will know the significance of these two words 'substance' and 'attribute', since, according to tradition, *Vedhaantha Saasthraa* can be studied only after acquiring a thorough knowledge of *tharka*, *meemaamsa* and *vyaakarana saasthraas*. This is because of the reason that the terminologies in these three *saasthraas* are very commonly used by traditional commentators of *Vedhaantha saasthraas*, right from *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*. Unfortunately, *Vedhaanthic* teachers of current times do not get the opportunity or the time to discuss in detail, the contents of these *saasthraas*.

Tharka saasthraa defines the words 'substance' and 'attribute'. What are their definitions according to *tharka saasthraa*? They define 'substance' as 'that which is the locus of one attribute or another'. "*Dharma aasraya: dravyam*" is the relevant quotation. '*Dravyam*' means 'substance' and is defined as the locus (*aasraya:*) of one attribute or another.

Thereafter, the *tharka saasthraas* divide attributes into several types – one type is called 'property' (*gunaa*); another type as action (*kriyaa*); and, yet another as species (*jaathi*) etc. They are all various 'dharmaas' or 'attributes'. And, 'substance' (*dravyam*) is defined as 'that which is the locus of one attribute (*dharma/gunaa*) or another'. It follows, therefore, that, any *dravyam* is always *sagunam*. Any substance can only be *sagunam*.

To repeat (in view of the importance of the fact): According to *tharka saasthraas*, *dravyam* (substance) means 'the locus of one attribute or another' and therefore, any *dravyam*, by definition, is *sagunam*. *Yathra yathra dravyathvam thathra thathra sagunathvam*.

If one remembers this definition of 'substance', one will realize that, *aathmaa* can never be defined as a 'substance', because, the moment it is said that '*aathmaa* is a substance', it will become *sagunam*; and, *aathmaa* cannot be said to be *sagunam*, since, in *Advaitham*, *aathmaa* is *nirgunam*. Leave alone *Advaithaa* philosophy; *Upanishad* itself declares *aathmaa* as '*nirgunam*, *nishkalam*, *nithyam* etc'. Therefore, *aathmaa* is not a 'substance'.

An interesting aside: *Visishtaadvaitins* draw heavily on the same *tharka saasthraas* and using all the arguments of *tharka saasthraas*, conclude that both *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are *sagunam*. On the other hand, in *Advaitham*, *aathmaa* is *nirgunam* and, therefore, cannot be a 'substance'.

Proceeding further, what is the significance of the word 'attribute' or 'property'? Again, in *tharka saasthraas*, as mentioned earlier, all the attributes have been categorized and analyzed. And, *tharka saasthraas* firmly establish that all 'attributes' depend on 'substances'; that, any 'attribute' depends on one 'substance' or another. "*Guna: dravya aasritha:*" is their conclusion. Any attribute depends on a substance for its existence. It follows, therefore, no attribute has an independent existence. Attributes are not *svathanthraa*; they are always *parathanthraa*.

Therefore, if it is said that Consciousness is an attribute, Consciousness will become a dependent entity; but, the *Upanishads* always declare Consciousness as *svathanthram* – independent. Therefore, Consciousness cannot be looked upon as 'attribute'.

Consciousness cannot be looked upon as 'attribute' and *aathmaa* cannot be taken as 'substance'. Therefore, the relationship between *aathmaa* and Consciousness, cannot be 'substance-attribute relationship'.

If so, what is their relationship? Ans: "There is **no** relationship. They are one and the same". *Aathmaa is* Consciousness; *aathmaa is* self.

The conclusion is: "Between *aathmaa* and Consciousness and between *aathmaa* and Selfhood, there is no *dharma-dharmi-sambhandhaa*, whereas, between mind and Selfhood and between mind and Consciousness, there is *dharma-dharmi* / 'substance-attribute' relationship.

To consolidate: When it is said "mind is endowed with self-hood and Consciousness", they – viz., 'mind and selfhood' and likewise 'mind and Consciousness' - have got 'substance-attribute' relationship. But, when it is said "*Aathmaa* is endowed with selfhood and Consciousness", there is no 'substance-attribute' relationship between *aathmaa* and Selfhood or between *aathma* and Consciousness.

The student has to note and remember this distinction carefully. Otherwise, whatever substance-attribute relationship is there in the case of mind will be wrongly extended to *aathmaa* also. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* points out: "Wrong extension is the problem here".

What is to be the essence of the following *sloka*? Ans: "Do not make this wrong extension, viz., the 'substance- attribute relationship', prevailing in the context of the mind, to the context of the *aathmaa*."

Reverting to the text (introduction to Verse 13):

"बुद्धौ यथा एवं आत्मनि पूर्वयो": - "Just as the mind possesses the selfhood and Consciousness, in the same manner, *aathmaa* possesses selfhood and Consciousness".

- इति अतिदेशेन - By comparison in this manner, and consequent extension '*Athidesa*.' means 'extension through comparison'.
- बुद्धि साधर्म्य विधानात् - since *aathmaa* has been equated to the mind,

Through comparative extension, *aathmaa* has been equated to the mind. In what sense is the equation made? Mind also possesses Consciousness and Selfhood; similarly, *aathmaa* also possesses Consciousness and Selfhood. Thus, *in the possession of these two features*, mind and *aathmaa* have been equated.

This equation can create a problem. What is the problem? In the mind, there is 'substance-attribute' relationship. Extending this, the student may conclude that *aathmaa* also has got 'substance-attribute' relationship. This is the fear of the *Aachaaryaa*.

'*Saadharmyam*' means 'similarity' or 'equation'; '*vidhaanam*' means 'teaching'. '*Buddhi saadharmya vidhaanaath*' means 'because of the teaching of the similarity of *buddhi* with *aathmaa*', which teaching was done in the previous verse.

- नानात्वप्रसक्तौ - there will be the problem of plurality.
- '*Naanaathvam*' means 'plurality'; '*praskathi*.' means 'occurrence of a possibility'.

What is the 'plurality'? It is explained as below: Once the wrong extension ('substance-attribute' relationship in the context of the mind to a similar relationship in the *aathmaa*) is made, it will lead to a false conclusion.

The student may falsely conclude that just as the mind is a 'substance', *aathmaa* is also a substance and further falsely conclude that just as the mind has two attributes, Selfhood and Consciousness, *aathmaa* also has got two attributes, Selfhood and Consciousness. The student will conclude: "*Aathmaa* is there; Selfhood is there; and, Consciousness is there".

And, once the student makes these false conclusions, plurality i.e., one 'substance' and two 'attributes' will result. In *tharka saasthraa*, 'substance' and 'attribute' are counted separately, and accordingly there will be '*svagatha bedhaa*', which means 'internal difference'.

Because of this wrong conclusion, not only will *aathmaa* become *sagunam*, there will be *advaita bhanga*: also.

The *Aachaaryaa* is anxious to pre-empt this problem. Therefore, he says:

- तदपवादार्थमाह - The following reply is given to remove that possible problem.

'*Apavaadham*' means 'negation'; '*thatth*' means 'that' and, in this context, means 'that possible conclusion / possible plurality'; '*aaha*' means 'the following is given'.

The student should clearly make a mental note, that, according to *Advaitam*, *aathmaa* is not a 'substance' and Consciousness is not an 'attribute' also.

And, so, what is the relationship between *aathmaa* and Consciousness? Ans: (as already stated): There is no relationship. *Aathmaa* **is** Consciousness and Consciousness **is** *aathmaa*.

And, this '*aathmaa*-Consciousness' does not have any attribute either. It is neither substance nor attribute; and, not being a substance; it does not possess any attribute also. If '*aathma*-Consciousness' is a substance it will possess attributes; if '*aathma*-Consciousness' is an

attribute, it will depend on some substance. Therefore, you cannot use either of the words 'substance' and 'attribute' for 'aathmaa-Consciousness'.

And, what about the world? Is the world a 'substance', separate from *aathmaa* or is the world 'attribute' of *aathmaa*? If such a question is raised, the answer, according to *advaita*, will be, that, the world is neither a substance separate from *aathmaa* nor an attribute.

If the world is considered a 'substance' separate from *aathmaa*, such a view will constitute *dvaita* philosophy. World is not also an attribute of *aathmaa*, because, according to *advaitam*, *aathmaa* does not have an attribute. The world is considered as an attribute of *aathmaa*, by the *Visishtaadvaita* philosopher.

According to *advaitam*, the world is neither a substance nor an attribute of *aathmaa*. A 'substantial' world is not there; an 'attributive' world is also not there. World is nothing but an 'appearance', which is *actually* not there, *seemingly* there.

A study or a revision of the *Maandookya Kaarika* will help in a clearer understanding of this fact. *Gowda paadhaa* declares in *Maandookya Kaarika*: "Na nirodho na chothpaathi: na bandho na saadhaka:" – "There is no dissolution, no creation, none who is bound, none who strives for liberation (Verse 32 – *Vaithiyparakaranam*).

There is only one non-substantial non-attributive *aathma chaithanyam*, which is 'myself', in which the world is 'dancing'. World is neither a substance nor an attribute; it is *maayaa*.

This is the topic that the *Aachaaryaa* is developing, viz., "Prapanchopasama (free from the world) *chaithanya aathmaa aham asm'* – "I **am** that non-substantial, non-attributive *chaithanya Aathmaa*, free from the world".

So, he says "aaha" (*sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 13) - "(For that purpose) I am saying this".

Chapter III: Verse 13 –

धर्मधर्मित्वभेदोऽस्याः सोऽपि नैवात्मनो यतः ।

प्रत्यग्ज्योतिरतोऽभिन्नं बेदहेतोरसंभवात् ॥ १३ ॥

The distinction between substance and attribute falls within mind. It does not belong to the Self. Thus the Self is immediate awareness without any internal distinction, for there could be no ground for differentiation within it.

-
- अस्या(अस्ति) :धर्मधर्मित्व भेद : - 'Substance-attribute' relationship is possible, in the case of the mind.
'Asyaa:' means 'for the mind' or 'in the case of mind'.

In the case of the mind, the *tharka saasthraa* language viz., 'mind is matter' can be used.

Interestingly, *tharka saasthraa* says that *aathmaa* is matter, that, *aathmaa* is *dravyam* and also that *aathmaa* is 'inert matter with temporary Consciousness as its attribute'. Sureswaraachaarya does not agree and is anxious to repudiate this view.

He says: "Do not reduce *aathmaa* to matter. Mind *is* matter; it *is* an inert substance, with *chidhaabhaasaa* / reflected Conscience, as attribute. Therefore, in the case of mind 'substance-attribute' division / *dharma dharmithva bedha*: is possible. You can even say that this Consciousness, viz., *chidhaabhaasaa* is temporary also. *Asyaa: (buddhe:)* *dharmadharmibedha*: is possible". "But" he continues:

- सअपि : - Such a division / that 'substance-attribute' division
- आत्मन(सम्भवति) न : - is never possible in the context of *aathmaa*.

There is this important difference between the Conscience of the mind and that of *aathmaa*. Conscience of the mind is an attribute of the mind, while, Conscience of *aathmaa* is **not** the attribute of *aathmaa*.

131. Chapter III, Verse 13 to 15 (21-02-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is dealing with thvam padha vaachyaartha and thvam padha lakshyaartha.

Thvam padha vaachyaartha is ahamkaara: and thvam padha lakshyaartha is saakshi.

Sureswaraachaaryaa first differentiates between *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi*. And, after differentiating between them, he wants to talk about the relationship between them. *Ahamkaaraa* being a product of *saakshi*, the relationship between them is '*kaarya-kaarana sambhandha:*' or '*janya-janaka sanbhandha:*'|

And, when *ahamkaaraa* is talked about, an informed *Vedhaanthic* student will already know that it is the name of the 'mixture of the mind and the *chidhaabhaasa*', the *chidhabaasaa* given / lent by *saakshi*.

Though *Ahamkaaraa* is, thus, essentially a mixture of matter and reflected Consciousness, while teaching the *Vedhaantha saasthraa*, sometimes, the mind is given as the more important component of *ahamkaaraa*; sometimes, *chidhaabhaasaa* is presented as the *pradhaanam* or more important component; and, at other times, they are given equal importance.

How are these (the varying degrees of importance) presented? When mind is to be given importance, the *Vedhaanthic* teacher says "Mind is *ahamkaara*, backed by *chidhaabhaasa*"; i.e., if 'mind backed by *chidhaabhaasa*' is called *ahamkaaraa*, it is the mind that is being given prominence.

In a similar manner, importance is given to *chidhaabhaasa*, by the *Vedhaanthic* teacher saying: "'*chidhaabhaasaa*, associated with mind' is *ahamkaaraa*".

Sometimes, the *Vedhaanthic* teacher says "the mixture of the mind and *chidhaabhaasa* is called *ahamkaaraa*".

The student should not get confused because of these differences in presentation.

To repeat: Sometimes, it is said that mind is *ahamkaaraa*; sometimes, it is said that *chidhabhaasa* is *ahamkaara*; and some other times, it is said that the mixture is

ahamkaaraa. There should be no confusion; it is only a shift in 'presentation', depending on the context.

In each form of presentation some advantages will be there. The student should have a discerning mind to know the advantages that each mode of presentation has.

In these portions, Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving prominence to mind; and, therefore, he is consistently saying that mind is *ahamkaaraa*.

What is the advantage that he derives from this mode of presentation? The advantage that the *Aachaaryaa* gets is that, when the mind is presented as *ahamkaaraa*, he can easily say "mind is an object of experience and, therefore, *ahamkaaraa* also is an object only".

In other words, the advantage in this presentation is, that, it is easier to establish that *ahamkaaraa* is also an object of experience, going through the three steps (i) *ahamkaaraa* is mind (ii) mind is an object and (iii) therefore, *ahamkaaraa* is also an object.

Therefore, i.e. based on the fact that *ahamkaaraa* is also an object like the world and the body, through *mahaa vaakyam*, *Vedhaanthee* wants the seeker to give up the *ahamkaaraa*. Once *ahamkaaraa*, which is the *vaachyaarthee*, is dropped, the seeker can comfortably move to the *lakshyaarthee*, the *saakshi*. It is with this purpose, that, the *Aachaaryaa* is equating the *ahamkaaraa* to the mind, throughout these discussions.

And, then, the topic currently under discussion, covered in detail in the earlier session, is briefly given below:

"The mind, which is *ahamkaaraa*, which is the *thvam padha vaachyaarthee*, is endowed with Selfhood and Consciousness. *Saakshi*, the *aathmaa*, is also endowed with Selfhood and Consciousness. But, there is a difference. The difference is, that, between the mind and the other two, viz., Selfhood and Consciousness, there is a 'substance-attribute' relationship, whereas, in the case of *saakshi*, though it is said that *saakshi* is also endowed with Selfhood and Consciousness, there is no question of 'substance-attribute' relationship. (The logic was discussed in earlier sessions.) In the context of mind and its attributes, Selfhood and Consciousness, 'mind' is the substance; Selfhood and Consciousness are 'attributes'. In the context of *Saakshi*, the student / seeker should carefully avoid both the words 'substance' and 'attribute'. *Saakshi is Self; saakshi is Consciousness*. Their 'relationship' is that all the three are one and the same. *Eiykyam* alone is the 'relationship', which, in fact, is not a relationship, in the real sense of the word, since 'relationship' is possible only when there is duality. There is no duality or plurality among these three – *saakshi*, Self and Consciousness. All the three are one and the same.

"Then, 'is the 'saakshi-Self-Consciousness' a 'substance' or is it an 'attribute'?' is the question. It is neither."

This is the discussion that is being presented in this verse (verse 13).

- अस्याः धर्म धर्मित्व भेदः (अस्ति) - In the mind / ahamkaaraa , 'substance- attribute' division is there.
- आत्मनः सः अपि न एव - But, in the case of *saakshi*, that division is not at all there.

The pronoun 'Sa:' denotes 'dharmadharmithva bedha:' / 'substance-attribute' division; 'aathmana:' means 'saakshina:' / 'in the case of *aathmaad*'; 'naiva' means 'is never possible'.

Why is it not possible? The question is answered in subsequent verses:

- यतः असंभवात् - Since there is no possibility of (or scope for)
- भेद हेतोः - giving any reason for 'substance-attribute' division,

'Bedha:' means "substance-attribute' division' ; 'Hethu:' means 'reason'.

There is no reason to establish 'substance-attribute' division, between *saakshi* and Selfhood or between *saakshi* and Consciousness.

- अतः - therefore, (the conclusion is)
- प्रत्यग्ज्योतिः - the saakshi chaithanyam,

'prathyak jyothi:' literally means 'inner light' and denotes 'saakshi chaithanyam' here. 'Prathyak jyothi:' is only a figurative expression for Consciousness, **not** the reflected Consciousness ; but, the Original Consciousness .

- अभिन्नं - is free from 'substance-attribute' division.
'Abhinnaam' means 'dharma-dharmi bedha rahitham'.

This makes *aathmaa* a non-material entity.

An important and relevant fact is to be noted here, in this context:

Everything that is experienced in the world is material in nature. And, in the material field, there will always be either substances or / and their attribute. As a result, the human mind is habitually used to the concept of 'substance-attributes', which is a common phenomenon belonging to the material world. But, in the *Advaita* world of spirituality / Consciousness, the mind has to get out of the orientation of objectification, the orientation of materiality and the orientation of substance-attribute division. Understandably, the intellect always finds this difficult and since the intellect finds it difficult, the intellect concludes that *aathmaa* means 'nothing'. In other words, since the intellect does not have the capacity to conceive of a *nirguna padhaartham*, because a *nirguna padhaartham* is not a conventional material, *nirguna aathmaa* is rejected as 'nothing'. This intellectual 'rejection' is done not only by lay people; but, even by a number of philosophers. Ramanajuchaaryaa, the *Visishtaadvaita Aachaarya* and many other philosophers rejected the concept of the *nirguna aathmaa* / non-material entity.

Because all our experiences are in the field of 'substances and attributes', these philosophers vehemently reject the concept of *nirguna aathmaa*, saying "Nirguna aathmaa does not exist at all; there is no proof for this". And, if and when the word *nirgunam* is found in the *Upanishad*, they hold that the word does not mean the 'attribute-less'. Even when the *Advaita Aachaaryaas* clearly cite to them the relevant teachings from the *Upanishads*, the ultimate *pramaanaa* for all *vaidhikaas*, the anti-*advaita* philosophers reject this '*nirguna brahman*' concept. Then, if asked why the word *nirguna* is applied to *Brahman* or *Paramaathmaa* in the *Upanishad*, they reply that the word '*nirguna*' only means 'free from **dhushtha** gunaa:.' | '*nirgathaa: dhushtha gunaa:.*' | Thus, according to *Visishtaadvaita*, '*nirguna aathmaad*' means '*saguna Vishnu* | '*saguna Narayana*' alone. He is not '*dhushtha guna yuktha:.*'; their conclusion is that '*absolute nirguna vasthu*' is not there at all, which we, *Advaitins*, consider as an unfortunate conclusion.

What the *Advaita Vedhanthins* say is that, the non-material Consciousness is free from both good and bad attributes. The *Katopanishad manthraa* (I. 2. 14), where Nachikethas asks Lord Yama: "**Anyathra dharmath anyathra adharmath anyathra asmaath kruthaakruthaath anyathra bhoothaascha bhavyaascha yath thath pasyasi thadvadha**" – "Tell me of that absolute Truth which you see as **different from dharm and adharma**, cause and effect, past and future", is relevant in this context. *Aathmaa* does not have either *kalyana gunaas* or *akalyana gunaas*. This is what the *Advaita Aachaaryaas* try to establish, though the fact is mind-boggling.

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa also means, when he says (in verse 13) "*prathyak jyothi: abhinnaam*" which means "Conscience transcends 'substance-attribute' division".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 14:**भेदहेत्वसंभवं दर्शयन्नाह ।****Why there could be no ground for differentiation is brought out:**

In the fourth quarter of the previous *sloka*, there was an expression '*bedha hetho: asambhavaath*'. What does that expression mean ? It means : "Because there is no reason / logic to establish 'substance–attribute' division (in *saakshi chaithanyam*)". That expression is being expanded in the following verse. Therefore, the following *sloka* is a commentary upon the word '*bedha hethu asambhavam*'. The illogicality of 'substance-attribute' division is explained here.

- दर्शयन् - Explaining (or ' to explain')
- भेद हेतु असंभवं - the illogicality of 'substance attribute' division (in the case of *saakshi chaithanyam*)
- आह - the following statement (*sloka*) is made:

Why do we say that it ('substance-attribute' division) is illogical? The reason is given in the verse.

Chapter III: Verse 14 –**न कस्यांचिदवस्थायां बोधप्रत्क्त्वयोर्भिदा ।****व्यभिचारोऽथवा द्रष्टो यथाहंतद्विदोस्सदा ॥ १४ ॥**

In no condition are Consciousness and immediacy differentiated; nor are they found separately. This is unlike the relation between the ego and the knower thereof.

What is the explanation that Sureswaraacharya gives? He says: "You cannot make a difference between the *saakshi* and the Selfhood or between the *saakshi* and Consciousness, because, we never experience any dissociation / separation among these three. Between two objects, to qualify one as substance and the other as attribute, we have to experience, at times, the absence of any one of the two ; but, in this case, viz., of '*saakshi*, its Selfhood and its Conscience', at no time, do we experience the absence or dissociation of any one of these three ".

The Aacharya says:

- कस्यांचित् अवस्थायां - Under any circumstance / condition (whether it is *jaagrath* or *svapna* or *sushupthi* or within the *jaagrath avasthaa* itself, at any time) ,

- भिदा नास्ति - there is no separation experienced,
- बोधप्रत्ययत्वयोः - for the Consciousness-Selfhood pair,

Between the 'Consciousness-Selfhood' pair and the *saakshi*, we do not see any dissociation / separation at all, to identify one (the *saakshi*) as the substance and the other (the 'Consciousness-Selfhood' pair) as attribute.

If, between any two given objects, you should call one as a 'substance' and the other as an 'attribute', you should show a possible separation between the two - for instance, as we perceive

- (i) in a substance and its colour or
- (ii) in a substance and its form or
- (iii) in a substance and its smell.

We do know that separations can be brought about between a substance and its colour or between a substance and its form or between a substance and its smell.

But, a separation between the *saakshi* and 'Consciousness-Selfhood' pair, is never possible. Therefore, differentiation of one as substance and the other as attribute, is also not possible. There is no reason to classify them as substance and attribute, because, we have never seen a dissociation / separation between them.

The *Naiyaayikaa* philosopher differs from the *Vedhaanthin* on this aspect also. He says that Consciousness can disappear at times and the Self can exist by itself. According to him *Aathmaa* is only inert matter. He says: "When the *aathmaa* gets associated with the mind which is also matter, the *aathmaa*-matter and the mind-matter join together and Consciousness is generated in the *aathmaa* temporarily. This happens during both *jaagrath avasthaa* and *svapna avasthaa*. Therefore, *aathmaa* is sentient in *jaagrath* and sentient in *svapna*; but, in *sushupthi*, the mind is 'dismantled' from the *aathmaa*." (The *Naiyaayikaa*, however, does not explain as to how this can happen, when *aathmaa* is all-pervading as he also believes?) Thus, the *naiyaayikaa* holds, that, *chaithanyam* is a temporary attribute, generated in the inert *aathmaa*, which generated *chaithanyam* is lost by *aathmaa*, during *sushupthi avasthaa*.

But, *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* does not agree. Sureswaraachaarya also points out : "This is not true experientially, since, if Consciousness is not there in *sushupthi*, we will not be talking about *sushupthi* itself, after waking up".

The *sruthi pramaanam* also clearly says "nahi dhrashtu: dhrushte: viparilobho vidhyathe avinaasathvaath" – "The vision of the witness (the Self) can never be lost, because it is imperishable" (*Brahadharanyaka Upanishad* IV.iii.23). Consciousness is never lost, not even in *sushupthi avasthaa*, Therefore, *aathmaa* and Consciousness never get dissociated, contrary to what the *naiyaayikaa* claims. Therefore, one cannot qualify *saakshi* as 'substance' and the 'Consciousness-Selfhood' pair as a temporarily emergent 'attribute'.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* declares '*bodha prathyakthvayo: bhidhaa na (asthi)* – "for Selfhood and Consciousness, separation is not there".

Separation from what? The term '*saakshina:*' meaning 'from *saakshi*' is to be supplied.

- (साक्षिणः) भिदा न दृष्टः - separation from *saakshi* is never seen.

'*Na dhrushta:*' means 'never proved / never recognized/ never perceived.

Not only can this pair, viz. 'Selfhood-Consciousness' pair, be ever separated from *saakshi*, this pair itself cannot be internally separated also, i.e. 'Selfhood' of the *saakshi* cannot be separated from 'Consciousness'.

The *Aachaaryaa* just stated that, this 'Selfhood-Consciousness' pair cannot be separated from *saakshi*, the third entity. In the next quarter of the verse, he says that, this pair itself, the 'Conscience and Selfhood' pair, cannot be separated to count as two different attributes.

- अथवा व्यभिचारः (न दृष्टः) - Separation can never be seen / proved
- (बोधप्रत्ययत्वयोः) - between Selfhood and Consciousness also.

'*vyabhichara:*' means 'deviation' or 'separation'.

Between what and what? Ans: Between Selfhood and Consciousness. Wherever there is Selfhood, there is Consciousness and wherever there is Consciousness, there is Selfhood. In short, "all these three (*saakshi*, Selfhood and Consciousness) are non separable from one another" is the essence.

The *Aachaaryaa* gives a counter example for this. What is the counter-example ? Ans: '*saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*', which **are** separable.

The previous three (*saakshi*, Selfhood and Consciousness) are non separable, **unlike** *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* which are separable.

- यथा - Unlike,
- अहं - *ahamkaaraa* (in this context, as interpreted by commentators).

An aside: *Vedhaanthic* students during the *Aachaaryaa's* lifetime, would have understood these *slokas* without a commentator's help, because, they would have thoroughly studied *tharkaa*, *meemaamsaa* and *vyaakarana saasthraas* before taking up the study of *Vedhaantha saasthraa*. But, current students, because of non-exposure to these *saasthraas*, are intellectually at a disadvantage. They have to depend on the commentaries or interpretations authored by later scholars.

- तद्विद :- and its *saakshi* (*saakshi* of *ahamkaaraa*),
Between *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi*, there can be 'difference'; they are separable.
- सदा - (which are separable) always.

We should carefully understand that this is a counter example.

How is this fact, viz., '*ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi* are separable' proved? The answer is simple. It is regularly proved, when we go to sleep.

During *jaagrath avasthaa*, the *ahamkaaraa* is active, awake and functioning, the primary function of *ahamkaaraa* being the 'reporting of the existence of the world'.

Ahamkaaraa alone reports the existence of the duality itself; duality can never be proved without *ahamkaaraa*. That is why, Ramana Maharshi, both in his *Upadesa Saaraa* and *Sad Dharsanam*, repeatedly says *ahamkaaraa* alone is responsible for the dualistic universe. When *ahamkaaraa* is there, dualistic universe is reported; when the *ahamkaaraa* is resolved, the dualistic universe also is resolved; even family problems are resolved.

In *jaagrath* and *svapna avasthaas*, *saakshi* is associated with *ahamkaaraa* ; to express it differently, 'I', the *saakshi* am associated with *ahamkaaraa*, during *jaagrath* and *svapna avasthaas* ; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, *ahamkaaraa* is resolved and even as *ahamkaaraa* is resolved, the universe also gets resolved by itself.

Verse 20 of Ramana Maharishi's *Upadesa Saaram* runs: "*Ahami naasabhaaji aham ahamthayaa spurathy hruthsvayam paramapoornasath*" – "When the ego is destroyed, the limitless, full Existence, that is Self, shines by Itself as 'I', 'I' ".

When *ahamkaaraa* is separated, 'I', the *saakshi*, am non-dual.

Sushupthi avasthaa is the proof for the possibility of / capacity for separation of *ahamkaaraa*, from 'I', the *saakshi*.

But, it should be carefully noted, in this context, that *Advaita Vedhaanthaa* does not say that *ahamkaaraa* is 'destroyed' in *sushupthi* ; *ahamkaaraa* only 'resolves', which is only *ahamkaaraa's* temporary absence. Only after *Vedhaanthic* study and assimilation, *ahamkaaraa* is 'destroyed', that too, in the sense, that, *ahamkaaraa* is 'falsified' through *jnaanam*.

'Falsification of *ahamkaaraa*' is the ultimate solution for *samsaaraa*. Resolution of *ahamkaaraa* can only be a temporary measure. During deep sleep, *ahamkaaraa* is resolved and the individual is happy; during *nirvikalapa samaadhi* also, *ahamkaaraa* is only resolved and not falsified. Coming out of *samaadhi*, the individual can, in fact, be more depressed and irritable, since he has temporarily enjoyed *samaadhi aanandhaa* and finds himself back in *samsaaraa*. Only in *Vedhaanthaa*, through *mahaavaakya vichaaraa*, undertaken during *jaagrath avasthaa* (obviously, not in *samaadhi*) the seeker understands (i) that, *ahamkaaraa* is separate from 'me' (ii) that, *ahamkaaraa* is a product of *moolaavidhyaa* (iii) that, *ahamkaaraa* is a false entity and (iv) that, *ahamkaaraa* cannot cause any disturbance in all the three periods of time. This falsification is called permanent removal of *ahamkaaraa* or *advaita siddhi* or *naishkarmya siddhi*. *Ahamkaaraa*, thankfully, is not an integral part of 'Me'.

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 15 (Chapter III):

यस्मादज्ञानोपादानाया एव बुद्धेर्भेदो नात्मनस्तस्मादेतत्सिद्धम् ।

This is established, that divisions occur in the mind, which is an outcome of ignorance and never in the Self.

What follows is a consolidating *sloka*. What the *Aachaaryaa* has established is: "Mind is a substance, which has got Selfhood and Consciousness as attributes. Therefore, at the mental level 'substance-attribute' division is present. But, such a division is not present at *saakshi* level, though *saakshi* also has got Selfhood and Consciousness, as its features".

This is what has been arrived at, by the discussions, in the just completed portion. This is being consolidated in the next verse.

- बुद्धेः एव भेदः अस्ति : - There is a division only in the mind,

'*Buddhi:*' means 'mind', which is nothing but *ahamkaara*, because one of the definitions of *ahamkaara*, as discussed earlier, is "the 'mind', backed by '*chidhaabhaasaad* ". Therefore, though only the word 'mind' is mentioned here, it means 'the mixture of mind and *chidhaabhaasaad*', which is *ahamkaaraa*.

The 'division' referred to, is in the form of 'substance' and 'attributes' – the attributes being 'empirical Selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness'.

During worldly transactions, the mind enjoys 'empirical Selfhood' and 'empirical Consciousness', and not 'absolute Selfhood' and 'absolute Consciousness'.

What type of mind?

- अज्ञान उपादानायाः - which is a product of moolaavidhyaa.

'Ajnaana upaadhaanaa' is a noun, meaning 'product of moolaavidhyaa'; it is used here, as adjective to buddhi: | Ajnaanam upaadhaana kaaranaam yasyaa: saa buddhi: yajnaana upaadhaanaayaa: buddhi:|

(An aside: There is a different method of studying these texts, based on *Sanskrit* grammar, which process is also equally interesting).

Why does the *Aachaaryaa* remind us of this (that, 'mind' is a product of '*moolaavidhya*'), in this context? Ans: It is important to recollect this fact, because, only then, the unreality of the mind or *ahamkaaraa* will be remembered.

But, again, why is it necessary to remember the unreality of the mind?

Ans: During *jaagrath* 'I' get associated with the mind for the purpose of transactions. In *sushupthi*, 'I' get detached from *ahamkaaraa*, the mind. It follows, that, the moment one gets associated with *ahamkaaraa*, one is committed to duties, both family duties and social duties. And, for a normal individual, duties are burdensome / fearsome/ worrisome. Therefore, one will always hesitate to associate with *ahamkaaraa*.

Even a student exposed to *saasthraas* and *Vedhaanthic* studies might pray for *videha mukthi*, so that he will be permanently free from *ahamkaaraa*. The seeker might tend to think: "Association with *ahamkaara* is a problem; therefore, through *videha mukthi*, I should get permanently dissociated from *ahamkaaraa*". Therefore, it is important for a seeker to understand that *ahamkaara* is *mithyaa*, which will lead him to confidently think: "I am not

worried by association with *ahamkaara*, because *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* will not and does not give me problems, through my association with it; in fact, *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* gives me 'entertainment' through the association". This realization is *mokshaa*.

The *Vedhaanthic* seeker should have the convictions: "*Mithyaa ahamkaaraa* does not give problems through its association. Therefore, my aim is not *videha mukthi* or permanently dissociating from *ahamkaaraa*. *Mithyaa ahamkaaraa* gives entertainment, through its association. Therefore, I am not worried with the 'false' association with 'false' *ahamkaaraa*. There is no real association in all the three periods of time. Why is there no real association? *Ahamkaaraa* itself is false. How can I have a 'real' association with 'false' *ahamkaaraa* ? Therefore, when am I free? I am free as *saakshi*, all the time. I have only taken to false *ahamkaaraa* for the sake of *leelaa* or entertainment. Therefore, I am not worried about *jaagrath avasthaa*; nor *svapnaa avasthaa* ; nor *marana avasthaa* ; nor *moorchaa avasthaa* ; nor *pralaya avasthaa*. All *avasthaas* are entertainment given to me, by false *ahamkaaraa*, which *ahamkaaraa* is a product of *moolaavidhya*".

That "*ahamkaaraa* is a product of *moolaavidhya*" was established by Sureswaraachaaryaa in the lengthy Introduction to this chapter.

- न आत्मनः - This 'substance-attribute' division is not there in the *aathmaa*.
- यस्मात् - Because of this reason,
- तस्मात् - consequently,
- एतद् सिद्धम् - the following *Upanishadic* teaching has been successfully arrived at.

The successful conclusion is "I need not look forward to *mokshaa*. This is because *ahamkaara* is welcome. *Ahamkaaraa* has got *vaasanaa*-based thoughts and emotions; it also has will-based thoughts and emotions. Let the *ahamkaaraa* continue to go through will-based thoughts and emotions and quite often the *vaasanaa*-based thoughts and emotions. Some of them are manageable / can be reduced; some of them are unmanageable / cannot be reduced. Let *ahamkaaraa* go through all these; but, I have nothing to do with them; 'I' am only the *saakshi*, the never-changing Witness. I have nothing against *ahamkaaraa*, because *ahamkaaraa* is '*mithyaa*'. I have nothing against *saakshi*, because *saakshi* is wonderful. I have no complaint about either of them".

In short, *mokshaa* need not be sought after at all, since 'I' am ever free.

Verse 15 – Chapter III:

कूटस्थबोधतोऽद्वैतं साक्षात्त्वं प्रत्यगात्मनः। :

कूटस्थबोधाद्धोत्री धीः स्वतो हीयं विनश्वरी ॥ १५ ॥

The inmost Self is one and non-dual and has immediacy, because of its nature as unchanging Consciousness. But, the mind has the power of cognizing owing to the influence of that unchanging Consciousness. By itself, the mind is perishable.

- सिद्धम् (borrowed from *sambhandha gadhyam*) - The conclusion is, that,
- प्रत्यगात्मनः - for the prathyak aathmaa / the saakshi chiathanyam / the real 'I' / the thvam padha lakshyaartha,
- साक्षात्त्वं अद्वैतं सन्ति(- there are 'Absolute Selfhood' and 'freedom from division'.

'saakshaathvam' means 'absolute Selfhood'; 'advaitam', in this context, means 'freedom from division'.

What kind of division is kept in mind? Ans: 'Substance-attribute' division.

The seeker has to receive this message and must remember this message, even when varieties of situations arise. The seeker should successfully get out of the triangular (*jeeva-jagath-Isvara*) format, in which format *ahamkaaraa* appears 'real' and 'dominant', because of which the 'situations' appear as 'problems', and special prayers to *Isvara* are found necessary. In contrast, when the seeker diligently remembers that *ahamkaaraa* is false, the 'situation' will not be tagged 'problem'. It will be re-tagged ; the problem tag is removed and every situation will be considered as an 'entertainment', provided by *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*, with 'I', the *saakshi*, just observing the entertainment.

- एतद् सिद्धम् (again from the *sambhandha gadhyam*) - This conclusion is arrived at,
- कूटस्थ बोधतः - because of the 'absolute, changeless Consciousness' nature of saakshi chiathanyam.

'Kootastha bodhatha:' means 'Kottastha bodhaath hetho:' |

For the *ahamkaaraa* to be able to present this entertainment, 'I' have to be there. *Ahamkaaraa* is only the mind and the mind cannot give entertainment unless 'I' am there, blessing the mind with *chidhaabhaasaa*. (This is somewhat similar to the 'sensors' provided for modern day water taps, which open automatically to provide water, when the hand or receptacle is extended beneath the tap.)

When 'I' am there, the 'water' of life 'flows'; in *sushupthi*, the 'flow' stops temporarily.

132. Chapter III, Verse 15 to 17 (28-02-2009)

Explaining the lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa, Sureswaraachaaryaa is differentiating the *thvam padha vaachyaartha* and the *thvam padha lakshyaartha*, in the mahaa vaakyam, 'thaththvamasi'.

He first points out, that, the *thvam padha vaachyaartha* is the mind and the *thvam padha lakshyaartha* is the *aathmaa*.

Having presented *aathmaa* as *laksyaartha* and mind as *vaachyaartha*, he then shows the difference between the *aathmaa* and the mind, as well as the relationship between the two.

The important differences between *aathmaa* and mind are:

- (i) *aathmaa* is the primary Self and mind is the secondary Self;
- (ii) *aathmaa* has got intrinsic Consciousness and mind has got borrowed Consciousness;
- (iii) *aathmaa* is the observer of the mind and mind is the observer of the world;
- (iv) *aathmaa* observes the mind without undergoing any change; but, mind observes the world by undergoing changes
- (v) *aathmaa* is the permanent observer of the mind ; but, mind is non-permanent observer of the world , because mind observes the world, only in the waking stage; mind does not observe the world all the time.
- (vi) *aathmaa* observes the mind without a will and an action; it observes by its mere presence; whereas the mind observes the world by action, not by its mere presence.
- (vii) *aathmaa* is the *kaaranam* and mind is the *kaaryam* .

Of these, the last fact, viz. *aathmaa* is the *kaaranam* and mind is the *kaaryam*, is in the sense that *aathmaa*, the primary Self generates the secondary Self, the mind, by lending Consciousness. *Aathmaa* can be and is Self without the help of the mind, but, mind becomes the self, only because of borrowing Consciousness from the *aathmaa*. Expressing it differently, if the *aathmaa* does not lend Consciousness to the mind, mind cannot become the secondary self.

All these differences should be remembered by a diligent *Vedhaanthic* student / seeker.

Sureswaraachaaryaa concedes: "In common parlance, the word '*thvam*' would have meant the secondary Self, the mind" and proceeds "but, in *Vedhaanthic* parlance, the word '*thvam*' should refer to the primary Self, *aathmaa* alone." And, their relationship is, that, the secondary self is the 'son' (*kaaryam*) and the primary self is the 'father' (*kaaranam*).

The *Aachaaryaa* is struggling to communicate all these differences; his job is understandably difficult, because *aathmaa* and mind cannot be physically separated during the *jaagrath avasthaa*. If only this were possible, i.e. if only *aathmaa* and mind could be separated during the *jaagrath avasthaa*, the *Vedhaanthic* teachers can more easily point out the differences between the two.

But, during *jaagrath avasthaa*, primary Self and secondary Self are always together and are both operational. Also, the secondary Self dominates the primary Self during *jaagrath*, the tangible proof being the 'mental worries' that the individual is subject to, when awake. The causes of worry may differ; but, presence of worry is permanent in *jaagrath avasthaa*, proving the domination of the secondary self over the primary Self.

The introduction to or the experience of the primary Self, without the domination by the secondary Self, can be had in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, when the mind, the secondary Self resolves and only 'I' remain, dominating as the primary Self, *Aathmaa*. But, unfortunately, instead of claiming this primary Self, the *ajnaani* concludes: "I am 'nothing' during *sushupthi*".

That is what Indira also said in the *Prajapathi Vidhya - Chaandoghya Upanishad* (Ch. VIII), during the teachings he received on '*viswa-thaijasa-praagnya-thuriya*' stages. In the third stage of the teaching, without a clear understanding of the primary Self, Indira mistakenly says "During *sushupthi*, I surely get lost (*vinaasameva apitha: bhavathi*). I am 'nothing'". Then, *Prajapathi* has to correct him and teach him "During *sushupthi* you are **not** 'nothing'; you are the primary Self"

But, an important factor is to be noted in this context: To '**be**' the primary Self, *sushupthi avasthaa* is enough. But, to '**claim**' the primary Self (i.e. to claim "'I' am the primary Self") the seeker has to come back to *jaagrath avasthaa* and, ironically, use the instrumentality of the secondary Self, the mind. Using the secondary Self, 'I' claim "'I' am the primary Self".

'Guiding the student to understand this', is the job attempted by the *Vedhaanthic guru*, through the *mahaavaakya vichaaraa*.

"With the help of the secondary Self, I am claiming 'I' am the primary Self" is the essence of all these *slokaas*.

The first half of the *sloka* no. 15 deals with the primary Self and the second half deals with the secondary self. In the first half (as discussed in the earlier session), the *Aachaaryaa* said "*kootastha bodhatha: advaitham saakshaathvam prathyaagaathmana.*" meaning "because the *aathmaa* has got changeless Consciousness, that (*aathmaa*) is the primary Self

/ the absolute Self, without any internal 'substance-attribute' division". 'Advaitam' means 'without any division', in this context.

In the second half, Sureswaraacharya says:

- धीः बोद्धी(भवति) - The mind becomes the secondary Self / the observer of the external world,

'*Bhodhree*' means 'observer / knower of the external world'; '*dhee:*' means 'mind'. '*Bhodree*' is 'feminine' form of '*Bhodhad*', which word is of masculine gender; since '*dhee:*' is 'feminine', the word '*bhodhree*' is used, instead of '*bhodhad*'.

How does the mind become the 'knower of the world'?

- कूटस्थ बोधात् - because of the borrowed Consciousness of the *aathmaa*.

An important factor to be noted, in this context: Since it is said 'Consciousness **of** the *aathmaa*, it may appear that there is a 'substance-attribute' relationship between the two. Strictly speaking, the term, '**of** *aathma*' should not be used, since *aathmaa* and Consciousness are not different. *Aathmaa* **is** Consciousness and Consciousness **is** *aathmaa*. But, obviously, one has to use language for expressing / communicating ideas and in the process of using language, such compromises become inevitable.

This problem is explained by an expression, '*raaho: siravath shashti*'; '*raho: sira:*' means the 'head of *raahu*'. According to mythology, an *asuraa*, in the form of a snake, was cut into two, by Lord Vishnu; the head part of the *asuraa* became *Rahu* and the tail part became *Kethu*. Therefore, really speaking, the expression 'head of *Raahu*' or '*Raaho: sira:*' should not be used, since *Raahu* itself is the head. But, the expression '*raho: sira:*' is commonly used to be more explicit. Just as in that expression, the *shashti vibakthi* / the preposition 'of', has no meaning and the 'head of *Raahu*' means only *Raahu*, in a similar manner, 'Conscience of *aathma*' means only 'Consciousness, the *aathma*'. The preposition 'of' is only figurative.

From the Consciousness of the *aathmaa*, (i.e. from the Consciousness, 'borrowed' from *aathmaa*), the mind becomes the secondary observer called *ahamkaara:*, which is the *thvam padha vaachyaartha:* |

- अयं हि - Further, this mind/ the secondary Self,

- स्वतः :- by itself,
- विनश्यती - is subject to dissolution.

Unlike the primary Self which is permanent, the secondary self is impermanent. During *sushupthi*, the secondary self is gone. What is the proof? During *sushupthi*, the world is not observed. During *moorchaa*, the secondary self is gone; the world is not observed. During *maranam*, the secondary self is gone; the world is not observed. During *pralayam*, the secondary self is gone; the world is not observed.

In *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* also, if all the thoughts are removed, the secondary self/ the mind also will go; in 'thoughtless' *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, the primary Self will be there alright; but, the primary Self cannot claim "'I' am the primary Self ". That is why the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* says, that, *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* is not useful for *jnaanam*, if *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* is a 'thoughtless' stage. And, that is why, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin* further advises the seeker: "Never aim for a 'thoughtless' stage in meditation; even if you choose to practice meditation, the mind should be kept alert and active. Only then, the secondary self will be available. Only when the secondary self is available, you can claim "'I' am the primary Self".

When the seeker does *mano naasam*, the result will be, that, though the seeker will be the primary Self **alone**, it will be of no use for him / her, because he / she cannot *claim* "'I' am the primary Self". Whereas, *mokshaa* requires this 'claiming' that "'I' am the primary Self". Just '**being**' the primary Self does not help 'liberation'; every *samsaari* is primary Self '**alone**', in *sushupthi*. In fact, the seeker is primary Self **all the time**, coupled with secondary self during *jaagrath* and '**alone**' as primary Self, during *sushupthi*; but, it is "'**claiming**' the primary Self" that gives liberation.

That 'claiming' requires *jaagrath avasthaa* ; that 'claiming' requires the mind ; that 'claiming' requires the deep, precious thought "*aham brahma asmi*", which thought, ironically, has to be entertained by the secondary Self. Through that alone, the seeker has to claim "'I' am the primary Self".

Therefore the *Aachaaryaa* warns '*Iyam hi svatha; vinaswaree*', where, '*iyam*' denotes the '*buddhi:*' / the secondary self; '*svatha:*' means 'by itself' and '*vinaswaree*' means 'impermanent'. '*Vinasevaree*' is *sthree lingaa*, because, the word '*buddhi:*' is *sthree lingaa*.

What is to be importantly noted is: 'Using the secondary' self is harmless. Not only is it harmless but, 'using the secondary self' is highly useful and necessary also. Even to attempt *Vedhaanthic* study and study of texts such as '*Naishkarmya siddhi*', the seeker has to use

the secondary self. Therefore, the aim of *Vedhaanthaa* is not 'rejection of the ego'; but, is 'use of the ego' to claim "I am not the ego'.

"Use the precious 'ego' to claim 'I am not the 'ego'; 'ego' is my instrument.' I' am the primary Self, the *aathmaa*, user of the 'ego' " should be the realization. This is *nithya mukthi*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 16 – Chapter III:

अथाधुना प्रकृतस्यैव परिणामिनः कूटस्थस्य च लक्षणमुच्यते ।

Now the definitions of the 'changing entity' and the 'unchanging reality' are given:

In the following *slokaa*, another important difference between the primary Self, the *aathmaa*, and the secondary self, the mind, is highlighted by the *Aachaaryaa*, the difference being, that, the primary Self is 'changeless observer', observing by its mere presence, while secondary self is 'changing observer', observing by undergoing thought modifications. (This difference has been included in the 'list of differences' enumerated earlier, numbered as (iv)).

- अथाधुना - Hereafter / in the following *slokaa*
- लक्षणं - the distinct nature(s),
- परिणामिनः - of the changing secondary self, viz., the mind
- कूटस्थस्य च - and of the changeless primary Self, which is the *aathmaa*,

One (the mind) is *thvam padha vaachyaarthaa* and the other (the *aathmaa*) is *thvam padha lakshyaarthaa*.

- प्रकृतस्य एव - which is (are) the topic(s) of discussions

'*Prakrutham*' means 'current topic', which is *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. The primary Self and the secondary Self will have to be discussed, as parts of the *vichaaraa*.

- उच्यते - are being given.

The *lakshanam*(s) given here are very beautiful definitions. The *Aachaaryaa* explains as to what the 'changing entity' is and what the 'changeless entity' is.

'Changing entity' is that entity, some of the features of which, change; but, whose continuity nevertheless, is recognized by means of what can be termed the 'recognition process', which process consists in 'noting the changeless features'. For instance, when one comes across a known person, though one notes changes in some of the features of that individual, since the time one met the individual last (the earlier dark coloured hair changing into grey coloured hair etc.), there will be certain unchanged / common features also, because of which one recognizes that known individual. Those unchanged / common features help in arriving at the conclusion, 'that person is this person', which is called the 'process of recognition'. When the identity is thus recognized, through the unchanged / common features, the changed / uncommon features are also noticed. But, the 'oneness' is established because of the common continuous features. In other words, the *saamaanya dharmaa*: help in establishing the 'oneness' of the entity.

'Oneness' is the recognition such as 'that Rama is this Rama', 'that Devadhaththaa is this Devadhaththaa', 'that Swami Omkaranandha is this Swamiji' etc. In the incident referred to, in an earlier session, many people, who had not recognized Swami Omkaranandha for more than an hour during the *Puja*, because of changes in his appearance, recognized his voice, when the Swamiji started his speech, and remarked 'Oh! It is that Omkaranandha'.

In this incident, it was the voice of Swami Omkaranandha which was unchanged / the *saamaanya dharma*, which helped in recognition of the 'oneness' of the entity, in and through his changed physical features.

Thus, '*ParinaamI*' is that, which has got *saamaanya dharmaa*: / unchanged features / common features and also *visesha dharmaa*: / changed features / uncommon features. The *saamaanya dharmaa*: / common features help in recognition of the 'oneness' / continuity of the entity. The *visesha dharmaa*: / the changed features / uncommon features reveal the 'changes' in the '*ParinaamI*'.

The two combined features, '*saamaanya + visesha dharmaa*:', is the *lakshanam* of a changing entity. This definition is given in this verse no. 16.

Why does the *Aachaaryaa* give this definition? Ans: He wants to say that the secondary self is the changing self; that, *Ahamkaaraa*, the ego, is the *parinaami aham* / the changing entity. 'That the primary Self is the changeless *aham*' is covered in the next *sloka*.

Chapter III: Verse 16 –

विशेषं कंचिदाश्रित्य यत्स्वरूपं प्रतीयते ।

प्रत्यभिज्ञानप्रमाणेन परिणामि स देहवत् ॥ १६ ॥

What gets apprehended through recognition as one and continuous, in and through differences, is the changing phenomenon, like the body.

- यत्स्वरूपं प्रतीयते - The continuity of a changing substance is known
- प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रमाणेन - by means of the process of 'recognition',

What is this 'process of recognition'?

In the *saasthraas*, the 'recognition process' is clearly explained. A *Vedhaanthic* student should clearly understand the process. The process has three stages or phenomena. The first stage / phenomenon is called 'cognition'. When one sees an individual / an object for the first time, it is called 'cognition'; 'cognition' is the result of *prathyaksha pramaanam*. The second stage / phenomenon is, that, even after the individual goes away/ the object is removed, the individual / the object is 'remembered'. That phenomenon / stage is 'remembrance'. When the individual / object is seen a second time, and understood as 'that is this', it is the third stage / phenomenon, termed 'recognition'.

The 'recognition process' can be further explained by a simple example, as below:

"Suppose I see a person for the first time, introduced to me, as Rama. I get to know him as Rama. This is 'cognition', when there is thought, as '*ayam Raama:*'; *Rama vrutthi* is there. After Rama leaves my presence, I remember him and in that 'remembrance' also, there is thought, but, as '*sa: Raama:*' | *Rama vrutthi* is there in 'remembrance' also; but, Rama is not in front of me. When I have *Rama vrutthi*, when Rama is in front of me, the *vrutthi* is '*ayam Rama:*' / When I have *Rama vrutthi*, without Rama in front of me, the *vrutthi* is '*sa: Raama:*' | '*Ayam Raama:*' is 'cognition'; '*sa: Raama:*' is 'remembrance'. But, in both, i.e. in 'cognition' and in 'remembrance', *Rama vrutthi* is there, in 'cognition' with Rama in front and in 'remembrance' with Rama not in front.

"Now, suppose Rama comes in front of me for a second time, and I see him. Can it be called cognition? No, it cannot be called 'cognition', since the word 'cognition' is to be used only when Rama is perceived for the first time. But, this is not the first time. Therefore it is not 'cognition'. Then, can it be called 'remembrance'? Again, no, because, in 'remembrance' Rama will not be in front of me; he will be away. But, in this instance of Rama coming for a second time, Rama is in front of me. Since Rama is in front, it is not 'remembrance' also.

"Thus, it is neither 'cognition' nor 'remembrance'. Then, what is it? Ans: It is 'recognition'; i.e. I have **re**-cognized the previously cognized Rama.

"How is the 'recognition' expressed? Ans: As '*Sa: Rama: ayam Rama:'* – 'the previously cognized Rama is the Rama I am cognizing now'. Thus, in 'recognition', two Rama-s are involved:

- (i) the previously cognized Rama, and
- (ii) the presently cognized Rama.

I equate both of them as one Rama, because they have some common features, even though they may have some uncommon features also.

"I notice the common features (*saamaanya dharmaa:*) between the two Rama-s , because of which common features, I equate the two Rama –s; but, I also notice some uncommon features (*visesha dharmaa:*), because of which , I get to know that Rama is a 'changing' person.

"Previously cognized Rama is presented as '*sa: Rama:'*'; presently cognized Rama is called '*ayam Rama:'* | Therefore, in all 'recognitions' both the words '*sa:'*' and '*ayam'*' must come. '*Soyam'*' is the typical factor in all 'recognitions'.

"To consolidate: In 'cognition', the word '*ayam'*' is used, as '*ayam Rama:'*'; in 'remembrance', the word '*sa:'*' is used, as '*sa: Rama:'*'; in 'recognition', the compound word '*soyam'*' is used, as '*soyam Rama:'*'. In '*soyam Rama:'*', both the changeless, *saamanyaa dharmaa:* and the changing , *visesha dharmaa:* are kept in mind. And I equate both Rama-s, as '*soyam'*'."

In Sanskrit, 'cognition' is called '*prathyaksham'*'; 'remembrance' is called '*smrithi:'*' and 'recognition' or 'recognition' is called '*prathyabhijnyaa'*'.

Every '*prathyabhijnyaa'*' involves the two components, '*prathyaksham'*' and '*smrithi:'*' | Expressed arithmetically, '*Prathyaksham' + 'Smrithi:'*' = '*Prathyabhijnyaa'*'.

In the compound term '*soyam'*', the '*sa:'*' part is 'remembrance', '*ayam'*' part is 'cognition' and the combination '*soyam'*' is 'recognition'. To express in Sanskrit, '*sa:'*' part is '*smrithi:'*', '*ayam'*' part is '*prathyaksham'*' and '*soyam'*' combination is called '*prathyabhijnyaa'*'. Every '*prathyabhijnyaa'*' reveals the continuity of a 'changing entity'.

Coversely, whatever is revealed by '*prathyabhijnyaa'*' is called 'a changing entity'. '*Prathyabhijnyaa: vishaya:'*' is 'the changing entity'.

Reverting to the text (verse 16):

- यत्स्वरूपं प्रतीयते - Whatever gets apprehended
- प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्रमाणेन - through the 'process of recognition',
- सः - that entity,
- परिणामि - is a 'changing entity' ,

An example is given for '*parinaami*'.

- देहवत् - like the body,
- विशेषं कंचित् आश्रित्य - because of some 'changing special features',

'*Visesham*' means 'changing special feature'. What is meant by 'changing special feature'? Ans: A current feature which was not there earlier.

To understand this term '*visesham*' more clearly, the earlier cited example of Swami Omkarananada may again be taken up. The voice of the Swamiji had not changed and is, therefore, termed the *saamaanya dharma*, i.e. as 'common feature' between the Swamiji known in the past and the Swamiji now present.

The unchanged voice helped in 'equating' the two Swamijis, the past and the present, and therefore, in the 'recognition' of the Swamiji. But, some of his other features such as *jata*, facial hair etc. were not there earlier, and are the therefore his 'changed features, termed '*visesham*' in Sanskrit.

All '**re**-cognized entities' are called *parinaami* – 'changing entity'. Human body is *parinaami* / 'Mind' (*ahamkaaraa*) also is a *parinaami* |

In this verse, the '*thvam padha vaachyaarthaad*' viz., *ahamkaaraa* has been talked about. The next verse talks about the *thvam padha lakshyaarthaad*, viz., *aathmaa*, the 'changeless entity'.

Chapter III: Verse 17 –

सामान्याच्च विशेषाच्च स्वमहिम्नैव यो भवेत् ।

व्युत्थायाप्यविकारी स्यात्कुम्भाकाशादिवत्तु सः ॥ १७ ॥

What, by its own nature, transcends the universal and particular determinations as their witness and abides by itself without any change whatever, is called unchanging like the space transcending the limiting condition of a jar.

Whereas (i.e. having discussed about 'mind'), what about *aathmaa*?

- यः भवेत् - That which remains
- अविकारी - as a 'changeless entity',

Body changes; mind changes; *chidhaabhaasaa* also has to undergo changes. When the mind is dull, the absorbing capacity of *chidhaabhaasaa* also comes down. *Chidhaabhaasaa* changes. *Chith* remains changeless.

How?

- स्वमहिम्ना एव - by its own glory,

Ahamkaaraa 'is', but, not because of its own glory; it has got only borrowed glory, *chidhaabhaasaa*, whereas, *aathmaa* has *svamahimaa*. It remains the *saakshi* / the 'changeless Observer', by its own intrinsic Consciousness.

- व्युत्थाय - transcending
- सामान्याच्च - *saamaanya dharma-s* / general attributes

Aathmaa, unlike the mind which has got its own common attribute viz. that of being 'matter', does not have any common / universal attribute. Thoughts of the mind may be 'changing'; but, *bhudhikathva dharma* (materiality) is always there for the mind. That is the *saamaanya dharma* of the mind, and, in fact, of any other object.

- विशेषाच्च - and also *visesha dharma-s* / particular attributes,

This is a very important concept, discussed in *Vedhaanthaa*. *Aathmaa* should be presented as that which is beyond *saamaanyam* and *visesham*, '*saamaanyam*' meaning 'generality' and '*visesham*' meaning 'particularity'.

Whatever is '*saamaanyam*' / 'general' will be associated with 'particular' and whatever is 'particular' will have relationship with '*saamaanyam*' / 'general'. How and why? Ans: Anything

'general' is associated with 'particular', because, the very word 'general' is that, which is in and through all the 'particulars'. Anything 'particular' is called 'particular', only because it is associated with 'general', since without association with 'general', the very word 'particular' is meaningless.

Therefore, '*saamaanyam*' and '*visesham*' have got non-separable relationship. This is one important fact to be noted.

A consequent fact is, that, when *visesha* undergoes change, *saamaanya* being related, is also influenced by the change. The continuity of *Saamaanyaa* is there; but it is influenced by the change, because, it has got a relationship with the changing *viseshaa*.

It follows, therefore, that, **if** *aathmaa* comes under either *saamaanyam* or *visesham*, it will become a 'changing entity'. It will be 'eternal but eternally changing', similar to matter. Whereas, *aathmaa* is beyond both *saamaanyam* and *visesham*.

A more detailed explanation / analysis of this topic will be given in the next session.

At this juncture, it is enough to note the following: "We have got two types of 'eternity'.

"One is 'changing eternity' and the other is 'changeless entity'. Matter comes under 'changing eternity'; it *is* 'eternal entity' – but, is 'changing eternal entity'. There *is* continuity for matter, for it is 'matter' all the time; but it is changing matter. The eternity is 'changing eternity'.

"Consciousness is also eternal but it is a 'changeless eternity'.

"Matter has got *saamaanyaa* and *visesha*. Consciousness has neither."

- सःस्यात् - is the *thvam* *padha* *lakshyaartha*:, called the *aathmaa* .

The *Aachaaryaa* gives an example, for the 'changelessness and limitless' of the *aathmaa*.

- कुम्भ आकाशादिवत् - (This *aathmaa* is 'unchanging and limitless') similar to 'space' in a jar, but, which transcends the limiting condition of the jar

133. Chapter III, Verse 17 to 19 (07-03-2009)

Sureswaraachaarya is differentiating between the 'thvam padha vaachyaarthaa', which is the 'mind' or 'ahamkaaraa' and the 'thvam padha lakshyaarthaa', which is the 'aathmaa'. The differences between 'aathmaa' and 'mind' are presented by him.

In the previous session, the differences were given in the form of a chart. In view of the importance of the topic, they are listed out again, as below:

- (i) *aathmaa* is the primary Self and mind is the secondary Self;
- (ii) *aathmaa* has got intrinsic Consciousness and mind has got borrowed Consciousness;
- (iii) *aathmaa* is the 'perceiver' of the mind and mind is the 'perceiver' of the world;
- (iv) *aathmaa* is the permanent 'perceiver' of the mind ; but, mind is the temporary perceiver of the world;
- (v) *aathmaa* is changeless 'perceiver' ; mind is changing 'perceiver'.
- (vi) *aathmaa's* 'perception' requires only its mere presence; mind's 'perception' requires a process.

These are the main differences between '*thvam padha vaachyaarthaa*', the mind and '*thvam padha lakshyaarthaa*', *aathmaa*.

In the context of *mahaavaakyam 'thath thvam asi'*, only the *lakshyaarthaa* should be taken for the word '*thvam*' and not the *vaachyaarthaa*.

In these two verses 16 and 17, Sureswaraachaarya is highlighting the 'changing nature' of the mind and the 'changeless nature' of the *aathmaa*.

Mind is subject to change and therefore, is called *parinaami* | *Aathmaa* is not subject to change and therefore, called *kootastha*: | Sureswaraachaarya is presenting here, the differentiation between the '*parinaami mana:*' and '*kootastha aathmaa*' | The *Aachaaryaa* is presenting it in a particular language, which the student has to understand.

Whenever any 'change' is talked about, it requires two things; i.e., any 'change' presupposes two things. One is the 'locus' of the change. The other is the 'witness' of the change.

What is the difference between the 'locus' of the change and the 'witness' of the change?
Ans: 'Locus' of the change is that entity which is the 'possessor' of the change and which is affected by the change. Whereas, 'witness' of the change is not a 'possessor' of the change and is not affected by the change also.

To repeat in other words: One is 'possessor' and the other is 'non-possessor'. One is 'affected' and the other in 'non-affected'. The 'possessor, affected one' is called 'locus' and the 'non-possessor, non-affected one' is called 'witness'.

Whenever the property of 'change' is talked about, both the 'locus' and 'witness' are involved. And, Sureswaraachaarya points out that mind is the (i) possessor of 'change' (ii) the 'locus' of 'change' and (iii) is affected by 'change'.

In contrast, *aathmaa* is the 'witness' of the change and therefore is neither the possessor of the 'change', nor is the affected party.

Therefore, mind is called '*parinaami*' and *aathmaa* is called '*kootastha:*', which word only means '*aparinaami*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa further says that both the 'locus' of the change and the 'witness' of the change are understood only through '*prathyabhignyaa pramaanam*' i.e., during 'the process of recognition'. This is a very important and unique proposition made by this treatise, Naishkarmya Siddhi.

This proposition / concept is explained by a simple analogy, as below:

"When you are visiting the *aasthika samaajam* hall for the first time, you are 'cognizing' the hall. When you are thus cognizing the hall for the first time, can you talk about a 'change' in the hall? Can you say 'the *aasthika samaajam* hall has changed'? The answer is obviously 'no', since you see the hall for the first time. When you are visiting the hall for the first time and therefore, without the knowledge of how the hall looked earlier, you can never talk about the hall as 'changed' or as a 'locus' of change. If and when you say 'the hall has changed', then, it is not your first-time perception of the hall. You can talk about any change in the hall, only when you are visiting the hall for the second time. And, when you are visiting the hall for the second time, are you 'cognizing' the hall or '**re**-cognizing' the hall? It is '**re**-cognition'. Only at the time of recognition, when you perceive the hall for the second time, you can recognize changes, if any, such as 'the hall has been re-painted' or 'the previously dilapidated hall has been renovated' etc. The conclusion, therefore, is that the 'locus' of the change can be known through 'recognition' only. In other words, a *parinaami vasthu* is known as *parinaami vasthu*, only through or during '*prathyabhignyaa*'.

"Similarly, witness of the change also can be known only through *prathyabhignyaa*. Going back to the *aasthika samaajam* hall example, during the first visit, i.e. in the first 'cognition', you could not talk of a 'change' in the hall and therefore, you could not talk of yourself as 'witness' of any 'change'. Only during the second or subsequent visits, when, changes, if

any, are noticed and you can talk of the changes and therefore, you can talk of yourself as 'witness' of the changes. You were 'witness' of the previous condition of the hall and later you are a 'witness' of the changed condition of the hall also. It follows, therefore, that, the 'witness' of the 'change' is also known through 're-cognition' or '*prathyabhignyaa*' only.

"In the above example, the *aasthika samaajam* hall is the 'locus' and you are the 'witness' and both 'locus' and 'witness' are known during the second visit only or through 'recognition' or '*prathyabhignyaa*' " .

The difference between the locus and witness is: "'Locus' is the possessor of the change and is affected by the change. 'Witness' is neither the possessor nor is the affected one".

And, Sureswaraacharya points out: "Whenever you refer to yourself as 'I am the changing one, the possessor of the change and affected by change', the word 'I' refers to the *parinaami ahamkaara*; the mind or the *parinaami* body . Alternately, if and when you refer to yourself as only the 'witness' of the change, not the possessor and nor the affected one, the word 'I' refers to *aathmaa*, the *saakshi*".

Therefore, what is the difference between mind and *aathmaa*? Ans: "When I am the possessor of the change, I am the mind. When I say that I am witness of the change I am the *saakshi*. One is affected by the change; another is unaffected by the change".

A further factor is to be noted: The 'locus' of the change is present in and through the change as the possessor of the change. 'Witness' of the change is also in and through the change but not affected by the change. In other words, the *parinaami* is also continuous and the 'witness' also is continuous.

To consolidate: Continuity is there for the 'locus' of the change; continuity is there for the 'witness' of the change also. The continuous 'locus' is the affected one; the continuous 'witness' is the unaffected one. Mind is the continuous 'locus', the affected one; Consciousness is the continuous 'witness', the unaffected one. The 'continuous, affected locus and the 'continuous, unaffected witness' are both known through / during *prathyabhignyaa*.

And, to differentiate the 'continuous, affected locus' from the 'continuous, unaffected witness', specific Sanskrit terms are used for both:

- The 'continuous, affected locus' is called '*saamaanyam*' .
- The 'continuous, unaffected witness' is called '*nissamaanyam*' .

Mind is *saamaanyam*, which is the possessor of *visesham* and affected by *visesham*. Whereas *aathmaa* has neither *visesham* nor is *saamaanyam*. The definition for *aathmaa* is '*nissaamaanya visesham*' – 'continuous witness, which does not possess any *visesham*'.

In the 16th *sloka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa talked about mind as the *saamanya amsaa*, which possesses the *visesham*; in the 17th verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa says *aathmaa* is the 'continuous witness' of *visesham*, but, neither *saamaanyam* nor possessor of *visesham*.

Reverting to the verse no. 17:

- यः - *Aathmaa*, which is the continuous 'witness',
- व्युत्थाय - which (*aathmaa*) transcends
- सामान्याच्च - the continuous mind, which is the locus of the change,
'*Saamaanyam*' refers to the continuous mind, which is the 'locus' of the change, the possessor of the change and is affected by the change. *Aathmaa* is different from that mind.
- विशेषाच्च -- and the changing attributes also,

In short, *aathmaa* is different from the changing attributes and *aathmaa* is different from the changing locus also. It is neither the attribute nor the locus of the attribute. It is the 'changeless witness'.

- स :- that *aathmaa*
- अविकारी स्यात् - is called 'unchanging' / 'changeless'

Like what? An example is given.

- कुम्भ आकाशादिवत् - like the *ghataakaasa* thathvam.

'*Ghataakaasam*' means 'pot space'. How is the example to be applied? Ans: The pot space is in and through the change but not the locus of the change. When the pot is broken i.e., when the condition of the pot changes, the space in the pot does not change. The pot is the 'locus' of the change; but, pot-space is not the 'locus' of change. In a similar manner, Consciousness is also in and through change; but not the 'locus' of the change, unlike the mind which is also in and through the change but is the 'locus' of the change.

The word 'locus' is used to refer to an entity which itself changes when exposed to a change. Conversely, when an entity is said to be 'not the locus', it means that 'the entity itself does not undergo change'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 18 and 19 – Chapter III:

आत्मनो बुद्धेश्च बोधप्रत्यगात्मत्वमभिहितं तयोरसाधारणलक्षणाभिधानार्थमाह ।

To both the Self and the mind, Consciousness and immediacy were ascribed. Now their distinctive natures are definitely elucidated:

To recap the recent discussions: Matter is also eternal; Consciousness is also eternal. Matter is the 'locus' of all the changes; therefore, it is 'changing eternity' or '*parinaami nithyam*'. Consciousness is also eternal, but, is only the 'witness' of all the changes, not subject to change. Therefore, it is 'changeless eternity' / '*kootastha nithyam*'. This important difference between the 'locus' and the 'witness', between 'matter' and 'Consciousness' should be noted and remembered.

Now, in the *sloka* following this *sambhandha gadhyam*, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about some other differences between mind and *aathmaa*. In the *sambhandha gadhyam*, he says:

- आत्मनः बुद्धेश्च - For the *aathmaa* and the mind,
- बोधप्रत्यगात्मत्वं अभिहितं - 'sentiency' and 'selfhood' have been ascribed .

'*Bodha*' means 'sentiency' / '*chethanathvam*'. Sentiency is there for the mind also and sentiency is there for the *aathmaa* also; i.e., '*Chethanathvam*' is common to both the mind and the *aathmaa*. Similarly, '*prathyagaathmathvam*', meaning 'selfhood', is also mentioned for the mind as well as *aathmaa*. Mind was called 'secondary self'; *aathmaa* was called 'primary Self'. 'Selfhood' is common to both. What do you mean by 'selfhood'? Ans: It means "can be referred to by the word 'I' ". '*Prathyagaathmathvam*' or 'selfhood' means '*aham sabhda vishayathvam*'.

When an individual says "I am emotional", he / she is referring to his / her secondary self, the mind. The word 'I' is used, in this context, to refer to the secondary self, the mind. But, if and when the same individual claims '*aham Brahma asmi*', the very word *aham* / 'I' is used to refer to the changeless *aathmaa*. Thus, the opportunity / possibility of being referred to, by the word 'I', is called 'selfhood' and 'selfhood' is attributed to both *aathmaa* and mind. Sentiency is also attributed to both *aathmaa* and mind.

This gives rise to the question: "If 'selfhood' and 'sentiency' are common to both, what is the difference between the 'selfhood' of the mind and that of the *aathmaa*; and, similarly, what is the difference between the 'sentiency' of the mind and that of the *aathmaa*?"

- अभिधानार्थम् - For the purpose of teaching,
'*abhidhaanam*' means 'teaching'
- असाधारणलक्षणम् - the distinctions
- तयोः - between these two (viz., the 'selfhood' of the mind and that of the *aathmaa*; and the 'sentiency' of the mind and that of the *aathmaa*)
- आह - the author is presenting the following verses.

The *Aachaaryaa* is presenting the following two *slokas*, to highlight the distinguishing features of the two 'sentiency-s' and the two 'selfhood-s'.

Chapter III: Verse 18 –

बुद्ध्यन्तप्रत्यगात्मत्वं तत्स्याद्देहाद्युपाश्रयात् ।

आत्मन्स्तु स्वरूपं तन्नभसः सुषिता यता ॥ १८ ॥

The mind can be regarded as the inner self only relatively to the body etc., but being the inmost self is the intrinsic essence of the real Self, even as spaciousness is the essence of space.

Of course this is a known idea, which the *Aachaaryaa* is crystallizing here.

- प्रत्यगात्मत्वं यत् तत् - The selfhood of the mind
- देहादि उपाश्रयात् स्यात् - is (only) from the standpoint of the external body.

From the standpoint of the external physical body, the mind is called 'I' or 'subject'. When you are looking at the body, the mind becomes the 'subject', the 'self'. But, when the mind itself is objectified, at that time, the mind becomes the non-self and Consciousness becomes the self. In other words, mind's selfhood is only when you are objectifying the body. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says '*dehaadhi upaasrayaath*' meaning 'from the standpoint of the body'.

Referring to the chart of differences discussed earlier, it was said that, "when *aathmaa* is the 'perceiver', the mind is the 'perceived' " and also that, "when the mind is the 'perceiver', the world is the 'perceived' ". Therefore, if the question "Is the mind the 'perceiver' or the

'perceived'?" is asked, there can be no immediate answer, since the mind has got 'dual' status and therefore, the question itself would need further clarification.

Mind is called a 'perceiver' from the standpoint of the world; whereas, from the standpoint of *aathmaa*, mind is no more the 'perceiver'; it becomes the 'perceived'. Therefore, from the standpoint of the world, mind becomes the 'subject', whereas, from the standpoint of *aathmaa*, it cannot be referred to, by the word 'I'; it should become an 'object' only.

Thus, the mind will be referred to, by the word 'I', when it gets the subjective status, from the standpoint of the world. Mind cannot be referred to by the word 'I', when it gets the objective status, from the standpoint of *aathmaa*.

This is the essence of the *Aachaaryaa's* statement "*dehaadhi upaasrayaath buddhe: prathyagaathmathvam syaath*" – "from the standpoint of the body and the world, the mind has got 'perceiver' status / 'subject status / selfhood'".

Then, what about *aathmaa*? Sureswaraachaarya says:

- आत्मनः तु - Whereas , for the *aathmaa*,

When does *aathmaa* enjoy 'the perceiver' status ? Mind enjoys 'the perceiver' status from the standpoint of the world, whereas it has only 'the perceived' status from the standpoint of *aathmaa*. In contrast, *aathmaa* enjoys 'the perceiver' status **all the time** ; because *aathmaa* is never / at no time perceived.

- प्रत्यगात्मत्वं - the 'perceiver' status / the 'subject' status
- स्वरूपं - is intrinsic / absolute.

Like what? An example is given.

- नभसः सुषिता यथा - like the 'hollowness' of the sky.

'*Nabhas*' means '*aakaasa*.'| '*Sushitha*' means 'hollowness', which, in turn, indicates, 'capacity to accommodate objects'. Other examples may also be quoted, such as, the 'heat of the fire' / the 'coldness of ice' etc. Similar to the 'accommodating capacity' of space, the 'heat of the fire' and the 'coldness of ice', which are all intrinsic or absolute to space, fire and ice respectively, the *prathyagaathmathvam* of the Consciousness is also intrinsic or absolute.

In simple language, "mind's self hood is relative; *aathma's* selfhood is absolute."

Chapter III: Verse 19 –

बोद्धृत्वं तद्वदेवास्याः प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिहेतुतः ।

आतमनस्तु स्वरूपं तत्तिष्ठन्तीव महीभूतः ॥ १९ ॥

The cognizing power of the mind is relative to its being the cause of mental presentations. But, the consciousness of the Self is its intrinsic essence, like the stability of a mountain.

In the previous *sloka*, the difference between the 'selfhood' of the mind and the 'selfhood' of *aathmaa* was presented. Here, in this verse, the difference between the 'awaring capacity' or 'sentiency' of the mind and the 'awareness' or 'sentiency' of the *aathmaa* is discussed.

One difference is that *aathmaa* has got intrinsic 'sentiency', while, mind has got only borrowed 'sentiency'.

But, here, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about another difference. What is that? Ans: The sentiency of the mind requires thought modification all the time, whereas, *Aaathmaa's* awareness is its very *svaroopam*.

To explain in detail: Mind enjoys awareness of things, only by undergoing thought modifications. To become aware of the world, it requires 'world thought (*idham vrutthi*)'; to become aware of itself, the mind requires 'I' thought (*aham vrutthi*).

In other words, mind's 'awareness of things' or 'self awareness', requires *vrutthi parinaama*. That's why in *sushupthi*, when the *vrutthis* are resolved, the mind is neither aware of the world nor aware of itself. In *sushupthi*, mind does not entertain thoughts; therefore it is neither aware of the world (because '*idham vrutthi*' is absent); it is not aware of itself also (because '*aham vrutthi*' is absent). In short, awareness of the mind requires a process.

Whereas, when you talk of the awareness of the *aathmaa*, in that context, the Consciousness is not a process; it is not based on *vrutthi parinaama*. 'Thought process' is not involved. *Aaathmaa's* awareness is its very *svaroopam*. It is not a faculty derived from thought modifications.

Referring to the *sloka* (verse 17):

- तद्वदेव - In a similar manner,

- अस्याः बोद्धृत्वं - the self awareness and world awareness of the mind,
(In this context, the term 'self awareness' is used to mean 'mind awareness').
- प्रत्यय उत्पत्ति हेतुतः - are only because of the 'rise' (and fall) of thoughts;

'*prathyaya*.' means 'thought'. When the student listens to the teacher, he / she is 'aware' of the teacher's words; he / she is 'aware' of the external world ; but, at that time he / she is not deliberately 'self-aware', in the form of "I am sitting ; I am listening" etc. He / she is not entertaining such thoughts. That's why, quite often, the absorbed student says "I forgot myself during the class". This 'forgetting' is because of absence of *aham vrutthi* in the mind of the student. But, if the teacher, at that time, questions the student 'how are you?', the *aham vrutthi* is deliberately entertained/ brought into action by the student and he / she talks about himself / herself, his / her physical condition, mental condition etc. This shows that the 'awareness' of the mind requires the 'thought process'.

'*Prathyaya*' means thought; '*uthpatthi*' means rise ; '*hethutha*.' means 'caused by'. This alone is meant by 'thought process'. Thought process is involved in mental awareness.

- आत्मनः तु - whereas, for the Self,
- बोद्धृत्वं स्वरूपं - the Consciousness / awareness is intrinsic.

The 'awareness' of the *aathmaa* is not the result of a process that happens in the *aathmaa*. Then, can it be said that 'Consciousness' / 'awareness' is an attribute of the *aathmaa*? Ans: No, this has also been negated before. It was pointed out earlier, (while discussing the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 15) that the 'mind' and 'awareness' have got 'substance-attribute' relationship, whereas *aathmaa* and 'awareness' do not have even 'substance-attribute' relationship. Therefore, 'awareness' of *aathmaa* is neither a process in *aathmaa* nor an attribute of *aathmaa*.

Then, what is the relationship between 'awareness' and *aathmaa*? Ans: There is no relationship; awareness **is** the *aathmaa*, which is 'changeless principle'.

That is why, in English, the term 'spirit' is used to denote *aathmaa*, because 'spirit' means 'non-material entity'. Anything 'material' would involve either 'attribute' or 'process' or both. *Aathmaa* is not a material, because neither process, nor attribute is involved in the context of *aathmaa*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*aathmana: thu boddhruthvam svaroopam*", meaning, that 'awareness' is the very nature of *aathmaa* – neither an attribute nor a process.

In contrast, in *nyaaya-vaisheshika dharsanam*, one *dharsanam* says awareness is an attribute of *aathmaa*; and, the other says awareness is an action of *aathmaa*.

Vedhaanthee asserts that 'awareness' is neither 'kriyaa' nor 'guna'. 'Aathmaa' is neither 'jnaana kriyaasrayam' nor 'jnaana gunaasrayam' but 'jnaanavaroopam'.

This gives rise to a doubt, viz., "if it is not a process, how can it be said that *aathmaa* is the 'perceiver' of the mind? The expression 'perceiver' is derived from the root 'perceive', 'perceive' is a verb and a verb reveals a process. So, would not the statement '*aathmaa* is 'perceiver' of the mind, result in admitting the involvement of a 'process'? If in reply to this, it is said 'No, *aathmaa* is not a 'perceiver' ; but it is a 'witness', even then, *aathmaa* will get associated with a process, since 'witnessing' is also a process. Whatever verb is used, *aathmaa* will get associated with a process. Then, how can statements such as '*aathmaa* is *saakshI*, '*aathmaa* is the knower' etc. be made at all?"

Sureswaraacharya answers this doubt. He says: "We are using a verb, but the verb used in the context of *aathmaa* does not convey a process. We are helplessly using a verb, because, in language, there is no other method available; and, therefore, we are constrained to use a verb. But, in the case of *aathmaa*, the verb does not reveal a process. Therefore, *aathmaa* is a 'processless' perceiver of the mind".

How does one understand this statement? Ans: "It is 'perceiver'; but, no action is involved in this 'perception'".

Several examples are given for this. One is what *Sankara Baghavadh Padhaa* gives in *Upadesa Saahasri*, the 'burning action' of fire. It can be explained as follows:

"Let us assume a piece of paper was placed in fire and was burnt. You say 'fire burned the paper'. When did the burning action start? Only when the paper is placed on the fire, the fire burnt. Therefore, the burning action of the fire *seems* to start at that particular time, when the paper is kept on the fire. Let us assume that at 8 o'clock, the paper was placed on the fire. At that time, what did the fire do? It burned the paper. But, can you say that the burning action of the fire started at 8 o'clock? Even though fire burned the paper at 8 o'clock, you cannot say that 'before 8 o'clock, the fire was not burning. At 8 o'clock, the burning action started'. Even though you use the expression 'fire burnt the paper at 8 o'clock', you cannot attribute an action on the fire at 8 o'clock, because the fire was remaining the same throughout, before placing the paper and after placing the paper. The fire did not do any special action. Still, we make the statement 'fire burnt the paper', with the verb 'burnt'. Here, with regard to fire, the verb 'burning' does not convey any process. If

at all a process was involved, it is only in the paper. It was the condition of the paper that changed. We use the verb 'burns' for the fire; but, fire actually does not perform any action, in 'burning'.

Then, what is the 'burning'? It is the *svaroopam* of the fire. In the same manner, when you say 'aathmaa illumines the mind', *aathmaa* does not do any action; it was, it is and it ever will be. Just, as in the presence of paper, we say 'fire burnt the paper', using the verb 'burnt', in the same manner, in the presence of the mind, we say 'aathmaa illumines the mind', using the verb 'illumines', though the verbs 'burnt' and 'illumines' do not involve any process on the parts of the fire and *aathmaa* respectively".

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives another example, instead of the above more popular 'fire' example given by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*,

- तत् तिष्ठन्तीव महीभूतः - (But) this is similar to saying that 'the mountain is 'standing' there.

To explain this example: In Sanskrit grammar, the verb 'standing' is used in the sense of non-motion / not moving – *gathi nivrutthau*. 'Withdrawal from motion' is called 'standing'. One can say 'a man is standing', because a man can also move / walk ; from the standpoint of 'motion' / 'walking' there is a meaning for the verb 'standing'. When it is said 'the man is standing', it means, 'the man is not moving now'. But, in the case of the mountain, strictly speaking, one cannot say 'the mountain is standing', because, the mountain never moves. In the context of the mountain, the verb 'standing' is used to convey its 'eternal motionless'. Though, thus, the verb 'standing' does not, in reality, have any significance in the context of the mountain, but, nevertheless, is used in the case of the mountain also, the verb 'perceives' is used for the *aathmaa*, though, it does not perform the *action* or *process* of 'perceiving'.

Aathmaa 'perceives' without a process; the mind perceives through a process. This is the difference between the awareness of the mind and awareness of the *aathmaa*.

134. Chapter III, Verse 19 to 21(14-03-2009)

Sureswaraacharya is differentiating between *thvam padha vaachyaarthaa*, which is nothing but the mind and *thvam padha lakshyaarthaa*, which is the *aathmaa*.

Aathmaa is the primary Self. Mind is the secondary self.

In these two verses 18 and 19, the *Aacharya* is differentiating between the selfhood of the mind and the selfhood of the *aathmaa*, as well as, between the sentiency of the mind and the sentiency of the *aathmaa*.

The differentiation of the 'selfhood' was done in the 18th verse. The student should first know what is meant by the word 'selfhood'. 'Selfhood' means 'having the status of being the meaning of the word 'I' '. In other words, the 'referability' (ability of being referred to) by the word 'I', is 'selfhood'. As for the differentiation, the selfhood of the mind is only relative selfhood, whereas the selfhood of the *aathmaa* is absolute selfhood. The 'I' status of the mind is only from the standpoint of the body and the world. The very same mind loses 'selfhood' from the standpoint of the *aathmaa*, from which standpoint, the mind becomes an 'object', and, therefore, cannot enjoy 'selfhood' or 'subject-hood'. To repeat for clarity: From the standpoint of the world, the mind is the 'subject', whereas, from the standpoint of *aathmaa*, it is only an 'object'. On the other hand, *aathmaa* is ever the 'subject' and never an 'object'. Therefore, mind's 'selfhood' is relative; *aathmaa's* 'selfhood' is absolute.

Having said that in the 18th verse, in the 19th verse, Sureswaraacharya talked of the differentiation on the 'sentiency' aspect. He said that the mind's sentiency depends upon the process of 'awaring' things by entertaining thoughts, whereas the sentiency of *aathmaa* is its very nature.

Mind's awareness is a result of a thought process. When the thoughts are ended or suspended, as in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, the mind can never 'aware' the world; nor can it 'aware' itself, as the relative 'I'. In *sushupthi*, when thoughts are suspended, the mind is neither aware of the world nor is it aware of itself or its condition. It follows, therefore, that, mind's awareness is a process or an action. This process or action is called '*prathaya uthpatthi:*' | '*Prathyaya uthpatthi:*' is another term for '*vrutthi parimaana:*' and both of them mean 'thought modification'. Therefore, the *Aacharya* says "*asyaa: (budde:) bodhruthvam prathyaya uthpatthi hethutha:*" meaning "the mind's sentiency or awareness is only because of rise and fall of thoughts"; as for the sentiency of *aathmaa*, he says "*aathmana: thu bodhruthvam svaroopam*", meaning "whereas, the sentiency of the *aathmaa* / the awareness of the *aathmaa* is not an action done by *aathmaa*; but, it is its very nature".

But, even though *aathmaa* does not have awareness as an 'action', we figuratively use verbs with regard to *aathmaa* also, as in the sentences "*aathmaa* is 'experiencing' the mind, *aathmaa* is 'witnessing' the thought" etc. We do use verbs; but, those verbs do not have any connotation of 'action'. To explain this concept, Sureswaraachaarya gave an example: "the mountains are 'standing'", in which statement, the verb 'standing' does not really have any 'action' connotation.

Another example is the statement "fire is 'burning'", in which sentence also, the verb 'burning' does not have any 'action' connotation.

To explain more in detail:

An action is always conditioned by time; that is why, any verb of action will always be associated with either present tense or past tense or future tense. Can one imagine a predicate in a sentence, without any tense – present, past or future? No; every predicate has to exist either in the *varthamaana kaalam* or *bootha kaalam* or *bhaavi kaalam*. For instance, the predicate 'eats' is in the *varthamaana kaalam*, 'ate' is *bootha kaalam* and 'will eat' is *bhaavi kaalam*. The predicate or the verb of action is always associated with tense or *kaalam*. But, in the statement 'mountains stand', the 'standing' of mountains is not associated with any particular *kaalam* – past, present or future. Since the three *kaalam*s have no relevance with regard to the 'standing' of the mountain, it is concluded that the verb 'stand', in this context, is not an 'action', even though it is a verb. That verb 'stand' does not also indicate a will on the part of the mountain; not does it involve a process on the part of mountain. In the same manner, when it is said "*aathmaa* is 'witnessing' the mind", the verb 'is witnessing' does not involve will; it does not involve action; it does not involve *kaalam* also. Therefore, the 'witnessing' is called *svaroopam*.

In the statement, '*maheebhrutha: thishtanthi, maheebhrutha:*' is plural or *bahuvachanam*, '*mahibhruth*' being the singular form or '*ekavachanam*'; and, '*maheebhrutha:*' means '*parvathaa:*' or 'mountains'; '*thishtanthi*' is the verb, where the verb indicates *svaroopam* and **not** action. Similarly, when it is said '*aathmaa* is aware', the 'awareness' is neither an action nor a property; but, it is *aathmaa's svaroopam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 20:

तयोः कूटस्थपरिणामिनोरात्मानवबोध एव संबन्धहेतुर्न पुनर्वास्तवः कश्चिदपि संबन्ध उपपद्यत इत्याह।

Between these two, the unchanging Self and the changing self, there is a phenomenal relation brought about, by the ignorance of the Self. No 'ultimately real' relation is possible between them. This is stated below:

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The secondary self, viz., the mind and the primary Self, viz., the *aathmaa* are intimately together. Whenever I use the word 'aham' or 'I', it is this mixture that is using the word 'I'; the mind, by itself, cannot use the word 'I'; *aathmaa*, by itself, also can never use the word 'I'; therefore, whenever I use the word 'I', it is the mixture of the secondary self and the primary Self together; and, since it is an 'intimately-together' mixture, an ignorant person fails to understand the distinction between the two components of the mixture. The 'ignorant' person is not aware of the fact that there is a higher, real component and a lower, *mithyaa* component in this mixture. This fact is not known to him. Therefore, there is *anyonya adhyaasa*: between them".

- तयोः कूटस्थ परिणामिनोः - Between these two, the primary Self and the secondary self, which are 'changeless' and 'subject to change' respectively.

The primary Self, viz. the *aathmaa* is *kootastha*; the 'changeless' ; the secondary self, viz. the mind is *parinaami*, the 'changing'.

- आत्म अनवबोधः एव - only because of the sheer ignorance of the fact that I am a mixture of the two things, of which one is higher and changeless and the other is lower and changing,

One is sathyam; the other is anrutham; the sathya anrutha vivekaa is not there; therefore, they are mixed up. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in Adhyaasa Bhaashyam (Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam) refers to this delusion as 'sathya anrutha mithunee krithya'.

Because of this confusion,

- संबन्ध हेतुः - a relationship is struck.

Even though the higher 'I', the *aathmaa*, cannot have relationship with the lower 'I', the mind, nor with the emotions of the mind, I still form the 'connection' and I say 'I have problems'. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*aathma anavabhodha: eva sambhandha hethu.*" meaning "Only the 'ignorance of the two' is the cause for the relationship between the two, the higher, 'changeless' 'I', and the lower, 'changing' 'I'."

A relationship between the two, for the sake of worldly transactions is perfectly fine and is, in fact, needed. During transactions, an individual cannot use the word 'I', in the meaning of the higher 'I'. At *vyavahaarika* level, the word 'I' can and should be used with the meaning of the lower component only, for transactional purposes. But, a diligent seeker should always be aware / bear in mind, that the real 'I' is the higher component only.

For transactional purposes the thoughts can be *ahamkaaraa*-centric; but, when there is no transaction, the 'I' should be *saakshi*-centric.

Saakshi-centric thoughts also can go on only in the mind; *ahamkaaraa*-centric thoughts also can go on only in the mind. In other words, mind is the common locus, for entertaining *ahamkaaraa*-centric thoughts, as well as *saakshi*-centric thoughts. The type of thoughts that *dominate* one's mind determines whether one is a *samsaari* or not. If one entertains *ahamkaaraa*-centric thoughts for transaction purposes only, he/she is wise. But, if, on the other hand, *ahamkaaraa*-centric thoughts keep disturbing one's mind / dominate one's mind, at all times, even when one goes to bed, when in bed and when one wakes up in the morning etc., *samsaaraa* is certain to result for such an individual.

Vedhaatha is intended for making the aspirant's mind get dominated by *saakshi*-centric thoughts. That 'domination' is not there in a *samsaari's* (an ignorant individual's) mind. Therefore, the *Aachaarya* says "*anavabodha: eva sambhandha hethu:*" - "ignorance only is the cause of mixing up". And follows it up saying:

- पुनः वास्तवः कश्चिदपि संबन्धन उपपद्यते : - But, no real connection between 'me' and the mind is possible.

That is why, it is advised that 'mind' be considered as a *vesham*, which is used for transactional purposes. If this is understood, life is not a burden. On the other hand, if one has serious relationship with the mind, life will be miserable, since mind itself will always have problems, because mind is in 'triangular' format.

This is indicated in Verse 3 of the Nirvaana Shadgam of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa also, a popular nidhidhyaasana sloka: "na me dvesha raagau, na me loba mogau, mado naiva me naive maathsarya bhaava:" – "'I' do not have hatred or desire; 'I' do not have greed or delusion; 'I' do not have arrogance or feelings of jealousy / malice".

This verse also answers the question "When am I free from *raaga dveshaa*"? The answer is to be deduced from the verse: "'I' am free **all the time** from *raagha dveshaa*, because 'I', the *saakshi*, do not have any connection, at any time, with the mind, *which* is the one that is burdened with all emotions. When I have no connection with the mind, how can I have connection with *raagha dveshaa*, which are attributes of the mind. When even substance-connection is not there, where is the question of attribute-connection?"

The term '*na upapadhaythe*' stresses the fact 'it is impossible for 'me' to be agitated'. 'I' am never agitated, because 'I' am only the *saakshi* of the *vyaavahaarika* agitations, which cannot affect 'me'.

- इति आह - This (that, no real connection is possible between 'me' and the mind or its motions) is being said.

Chapter III: Verse 20 –

सम्यक्संशयमिथ्यात्वैर्धरिवेयं विभज्यते ।

हानोपादानतामीषां मोहादध्यस्यते दृशौ ॥ २० ॥

It is only the mind that assumes diverse forms such as correct knowledge, doubt and false understandings. The emergence and cessation of these are attributed to pure Consciousness, by delusion.

Sureswaraachaarya says "The mind can never be free of thoughts, at any time, except during *sushupthi* or, if and when, a person chooses to sit in *samaadhi*. Except those times, the mind is bound to have thoughts, all the rest of the time. The thoughts may be of the nature of *saathvik* or *raajasic* or *thaamasic* varieties. But, the mind can never be free from some kind of thoughts, at any time. Just as the physical body has healthy and unhealthy conditions fluctuating all the time, the mind will also have either healthy or unhealthy thoughts; but, what is certain is, it will have thoughts all the time".

As *Swami Vidhyaaranyaa* famously said in his *Panchadasee*, "mind is also subject to '*jvaram*', just as the healthiest body also has *jvaram*, now and then. The frequency of *jvaram* may vary from body to body; but, no physical body will be entirely free from health problems. The 'mind' also, in keeping with the fluctuations of the three *gunaas*, in keeping with the fluctuations of *praarabhdhaa*, in keeping with the fluctuations of *vaasanaas* and in keeping with the fluctuations in the events of the world, will be subject to thoughts all the time.

Even the greatest *jnaani's* mind cannot avoid empathetic disturbances, on hearing news of tragic events. When such news are received, the thoughts of even a *jnaani* certainly cannot be *sukhavrutthi*; it can be *dhu:kavrutthi* only, because mind is designed to empathize with the environment. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says: "At *ahamkaaraa* level, thought fluctuations will ever be there; therefore, freedom can never be at the mental level. We do not have ownership or controllership with regard to the mind also".

- धीः विभज्यते - The mind is associated with / influenced by, '*vibhajyathe*' means '*viseshyathe*', which, in turn, means 'associated with' or 'influenced by'.

An interesting relevant thought: *Bhagavaan's* mind cannot have *sukha vrutthi* at any time, since *Bhagavaan* is ever aware of some tragic event or another. In this regard, *Bhagavaan* is in a worse situation than a human being, because an ordinary mortal does not know many events; for instance, his / her mind is blissfully ignorant of the many tortures going on, in the many jails all over the world and as the saying goes "out of sight, out of mind". On the other hand, being omniscient, *Bhagavaan* is intensely aware of all the sufferings of all the beings, all the time, day and night. Therefore, *Bhagavaan*, as *Bhagavaan*, i.e. as *ahamkaaraa*, can never be free from *dhu:kha vrutthi*. *Bhagavaan's mokshaa* also is not as *Bhagavaan* ; but as *Brahman* only. *Bhagavaan* can never enjoy freedom from pain as *Bhagavaan*, because being *sarvagnya:* , *Bhagavaan* also will be disturbed by all the sufferings resulting from *paapam*. But, if *Bhagavaan* says "I am *aananda:*" – "*aanando asmi*", it is only from *svaroopa dhrushti*. Freedom, whether for *jeeva* or *Isvara*, is only from *saakshi dhrushti*.

The *Aachaaryaa* says, that, the mind is associated with,

- सम्यक् संशय मिथ्यात्वैः - correct knowledge, doubt and false understanding.

'*samyak*' means '*samyak jnaanam*' / 'right knowledge', which represents, '*saathvika vrutthi:*' | '*samsaya*' means '*samsaya jnaanam*', which means '*raajasa vrutthi:*' | And, '*mithyaathvam*' means '*mithyaa jnaanam*', which is '*thaamasa vrutthi:*' | These three types of *vrutthis* will be there in every mind, whether it is *jeeva's* mind or *Isvara's* cosmic mind. As discussed earlier, even *Isvara's* mind cannot avoid pain-*vrutthi:*, when it is aware of the pains of the world, which constantly go on. This is the nature of the secondary self, the mind.

But, what happens thereafter?

- मोहात् - Because of delusion,
- अमीषां हान उपादानता - the arrival and departure of these thoughts (these *vyaavahaarika* emotions)
- अध्यस्यते - are superimposed
- दृशौ - upon the real 'I'.

'*Upaadhaanathaad*' means 'arrival; '*haanam*', in this context, means 'departure'. *Dhrusaal* means '*saakshi chaithanye*' / '*aathma chaithanye*' / 'upon the real 'I''. '*Dhrusi:*' is the noun, meaning, '*Chaithanyam*' or '*aathmaad*'. '*Dhrusaal* is *sapthami vibhakthi:* format, meaning 'upon the *aathmaa*, the real 'I' '.

The *vyaavahaarika* emotions like pleasure, pain etc., which actually belong only to the *mithyaa* mind, are superimposed, because of delusion, upon the real 'I', the *saakshi*, which *saakshi* alone really exists. The ignorant individual, after thus 'throwing' the *mithyaa* mind's emotions on the real 'I', attributes *samsaara* upon himself / herself, as a consequence.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "*mohaath dhrusau adhyasthe*". And, the moment this *adhyaasaa* takes place, a 'terrible' reaction sets in. The reality of the *adhishtaanam* is transferred to all the emotions. Borrowing reality from *aathmaa*, the unreal emotions also become real, just as the unreal, fictitious movie becomes a reality for a totally engrossed viewer. Just as when watching a movie, 'fiction' becomes a 'fact', borrowing the reality from the movie screen, life which is only 'fiction', becomes a fact, because of the *adhyaasam* detailed above.

Tragedy in fiction is entertainment and can be entertainment only when it is understood as fiction. Life is a mixture of tragedy and comedy and therefore, life can become entertainment, only when it is seen it as 'fiction' – a *naatakaa*. The moment this approach is forgotten / this attitude is forsaken, tragedy becomes serious and that is called *samsaaraa*. To recall the fifth capsule of *Vedhaanthaa* (as enunciated by Swamiji): "By remembering my real nature, I convert life into an entertaining fiction; by forgetting my real nature, I convert fiction into a fact and life into a burden – not ordinary burden but *mahaa* burden." An inevitable consequence of this 'forgetting' is, that, the constant prayer to *Bhagavaan* will be: "Oh! Lord! This must be my last *janmaa*. I should be relieved of this burden of life, at the earliest. I should go away from this world, never to return." For such a person, life itself is a tragedy and a burden. Such a person 'hates' life and for him / her, *videha mukthi* is 'escaping from the world'. But, if, on the other hand, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* (*Vedhaanthaa*) is understood properly, life will never be a burden; even the worst tragedy will only be 'fiction'. There will be no yearning to escape from the world nor a desire to continue in the world. The cycle of life and death will be rightly understood only as a continuous drama that is going on.

An interesting aside: Everything in life is both an asset and a liability. For example, whether the physical body of an individual is looked upon as an asset or as a liability, depends on the age of the individual. In the initial years of life, body is looked upon as an asset by the individual and death appears to him / her as a liability. Death is seen as *amangalam* and body as *mangalam*. *Mangalam* is an asset and *amangalam* is a liability. But, the same individual, after ageing, tends to look upon the body, as a liability, because of physical infirmities that have set in, and starts looking upon death as a 'welcome asset', which will relieve the individual of the miseries caused by the infirmities resulting from 'aging'. Mercifully, when body gets diseases and becomes a liability, the body itself, still holds an asset, in the form of *maranam*. A *jnaani* understands all these and looks upon the universe

as a mixture of assets and liabilities, a source of 'entertainment' and also as a necessity, which is required for acquisition of *jnaanam*. If *Brahman* alone exists, one cannot even claim "I am *Brahman*". *Brahman* cannot say "I alone exist", because, even to say "I alone exist", it requires the body-mind complex. The moral is: "Let us own up *Brahman* with the help of this asset-cum-liability universe. But, let this drama/ entertainment go on". In fact, this attitude is called 'liberation', which 'liberation' is lost because of *adhyaasa*:/

In the second line of the verse no. 20, '*haana upaadhaanathaad*' means 'arrival and departure'; '*ameeshaam*' means 'of these emotional modifications' / '*samyak, samsaya, mithyaa jnaanaanaam*'. The word '*ameeshaam*' is '*shashti vibakthi - bahu vachanam*'.

Lord Krishna also presents this same idea, in the 14th Chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githaa* (in the very important verse 22), while talking of a *guna adheetha*: (one who has transcended the three *gunaas*): "*prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaankshath*" – " Arjuna ! (the *gunaadheetha*.) does not hate brightness, activity and delusion, as they arise; nor does he desire for them, as they withdraw". This verse also implies : "Even a *jnaani's* mind will go through *saathvika vrutthi* , *raajasa vrutthi* and also *thaamasa vrutthi*. Do not imagine that a *jnaani* has only *sukha vrutthi* all the time. *Dhu:kha vrutthi-s* will also be there". What, then, is the greatness of a *jnaan*? The verse answers: "*Na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaankshath*" – "he does not hate their arrival; nor does he desire for them when they withdraw". When pain-*vrutthi* comes, along with that pain-*vrutthi*, *jnaani* entertains another parallel *vrutthi*. Pain *vrutthi* is *ahamkaaraa*-centric; *jnaani* entertains a *saakshi*-centric *vrutthi* also, viz., that, 'this pain *vrutthi* belongs to the mind, which has to go through certain thoughts, of which some are avoidable and some are unavoidable. But, they are all only *vyavahaarikaad*'. Therefore, he does not hate the pain *vrutthis*, when they come; when wonderful *vrutthis* go away, he is not disturbed also. Why? Because he has objectivity with the *mithyaa* mind also. Therefore, he maintains the *Saakshi*-centric *vrutthi*, in spite of the worldly *vrutthis*.

An interesting analogy for this attitude of the *jnaani*: 'Tying' of the *maangalya dhanthu* is an important part of the conventional Hindu wedding. At the moment of the 'tying' of the *dhanthu*, the *purohith* will call for '*getty melam*' – playing the *Naadaswaram* and the accompanying *Thavil* loudly, producing a lot of noise. What is the purpose of this loud music? One purpose is to announce that, the main event, viz., 'tying' of the *mangala soothram* is on. The other, more important purpose is to drown any other possible inauspicious noises, like weeping, sneezing (considered inauspicious) etc., in the vicinity. The loud noise produced by the '*getty melam*' drowns the possible *amangala* sounds. In the same manner, the *jnaani's* *saakshi*-centric thoughts, viz., the binary format thoughts, which the *jnaani* makes 'louder' and 'louder', by *nidhidhyaasanam*, 'drown' the *ahamkaaraa*-centric thoughts about family, possessions, body etc. The triangular format *vrutthi-s* are

ahamkaara-centric and unavoidable. But, a *Jnaani* is not afraid of them. Whenever these thoughts become 'loud', he makes the *saakshi vrutthi* 'louder', so that the *ahamkaara vrutthi* is not 'heard' at all. This is called *moksha*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 21:

कुतः कूटस्थात्मसिद्धिरिति चेद्यतः।

How is the unchanging Self established?

In the last verse, the *Aachaaryaa* mentioned the word *dhrusi:* or *aathmaa*. A doubt may arise. He, now, therefore, talks of this fundamental doubt, viz. "How do you know that the changeless Consciousness / *saakshi* is there, when the emotions are thus constantly arriving and departing?" The word 'emotions' is used, in this context, to mean *samyak jnaana*, *samsaya jnaana* and *mithyaa jnaana vrutthaya:*, otherwise called *saathvika*, *raajasa* and *thaamasa vrutthaya:*, or, in short, happy and unhappy feelings.

- कुतः - "What is the reason / logic
- कूटस्थ आत्म सिद्धिः - for the existence of kootastha aathmaa?"
- इति चेत् - If such a question is raised,
- यतः - the following is the reason / answer.

What is that?

Chapter III: Verse 21 –

न हानं हानमात्रेण नोदयोऽपीयता यतः ।

तत्सिद्धिः स्यात्तु तद् हीने हानादानविधर्मके ॥ २१ ॥

Nothing that appears and nothing that disappears can be established, as thus appearing and disappearing by itself. They are established to be appearing and disappearing in the awareness of the Self, which neither appears not disappears.

Of course, this is an idea known to an advanced student of *Vedhaantha*. The *Aachaaryaa* is only reminding the student of the idea. The very fact that we are talking about 'changes', is only because of the 'changeless Witness'. If the 'witness' has appeared with emotion no. 1 and that 'witness' disappears with emotion no. 2, it would mean that you have a 'second witness' for the second emotion ; likewise, a third 'witness' for the third emotion. Thus, as many emotions are there, so many *saakshis* also will be there, viz., *saakshi* no. 1 for emotion no. 1, *saakshi* no. 2 for emotion no. 2 and so on. If, thus, the 'witness' also

changes, what is the consequence? Witnesses will also be many. Then, what will be the resulting problem? No single witness can talk about **all** the emotions. First witness will know only the 1st emotion; the second witness will know only the 2nd emotion and not the 1st or the 3rd. But, we **are** able to talk of all the emotions. That we are thus able to talk about the 'flow' of emotions, is only because of 'one changeless principle'.

The Aachaaryaa says:

- हानामात्रेण हानं न (सिद्यति) - The departure of the emotion / the thought, is not proved merely by the 'departure'.

The departure of the thought, by itself, does not / cannot prove the departure. The departure of the thought has to be proved by someone who has not departed.

An analogy: "Suppose at the end of the class, if someone says 'all the students have departed from the hall', the one who has observed and says this, is obviously one who has *not* departed, which means, that, the departure is proved by the non-departing one".

'Haanam' means 'departure'; 'na' means 'not possible' / 'not proved'; 'haanamaathrena' - 'by mere departure'. But, then, how is it proved? Ans: By a non-departing *saakshi*.

So, 'every departure presupposes a non-departing one' is the logic. So also every arrival

Extending the above 'class' analogy: "Suppose someone says 'the first student has arrived'; to say that, you require somebody; and, that one is the non-arriving one". This is said in the second half of the first line of the verse:

- उदयः अपि - The arrival also
- न - is never proved
- इयता - by the mere 'arrival'.

'Iyathaa' implies 'udhaya maathrena'. "Udhaya: udhaya maathrena na (siddhyathi)" - "Arrival is not proved by mere arrival".

The word 'iyathaa' is derived from the root 'yath' | The 'yath sabdha:' is 'thakaarantaha: pullinga:' | 'iyathaa' is its 'thritheeyaa vibakthi eka vachanam' | Literally, it means 'by this much alone'; and, 'by this much alone' it implies 'by mere arrival'.

"*Haanam haanamaatherena na siddhyathi; udhaya: api iyathaa (udhayamaathrena) na siddhyath'*" - (The verb '*siddhyath'*' is to be supplied) - "Departure is not proved by mere departure; arrival also is not proved by mere arrival".

Then, how are the 'departure' and 'arrival' proved? Both departure and arrival are proved by the non-departing, non-arriving (ever present) Consciousness.

- यतः तु - On the other hand,
- तद् सिद्धिस्यात् : - the establishment of both of them (arrival and departure of the thoughts) is possible,

The word '*thadh'*' refers to 'arrival and departure of the thoughts / emotions / *saathvika raajasa thaamasa vrutthis'*'; '*siddhi:'* means 'establishment'; '*syath'*' means 'is possible'.

How is the 'establishment' made possible?

- तद् हीने हान आदान विधर्मके (आत्मनि) - in the presence of the 'Witness Consciousness entity', which is free from both departure and arrival.

The word '*aathman'*' is supplied.

'*Thadh'*, in this portion of the verse also, means 'arrival and departure'; '*heenan'*' means 'free from'. '*Thadh heene aathman'*' means '*haana upaadhaana rahithe aathmani'*'. The term is '*sathi sapthami'*', which means 'in the presence of'.

'*Thadh heene (aathmani)*' would therefore mean 'Only in the presence of the non-material Witness Consciousness, which is free from both arrival and departure', which is further stressed by the usage '*haana aadhaana vidharmake'*' - 'free from both departure and arrival'.

And, as it is always said in *Vedhaanthaa*, during *sushupthi avasthaa*, even when time and space depart, even at that time, 'I' am there, as the witness of 'absence of time' and 'absence of space', which means that "even when time and space have departed, 'I' am there", which, in turn, means " 'I' am not located in time and space. Time and space are located in 'me'".

135. Chapter III, Verse 21 and 22 (21-03-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is analyzing the thvam padhaartha occurring in the maahaa vaakyam. He pointed out that this thvam padhaartha is a mixture of the secondary self, called the mind and the primary Self, called aathmaa. Mind is parinaami aham, the changing 'I' and aathmaa is kootastha aham, the changeless 'I'. This "changing 'I'- changeless 'I' mixture" alone is referred to, by the word 'thvam', in the mahaavaakyam. From this mixture, we have to set aside the changing 'I', called the mind and then alone the equation 'aham brahma asmi' is possible, i.e., 'aham brahma asmi' equation is valid, only from the standpoint of the changeless 'I'.

The *Aachaaryaa* further said, that, the existence of the changeless 'I' is proved by the awareness of the changing 'I', because one can talk about the changing parts in the mind, only from the standpoint of the 'changeless awareness'. If the awareness also changes along with the thought, that changing awareness will not be able to talk about the changing thoughts.

Therefore, he said in the 21st verse (completed in the last session) "*haanamaathrena haanam na siddhyath*" - "The departure of the thoughts will not be proved by the departure of the thoughts alone". The departure of the thoughts will have to be proved by the non-departing Consciousness. Similarly, "*udhaya: api iyathaa na siddhyath*" - "the arrival of thoughts is also never proved merely by the arrival of thoughts". Arrival of thoughts is also proved by the non-arriving Consciousness only. Thus, all departures and all arrivals are proved by the non-departing and non-arriving Consciousness.

An example .from our mundane experiences: In a railway station, if someone is talking about the arriving and departing trains, that someone who talks about the arriving and departing trains can never be in one of the trains; he must be outside the arriving train also; he must be outside the departing train also. A traveler in one of the trains can never talk about the arrivals and departures of the various trains.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* said "*thadh siddhi: thadh heene syaath*" meaning "the proof of the arrival and departure is possible only in the presence of the *saakshi*, which itself is free from arrival and departure'.

"*Siddhi:*" means 'proof'; *thadh*, in this context, means '*haanam* and *udhayam*' or 'arrival and departure'. '*Thadh heenam*' is '*thritheeya thath purusha*', meaning 'one, which is free from both arrival and departure'. By the term '*thadh heene*', the word '*saakshin*' is understood, '*saaksh*' being implied by the nature of the '*saaksh*', which nature is 'freedom from both arrival and departure'. The usage '*thadh heene*' is *sathi sapthami*, meaning '*saakshini sath*'

or 'in the presence of a *saakshī* ; '*syaath*' means 'can be proved'. To make the meaning of '*thadh*' more explicit, the *Aachaaryaa* follows up his statement "*thadh siddhi: thadh heene syaath*", with the term '*haana aadhaana vidharmake*', repeating the same idea, viz., 'which is from arrival and departure'. Up to this was discussed in the previous session. Proceeding further:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 22 and Verse 22 – Chapter III:

एवम्-

आगमापायिहेतुभ्यां धूत्वा सर्वाननात्मनः ।

ततस्तत्त्वमसीत्येतद् हन्त्यस्मदि निजं तमः ॥ २२ ॥

Thus – After discarding all that is non-Self on the ground that it is subject to origin and cessation, the proposition 'That thou art' destroys in the Self, its darkness.

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* wants to describe as to what happens at the time of '*mahaa vaakya sravanam*' i.e. he wants to describe the internal phenomenon, at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. Generally, when we are dealing with the external *vyavahaaraa*, it is the secondary self, the mind functioning as '*aham*', which is prominent. From the standpoint of the body and from the standpoint of the external world, mind, as the self, becomes prominent. And, when the secondary self is thus prominent, the primary Self goes to the background; its importance is not known at all. When we are in triangular format, the binary format is pushed behind. The proverb 'when the cat is away the mice have a field-day' is apt in this context. During worldly transactions, the secondary self appears **as though** primary and the primary Self is overshadowed.

But, when the seeker comes to the *mahaavaakyam*, when the seeker looks from the standpoint of the primary Self, at that time, the secondary self should be reduced to non-self. The mind, otherwise called *ahamkaaraa*, otherwise called the 'changing self', should be pushed 'out'. Along with the body and the world, the mind should also be pushed 'out'. Thus, the secondary self loses its selfhood and it becomes non-self. *Mahaa vaakyam* will function only when the secondary self is converted into non-self. Then alone, the equation, '*aham brahma asmi*', will work. 'Including' the mind in 'me', the seeker can never claim freedom.

That is why it is pointed out: "You, as a seeker, may think that *mokshaa* is complete freedom from fear in the mind. But, you should understand, that, this thought is wrong. Do not ever worry about the fear coming in the mind. Remember, you will never be able to eliminate fear from the mind totally; therefore, instead of trying to eliminate fear from the mind, you have to eliminate the mind itself, so that, when the mind is afflicted by any fear, you can claim 'I am not the fearing mind; I am the *saakshi* of the fearing mind'. The

ultimate *mokshaa* is not the 'elimination of the fear from the mind'; ultimate *mokshaa* is the 'elimination of the mind from 'me'', by seeing the mind as non-self'. This must be understood clearly by you; otherwise you will always wonder: 'My fear is not completely gone; how can I claim I am a *muktha*?' Remember that even with '*jvara*' in the mind, *you* can be '*anujvara*.' | That is *mokshaa*. Therefore, "I have no fear, because I have no mind. I am not saying I have a fearless mind; I am saying I am mindless 'me'" should be the conviction. This will result in the further conviction "I am ever free, from both fear and the mind which contains the fear". Fear in the mind can probably be reduced by effort; but, can never be totally eliminated from the mind. Total elimination of fear is only at *aathmaa* level; therefore, reduce the fear in the mind and eliminate the fear from the *aathmaa*, by understanding 'I' never have fear at all, during all the three periods of time."

Reverting to the text, what is the topic here? Ans: "At the time of *mahaavaakya sravanam*, the secondary self should be converted into non-self" is what is said here.

- धृत्वा - Eliminating / having eliminated

For the word '*dhoothvaa*', '*dhod*' is the root, which root means 'to shake off' / 'to remove' / 'to throw off'.

- सर्वान् अनात्मनः - all the *anaathmaa*,

What are all the items included in *anaathmaa*? Ans:

- (1) The entire world is included in *anaathmaa*.
- (2) All possessions come under *anaathmaa*.
- (3) 'Profession' or 'vocation' comes under *anaathmaa*.
- (4) The family, which obsesses the mind, even during *Vedhaanthic* study, is also part of *anaathmaa*.
- (5) Most importantly, the body and the mind are also parts of *anaathmaa* alone.

What is meant by '*Dhoothvaa*' or 'eliminating'? Ans: The seeker should learn to dissociate from all these *anaathmaa* items. He / she should have the conviction "mind is neither 'me'; nor is the mind belonging to 'me'. Mind is neither 'me' nor is it 'mine' ". If he/ she claims "mind is 'me' ", it is *ahamkaaraa* problem; if he / she says "mind is 'mine'" it is *mamakaaraa* problem.

"Mind is neither 'me'; nor is it 'mine'. I am the *asangha saakshi*. Mind's problems do not belong to 'me', at any time" should be the firm understanding; but, ironically, the seeker has

to reach this understanding, only with the help of the mind. In other words, to say and understand "mind is not 'me'; mind is not 'mine'", the seeker has to use the mind alone.

"Using the mind, dissociate from all the *anaathmaa* – including the family, the body and the mind also; remain as *asangha aathmaa*; always remember 'na me mrithyur na sankhaa na me jaathibedha: pithaa naiva me naiva maathaa cha janmaa na bandhur na mithram gururnaiva sishya: chidhaanandharoopa: sivoham sivoham' (Verse 5 of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa's Nirvaana Shadkam)" is the advice.

By saying "*sarvaan anaathmana: dhoothvaa*", Sureswaraacharya means: "Internal *sanyaasaa*, renouncing the entire *anaathmaa*, should be practiced". Then and then only, *mahaa vaakyam* will be very, very meaningful.

How can this elimination / rejection be achieved? The *Aachaaryaa* replies:

- आगम अपायि हेतुभ्यां - by using / applying the reasoning that all of them are subject to arrival and departure,

Even the mind 'arrives' only during *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*; during *sushupthi*, the mind 'dissolves' / 'departs'. During *maranam* and *pralayam* also all of them (the *anaathmaa* items) go away. How long could one hold on to the mind, the family, the body etc.? They are not *saasvatham* / eternal.

'*Aagama apaayi hethu:*' means the 'arrival and departure logic'.

When, thus, the aspirant stands alone as this primary Self, eliminating / removing the family, the possessions, the body and the mind,

- ततः - then,

An analogy can be given. When a major surgery like a bye-pass in the heart is to take place, the senior surgeon, who has to actually perform the surgery, does not arrive at the beginning of the surgery; his paramedical team prepares the patient, doing all the preliminary work, sometimes including even administering the anaesthetic; after all preparations are done, the expert surgeon comes in, performs the actual surgery and goes away, again leaving it to the paramedical team to complete the rest of the job.

(In a lighter vein): The *mahaa vaakyam* '*Thathvamas!*' is the super surgeon. When the *vaakyam* arrives, the mind should not stand along with 'me', because *mind* is always full of

problems. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says `thatha:', meaning `after pushing away the body, mind etc.'

He advises: "Keeping away all this, listen to the *mahaa vaakyam*, as *saakshi*, the *nirvikaara chaithanyam*, the primary Self".

Then, what will happen?

- "तत्त्वमसि" इति एतद् - this *maahaa vaakyam*, `thaththvamas'
- हन्ति - destroys
- निजं तमः - the *moolaavidhyaa*
- अस्मदि - located in the *aathmaa*, the primary Self.

As the student would remember, a detailed analysis of the locus of *moolaavidhyaa* was done in the introduction to this chapter and it was concluded that *Aathmaa* is the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*, apart from being the subject of *moolaavidhyaa* also. The primary Self is the locus of *moolaavidhyaa*. *Mahaavaakyam* will eliminate that *moolaavidhyaa* from the locus of the primary Self. The *Aachaaryaa* uses the word `hanthi' meaning `destroys'.

The splitting of the words, in the second half of the verse, should be done carefully and properly. The different words are `thatha:', `thadh', `thvam', `asi' `ithi', `ethadh', `hanthi', `asmadh' and `nijam thama:' | `Asmadh', here, means *saakshi chaithanyam*, the primary Self. `Nijam thama:' means `the *thamas*, the *moolaavidhyaa*'. The *anvayam* of the sentence is "Thatha: `thath thvam asi' ithi ethadh (*mahaa vaakyam*) asmadhi nijam thama: hanthi' meaning "Then, (the *mahaa vaakyam*), `thath thvam asi' destroys the *moolaavidhyaa*, located in the primary Self, the *saakshi*" |

And, because of the elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*, the `localization' of the *saakshi*, (the limitation that is attributed to the *saakshi*) which is born out of ignorance, will go away. Before the *mahaa vaakyam*, the spiritual seeker may have advanced enough to arrive at the right understanding "I am neither the body nor the mind; I *am* the *saakshi* of my body and mind"; but, may still wrongly conceive the *saakshi* as a localized entity, with each individual having a different *saakshi* behind his / her body and mind.

The *mahaa vaakyam* will remove this wrong concept of the `localization of the *saakshi*'. *Jeeva saakshi* will be understood as *sarva saakshi*. *Aham*, the *jeeva saakshi*, *thvam padha lakshyaartha* is identical with *sarva saakshi*, *thath padha lakshyaartha*. That `eikyam' is gained by the removal of ignorance.

Therefore, 'I' am neither 'here', nor 'there' nor even 'everywhere'; strictly speaking, even the word 'everywhere' should not be used as 'location' of the *aathmaa*, because the usage will mean, that, *aathmaa* is located all over the space. *Aathmaa* is not located in space also; in fact, it is space that is located in *aathmaa*. Therefore, *aathmaa* is neither 'here'; nor 'there'; nor 'everywhere'; it is nowhere; but it is the *adhishtaanam* of 'here', 'there', 'everywhere' etc. That 'localization' ignorance should go away for a diligent seeker. But, unfortunately, quite often, that ignorance continues even after years of *Vedhaanthic* study. What is the proof? Ans: The student prays to the Lord: "This must be my last *janmaa*; after this *janmaa*, I should go from here and join *Bhagavaan* and after joining that *Bhagavaan*, I should never again come back here".

Unfortunately, quite often, this idea is very strong even in seekers who have been diligently studying *Vedhaantha* for a long time. This wrong idea of 'escaping from the world' indicates that the individual is looking upon himself / herself as somebody in *Bhooloka*, waiting for *videha mukthi*. An informed seeker should not entertain this 'escaping' idea, even in dreams. A diligent *Vedhaanthi* student / seeker should practice the thoughts: "There is no question of 'my' running away from the world. In fact, it is the world that is 'arriving' and 'departing' in 'me' eternally. Therefore, I do not have to escape from the world. I do not also want to escape from the world, because either the presence of the world or the absence of the world does not make any difference in 'me', the *asangha saakshi*. Therefore, let this body continue for billions of years or let this body perish tomorrow. '*Na jeevithe na marane dhruthim kuryaath'* is a *vaakyam* that *Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa* quotes in his *Isavasya Bhaashyam*. I should not entertain attachment either to life or to death; also, neither hatred of life nor hatred of death". This attitude is *moksha*.

'*Nijam thama: hanth'* conveys the import 'There is no more self-ignorance; I get the realization that 'I' am ever free'. The verb '*hanth'* means 'destroys'.

An incidental, but important point to note: When it is said that "*mahaavaakyam* destroys *moolaavidhyaa*", it should be understood as "*maha vaakyam* destroys the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa*; not the *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa*, which will continue; the *mithyaa* world and the *mithyaa sariram* will continue. But, 'I' have no problem, because the *aavarana sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* is gone."

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 23 & 24 – Chapter III:

इत्यादि पुनःपुनरुच्यते ग्रन्थलाघवाद्बुद्धिलाघवं प्रयोजकमिति । तत्र यध्यपि तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यादुपादित्स्मिताद्वितीयात्मार्ववत्पारोक्ष्यसद्वितीयार्थः प्रतीयते । तथापि तु नैवासावर्थः श्रुत्या तात्पर्येण प्रत्तिपादयिषितः प्रागप्येतस्य प्रतीतत्वादितीममर्थमाह ।

In this fashion, the same truth is again and again presented, with the idea that as the exposition is rendered easy, the comprehension of meaning becomes easy. Even though the terms 'That' and 'Thou' signify the wanted aspects of meaning, namely, that of being secondless and being the Self, and similarly those of mediateness and of having a second, the latter aspects of meaning are not purported to be conveyed by *sruthi*, for they are matters of experience even prior to the hearing of the *sruthi*. This point is brought up now.

Here, Sureswaraachaarya says: "I am very much aware that I have been repeatedly talking about *saaksh*'s distance or freedom from the mind and *saakshi*'s distinction from the mind. I have been talking about these, all through this *Naishkarmya Siddhi* text. In the second chapter, I discussed this, in the form of *aathma-aanaathma vivekal saakshi*-mind *vivekaa*. In this 3rd chapter also, I am repeating this. I am intensely aware of the repetitions. Technically speaking 'repetition' is a *dhosha*, known as *punarukthi dhosha*.; otherwise called *grantha gourava dhosha*: | It is called '*Grantha gourava dhosha*:', because, the *granthaa* (treatise) becomes bulkier because of the repetitions, even though the subject matter remains the same. The period of study also necessarily increases. I am aware that my repetitions also may be considered *dhosha*. But, on the other hand, in making the seeker understand the subject thoroughly and for creating the necessary impact in him/her, 'repetition' serves as 'reinforcement' and becomes necessary. 'Repetition' in the context of subtle and important topics should not be considered as 'repetition', but, as 'reinforcement'. Reinforcement is very important for a *Vedhaanthic* student, because of the following reason: For a diligent student / an ideal *maanasa sanyaasi*, at the time of listening to *Vedhaanthaa*, *saakshi* becomes more prominent than *ahamkaaraa*, as it should be. But, the problem is, even during the dedicated and engrossed study, if and when any worldly *vyavahaaraa* arises, the student's *ahamkaaraa* immediately takes over and becomes more prominent than *saakshi*, because of the student's heavy involvement with P.O.R.T. (Possessions, Obligations, Relationships and Transaction). Thus, there is a 'tug-of-war' between the *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*, even for a diligent and serious seeker. *Saakshi pradhaanaa* 'I' and *ahamkaara pradhaanaa* 'I' constantly compete in occupying and dominating the mind space. And, unfortunately, quite often, it is the powerful and problematic *ahamkaaraa* that succeeds in occupying the mind. Therefore, the *guru* and *Vedhaanthaa* have to introduce *saakshi* again and again. Therefore, I am deliberately repeating the teaching. The repetitions *are* required / necessary, because, the notion 'I am *samsaar*' does not go away easily; the 'escapist philosophy' also does not go away easily".

- इत्यादि - In this manner,
- पुनः पुनः उच्यते - the same teaching is deliberately repeated by me,

The *Upanishads* also repeat the message again and again, as in *Kenopanishad* : "**thadheva brahma thvam viddhi yadh vaachaa anabhyudhitham nedham yadhidham upaasathe**" – "Brahman is that very consciousness that is not revealed by speech; this deity which people meditate upon is not *Brahma*"(I – 5); "**thadheva brahma thvam viddhi yan manasaa na manuthe**" – "Brahman is that very consciousness, which people do not know with the mind" (I-6) ; "**thadheva brahma thvam viddhi yath chakshushaa na pasyathi**" – "Brahman is that very consciousness which one does not perceive with the eye" (I-7) etc.

This 'repetition' has to be done, because, transactions do require *ahamkaaraa* prominence and therefore, lay-people who are involved in worldly transactions and therefore, are dominated by *ahamkaaraa*, have to devote more and more time to the study of *Vedhaanthee*, to make the *ahamkaaraa* less prominent. This is true about some present-day *sanyaasin-s* also. There are two types of *sanyaasin-s* nowadays (1) *sanyaasin-s* involved in *vyavahaara-s* and (2) *sanyaasin-s* without any *vyavahaaraa*. The latter type of *sanyaasin-s* have an advantage, because they do not have to invoke *ahamkaaraa* as much as the former type, viz., *sanyaasin-s* with *vyavahaaraas*. Therefore, the *vyavahaaraa*-involved *sanyaasin-s* require more meditation than the *vyavahaaraa*-less *sanyaasin-s*, since *ahamkaaraa* is more prominent in them. Ironically, though, the *vyavahaaraa*-less *sanyaasin-s* have more time for meditation than the *vyavahaaraa*-involved *sanyaasin-s*. Coming back to lay-people, since they are involved in worldly *vyavahaaraas* all the time and therefore, they are invoking *ahamkaaraa* all the time, they require repeated exposure to *Vedhaanthee* principles. This makes it necessary for the *Vedhaantha Guru* to keep repeating his teachings.

Therefore, the *Aachaarya* says:

- इति - with the idea, that,
- ग्रन्तलाघवात् - by increasing the text / by presenting the teaching again and again,
- बुद्धिलाघवं - the facility of comprehension
- प्रयोजकं - will be the benefit / will result.

After all, the entire *Vedhaanthee* is either 'thadh padha aratha' or 'thvam padha arthaa' or 'asi padha artha'. In all the *Upanishads*, the message is the same – 'thath thvam asi'. Ultimately, the whole *Vedhaanthee* teaching is "aham sathyam jagan mithyaa" and "aham brahmaiva naapara:"| There is nothing else in *Vedhaanthee*, other than this 'binary format'. But, this teaching, viz., 'brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa jeevo brahmaive naapara:' has to be repeated over and over, since 'binary format' is easily achieved at 'lip level', but, is hard to be achieved at 'heart level'. To bring the binary format from 'lip level' to 'heart level', even while faced with worldly problems, a long and intense *Vedhaanthee* study is required. The

aim is (metaphorically speaking) only a short travel of the 'binary format' from 'lip' to 'heart'; but, to achieve this seemingly simple aim, it requires consistent and systematic study of Vedhaanthaa over a considerable length of time. And, as the seeker becomes older, it becomes tougher and tougher. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says: "Let the sravanam become nidhidhyaasanam for you".

From the next sentence, the *Aachaaryaa* is re-entering the technical topic. He is going back to our original discussion. As the student will recollect, it was discussed, that, between '*Thadh padhaa*' and '*thvam padhaa*' there is *saamanaadhikaranya sambhandha:*, and, between the *thvam padha vaachyaartha* and *thadh padha vaachyaartha*, there is *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava- sambhandha:*.

Now Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to establish, that, by going through the *vaachyaartha* alone, the seeker can go to *lakshyaartha*. He / she can never skip *vaachyaartha* and go directly to *lakshyaartha*.

The *Aachaaryaa* further wants to talk about 'how the intermediary stage of *vaachyaartha* functions' / 'the mechanism by which the intermediary stage of *vaachyaartha* works' in the arrival of *lakshyaartha*.

Before going into the text, a brief introduction will help and is given as follows:

In the intermediate stage, the student takes the *vaachyaartha* of *thvam padhaa* and the *vaachyaartha* of *thadh padhaa*. *Vaachyaartha* means 'primary meaning'. Primary meaning of '*thvam*' is '*jeevaathmaa*'. Primary meaning of '*thadh*' is '*Paramaathmaa*'. This '*jeevaathmaa*' is a mixture of the primary Self and the secondary self. When you take the *vaachyaartha*, it is not the *saakshi* part alone or *ahamkaaraa* part alone. In the *vaachyaartha*, *saakshi* is there; *ahamkaaraa* is also there. '*Jeevaathmaa*' is a mixture of '*jeeva saakshi*' and '*jeeva ahamkaaraa*'. In the same manner, the *vaachyaartha* of '*thadh padhaa*' also, includes both '*Paramaathma saakshi*' and '*Paramaathma ahamkaaraa*' |

What is the difference between '*jeevaathma saakshi*' and '*Paramaathma saakshi*? Ans: There is **no** difference between, *jeevaathmaa*, the *Saakshi* and *Paramaathmaa*, the *Saakshi*.

But, when the *ahamkaara* component of the *jeevaathmaa* and the *ahamkaaraa* component of *Paramaathmaa* are taken up for comparison, there is a vast difference between the two. The distinct *ahamkaara* of *jeevaathmaa* and the different *ahamkaaraa* of *paramaathmaa* are included in the *vaachyaartha*-s of *thvam padhaa* and *thadh padhaa* respectively. The student has to come into this intermediary level, where he / she keeps the mixture in the

thvam padhaartha and the mixture in the *thadh padhaartha*. After coming to that level only, the student has to eliminate the *ahamkaara* component in each of the mixtures.

This is similar to buying a banana fruit with its outer peel. The shopkeeper does not give the buyer, only the fruit portion of the banana, removing the skin. He hands over to the buyer the entire banana, with the fruit portion and the skin portion. In the intermediate stage, the fruit is also there; the skin is also there. Later, the buyer peels away the skin and discards it, for eating the fruit portion.

In the same manner, when the student gets the *mahaa vaakyam 'thath thvam asi'* from the *sruthi* 'shop'. in the intermediate stage, the *vaachyaartha* of '*thvam*' will include two components, the *saakshi* 'fruit' component and the *ahamkaara* 'skin' component. The '*thadhpadha vaachyaartha*' also has got *saakshi* 'fruit' and the *mahaa ahamkaara* 'skin', which is *sarvagnya:-sarveswara*:

And, the relationship of this *vaachyaartha* of *thvam padham* and the *vaachyaartha* of *thadh padham* is called *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*: or just *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandha*: | It is the relationship between *vaachyaartha jeevaathmaa* and *vaachyartha Paramaathma*, both of them including *saakshi* and *ahamkaara*.

The student should know what is meant by *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*: | Ans: It means: 'They mutually qualify each other'. *Jeevaathmaa* becomes the 'qualifier' and *Paramaathmaa* becomes the 'qualified'; in turn, *Paramaathmaa* becomes the 'qualifier' and *jeevaathmaa* becomes the 'qualified'. They will mutually qualify each other and by mutually qualifying each other, both of them exchange their statuses mutually. The *Paramaathmaa* status is given to *jeevaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* status is given to *Paramaathmaa*. Thus, they mingle, exchanging their statuses mutually. This exchange of the statuses by mutual mingling is called *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*: |

And, Sureswaraachaarya tells the seeker: "You cannot skip this step; after entering this step alone, and after tarrying there for some time, the length of the period depending on your intelligence, you have to leap into the final lap of the journey, which is *lakshana-lakshya-sambhandha*: | In that final lap alone, you throw away the peels called *ahamkaara – sarvagnya Isvara ahamkaara* and *alpagnya jeeva ahamkaara*".

In the modern advanced space investigation experiments, the rockets fired into space, drop their fuel tanks, after reaching the required heights. In a similar manner, both the 'skins' have to be 'dropped', at the appropriate stage and at the appropriate stage only. Carrying forward the analogy, the first 'fuel tank' to be dropped is *sthoola sareeram*, second 'fuel tank' is the *sookshma sareeram* and the third 'fuel tank' to be dropped is the *kaarana*

sareeram. After getting out of the *samsaaraa* gravitational pull , becoming 'light', the seeker gets into the orbit, *nithya mukthi*: / Only in the final stage, the *ahamkaara*-s have to be dropped.

In this portion, the *Aachaaryaa* is addressing the student in the *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*: stage, in which stage, *ahamkaaraa*-s are included.

- तत्र - This being so,
- तत्त्वमसि 'वाक्यात् - from the mahaa vaakyam 'thath thvam asi',
- उपादित्सित अद्वितीय आत्म अर्थवत् - similar to the wanted non-dual *saakshi*,
- पारोक्ष्य सद्वितीयार्थः प्रतीयते - the *ahamkaaraa* parts of both *Isvara* and *jeeva* also enter.

In the intermediary stage, when the student is listening to the '*thaththvamas'* *vaakyam*, just as a banana is taken from the shop with both the fruit portion and the skin portion, when the *thvam padhaartha* and the *thadh padhaartha* enter the mind, there is the wanted 'fruit', called *saakshi* and the unwanted 'skin', called *ahamkaaraa* also.

'*Upaadhithsitham'* means 'the wanted'.

The wanted *saakshi* comes at the time of *sravanam* and along with the *saakshi*, the unwanted *ahamkaaraa*, the secondary self also comes.

(In a lighter vein:) In a crowded auditorium or community hall, where there is not much open space for parking of the vehicles of all the guests, when the gate is opened to exclusively allow the car of the VIP to enter, other unwanted cars may also enter, along with the VIP's car.

Along with the intended '*saakshi*', the unintended '*ahamkaaraa*' also comes. This is the reason, when a student in the initial stages of the study of *Advaita* is told, "You are *aananda svaroopaa*.", he / she gets a doubt. The *guru*, by the word 'you', means the '*saakshi*' part. But, the student, along with the *saakshi*, includes the miserable, worry-riddled mind also in the word 'you'. With the mind included in 'me', how can one claim "I am *aanandhasvaroopam*"?

When the *Aachaaryaa*, thus says "the *ahamkaaraa* part of the *Isvara* also enters along with the *saakshi*", the student should understand that this statement is with reference to the *thadhpadhaartha*; he should further understand that it is true about the *thvampadhaartha*

also. *Ahamkaaraa* part of the *jeeva* enters, along with the *saakshi* part, in the *thvampadhaartha* also.

Once, thus, *Isvara* the '*ahamkaaraa*' part of *Paramaathmaa* enters the *thadhpadhaartha*, *Isvara's ahamkaaraa* being great and wonderful, the seeker finds it difficult to understand the *jeevaathma-Pramaathma-aiykyam*. That is the reason also why the *Visishtaadvaitin* finds fault with the *Advaitin* and considers the *Advaitin's* philosophy blasphemous.

The *Advaitin*, in reply, appeals to the *Visishtaadvaitin*, to 'peel off' and discard the 'skin', when the *jeevaathma-Pramaathma-aiykyam* equation is made. As long as this 'peeling off the skin' is not done, the 'binary format' will not work for the aspirant. He / she will continue only in the triangular format.

136. Chapter III, Verse 22 to 24 (28-03-2009)

In these verses Sureswaraachaaryaa is minutely studying the three compulsory stages, through which one has to go through while comprehending the 'thath thvam asi' mahaa vaakyam. He wants to establish, that, each stage is a significant and important stage and that, the aspirant cannot skip or avoid any one of these three stages.

The three stages have already been introduced by him, in the 3rd verse – "*saamaanaadhikaranyam cha viseshanaviseshyathaa lakshya lakshana sambhandha: padhaarthaprathyagaathmanam*". That is the most crucial verse of this chapter. In fact, the entire chapter is a commentary on this *soothra sloka* only.

Now, in this verse (no. 23) and in the following few verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about the significance of the second or intermediary stage called *viseshana- viseshya- sambhandha*. | He points out that this '*viseshana-viseshya-sambhandha*:' has to be applied after applying the first stage of '*saamaanaadhikaranyam sambhandha*:', in which first stage, since the words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*' are being used appositionally in the *mahaa vaakyam*, the relationship between them, is called '*saamaanaadhikaranyam sambhandha*:' or 'appositional relationship'.

After having first taken note of this appositional relationship, the student enters the second stage. While entering the second stage, Sureswaraachaaryaa tells the student: "In this second stage, you have to take only the primary meanings for these two words. You should not directly jump into the *lakshyaartha*-s / the secondary or target meanings of the words. Even though ultimately we are going to take the target meanings of '*thvam padha*' and '*thadh padha*', you should not apply them in this intermediary stage. In the intermediary stage, you have to take the *vaachyaartha*-s only. When you take the '*thvam padha vaachyaartha*', the *vaachyaartha* will have a mixture of '*Chith*' and '*chidhaabhaasa*', *Chith* being *nirguna thathvam* and *chidhaabhaasa* being *saguna thathvam*. *Chith* is *paaramaarthika thathvam* and *chidhaabhaasa* is *vyaavahaarika thathvam*. In the intermediary stage, you should take this '*Chith-chidhabhaasa*' / '*nirguna-saguna*' / '*paaramaarthika- vyaavahaarika*' mixture alone, as the primary meaning of '*thvam*'."

To recall the example given in the earlier session, when one wants to eat a banana, and purchases it from the shop, at the time of purchasing, not only the eatable fruit portion is purchased, but, the purchase includes the non-eatable skin also. In the same manner, *jeevaathmaa* includes both the *aathma* (the *nirguna* and *paaramaarthika Chith* part) and the *jeeva* (the *saguna* and *vyaavahaarika chidhaabhaasa* part). This mixture must be taken as the primary meaning of '*thvam*'. The student cannot straightway discard this primary

meaning. Only after deliberately applying the second stage, the 'skin' of *chidhaabhaasaa* can be 'peeled' off; it should not be 'peeled' in the beginning stage itself.

Similarly, when the word '*thadh'* is received, there also, the '*parama athmaa* / the *chith* principle in *Isvara* / *paaramaarthika chith* / *nirguna chith'* and the '*chidhaabhaasa* / *vyavahaarika* / *saguna Isvara'* mixture alone is comprehended by the intellect, during the intermediary stage.

The student should clearly note / understand this second or intermediary stage.

And, what is the relationship between the 'mixture *Paramaathmaad'* and the 'mixture *jeevathmaad'*? Ans: The relationship is '*viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandhaa'*.

What is *viseshanam* and what is *viseshyam*? Ans: '*viseshanam'* means the 'qualifier' and '*viseshyam'* means the 'qualified'. The 'qualifier-qualified relationship' has to be mutually applied. *Paramaathmaa* qualifies *jeevaathmaa*, *Paramaathmaa* transferring the *Paramaathma* status to *jeevaathmaa*. *Jeevathmaa* qualifies *Paramaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* transferring the *jeevaathmaa* status to *Paramaathmaa*. Thus, both of them exchange the statuses, by mutually giving their respective status to the other. Ultimately, we get a *jeevaathma-paramaathmaa* mixture. Already they are themselves 'mixtures', as explained earlier. These two mixtures will combine together, exchanging their statuses. This is the intermediary stage, which the student has to necessarily go through, before proceeding to the *lakshyaartha* of *advitheeya-nirguna-chaithanyam*.

Another example given earlier, viz., of the rocket fired into space and its fuel tanks, may also be recalled. The fuel tanks are extremely essential for the exercise; they *have* to be fitted into the rocket in the initial stages for the take-off of the rocket. Only after the fuel tanks have been properly utilized for the intended purpose, viz., for the 'pay-load' to go up to a particular stage, the fuel tanks can be ejected. The fuel tanks cannot be jettisoned in the beginning stages of firing the rocket or before the 'pay-load' gets into the orbit. The *vaachyaartha*-s and the *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa* which the seeker has to use in the second stage, to enable him / her to go to the third stage, can be likened to the important fuel tanks. Therefore, the student is advised by the *Aachaaryaa* to deliberately and slowly go through this second stage. That is what is being said here.

- तत्र - In the context of the *mahaavaakyam*,
- तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्यात् - from the *mahaavaakyam*-s like *thatthvamasī* etc.

The word 'aadhi', meaning 'etc.', is intentionally added by the *Aachaaryaa*, to indicate that 'thatthvamas' is not the only *mahaavaakyam*. There are hundreds, of *mahaavaakyam*-s in the *Vedas*. Any one of the *mahaavaakyam*-s will have *saamaandhikaranya*, *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa* and *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa*. That is uniform for all *mahaavaakyam*-s.

- आत्मार्थवत् - similar to the chith,
- उपादित्सित - which is the wanted
'Upaadhaathum ishtam' is 'upaadhithsitham', meaning 'the wanted/ to-be-consumed'
- अद्वितीय - (and) the non-dual (component),

What first enters the intellect is the *chith*, which includes (i) the *nirguna paaramaarthika chith thatvam*, the higher component of *Paramaathmaa* and also (ii) the *chith thatvam* of *jeevaathmaa* also, which is the higher component of *jeevaathmaa*. Both of them enter the intellect of the discerning student, when he / she studies the *mahaavaakyam*, just as, in the 'banana' example, the fruit comes into the purchaser's hand, while making the purchase. But, unfortunately, again, just as, in the example, it is not only the fruit portion that comes into the hand, but the skin portion also, the unwanted components also enter the intellect.

What are those unwanted components?

- पारोक्ष्य सद्वितीयार्थः - the 'remote' ahamkaaraa part of *Isvara* and the 'limited' ahamkaaraa part of *Jeeva*
- प्रतीयते - (also) appear (in the intellect of the student).

'Paarokshyam' means 'remoteness'. Does 'paarokshyam' belong to *jeevaathmaa* or *Paramaathmaa*? Ans: Only *paramaathmaa chidhabhaasa* has got remoteness. Remoteness belongs to the *chidhabhaasaa* of *Paramaathmaa*. Why does it (*chidhabhaasaa* of *Isvara*) become remote? Ans: Because *Isvara's chidhabhaasaa* has got extraordinary attributes such as *sarvagnyathvam*, *sarveswarathvam* and *anantha kalyaanaguna nilayathvam* etc., none of which, an ordinary mortal is endowed with. Therefore, the more one thinks of *Isvara's chidhabhaasaa*, the more it appears farther and farther away, because of the feeling of self-inadequacy to even approach *Isvara*. Attainment of the required *Saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is itself found to be an uphill task for an aspirant. Where is the question of *suddhathvam* etc., for a lay-man preoccupied with worldly and mundane affairs? Therefore the *chidhabhaasa* component of *Isvara* always brings in a sense of 'remoteness'.

Is 'remoteness' a wanted or unwanted attribute? Ans: 'Remoteness' is unwanted because, looking upon *Paramaathmaa* as 'remote' from 'me' is what causes strong *samsaarithvam*. After *Vedhaanthalaa*, remoteness of *Paramaathmaa* must go away. *Paramaathmaa* should come closer and closer and should ultimately join 'me'.

That is the reason why *chidhaabhaasaa* of *Isvara* also must be dismissed as *mithyaa*. Only then, the aspirant can happily accept *jeevaathma-Paramaathma eikyam*. But, before dismissal of the *chidhaabhaasaa*, it has to enter the student's intellect. The very word '*thadh*' reveals remoteness. '**That**' *Paramaathmaa* indicates the remoteness, which enters the intellect as the 'peel' of the banana, to be discarded later.

Reverting to the text, '*Sadhvitheeyathvam*' means 'having a second entity'. This, viz., 'having a second entity' is the status of *jeevaathmaa*. *Paramaathmaa* can never have a second entity, because *Paramaathmaa* is only One. *Jeevaathmaa* alone can have a second entity, in the form of another *jeeva*. '*Sadhvitheetyathvam*' means 'secondness' 'secondness' implies 'limitation'. This final implied meaning of the word '*Sadhvitheetyathvam*', viz. 'limitation' is the attribute belonging to the *jeevaathmaa's chidhaabhaasaa* component.

Thus, *jeevaathmaa's chidhabhaasaa* component has 'limitation' and *Paramaathmaa's chidhabhaasaa* component has got 'remoteness'. Sureswaraacharya says that these two unwanted components also, viz., the 'limitedness' component of *thvampadhaartha* and the 'remoteness' component of *thadhpadhaartha* enter the intellect, at the time of *sravanam*, along with the *upaadhitsitha chith*, similar to the 'skin' in the banana example. Both of them are also occupying the 'chair' (the intellect of the student), along with the non-dual *chith*.

The word 'Paarokshya' is connected with *thadh padha vaachyaartha* and the word 'sadhvitheeya' is connected with *thvam padha vaachyarthaartha*.

- (यध्यपि)तथापि तु - But, even though both of them enter the 'stage' ,

Recollecting the banana example, both the fruit and the peel portions of the banana enter the hands of the buyer, though only the 'fruit' part is intended to be sold and the peel part is not intended to be sold. In a similar manner, in the *thvam padha artha* and *thadh padha artha*, Sureswaraacharya says the *adhvitheeya aathmaartha* is the 'intended component' and the other two, viz., the *paarokshya chidhaabhaasaa* of *Isvara*, (in *thadhpadhaartha*) and the *sadhvitheeya chidhaabhaasaa* of *jeeva* (in *thvampadhaartha*) are 'unintended components', conveyed to the student. This is what is indicated by the *Aachaaryaa* in this portion.

One more example (apart from the banana example and the rocket example) may also be given. In an 'award presentation function', the winners of the awards may be very advanced in age ; when called upon to go on the stage and occupy their designated seats at the head table, they may need escorts to help them to their seats, because of their advanced age and consequent infirmity,. To assist them, the escorts will also go up to the dais. But, once the aged dignitary / the prize winner is properly seated, the assistants will go back to join the audience.

- असौ अर्थः - the 'remoteness' component which belongs to the *vyaavahaarika chidhaabhaasaa* of *Paramaathmaa* and the 'limitation' component which belongs to the *vyaavahaarika chidhaabhaasaa* of *jeevaathmaa*,
- न प्रतिपादयिषितः एव - are not really desired to be conveyed
- श्रुत्या - by the *sruthi*,
- तात्पर्येण - as its essential message / teaching.

The *sruthi* does not want to convey these meanings when using the words *thvam* and *thath*. Again, referring to the banana example, both the shopkeeper and the buyer know that only the fruit part alone is consumable; the skin part is not for consumption. But, the shopkeeper does not peel off the skin, to hand over the fruit portion alone to the buyer. He expects the buyer to peel off the skin and discard it, before eating the fruit portion. In a similar manner, the *sruthi* does not peel off the *saguna amsaas*; it gives the *saguna amsaas* also, though the *sruthi* does not really intend to convey the *saguna amsaas*. This is an unique, minute observation by Sureswaraacharya on this aspect, not found in other *Advaita granthaas*.

The compound word '*naivaasaavartha:*' is to be split as '*na + eva + asau + artha:*'| '*Asau artha:*' refers to the *saguna* components of the two mixtures viz., the *Paramaathmaa* and the *jeevaathmaa*.

'*prathipipaadhaishitha:*' is also a complex word, the past passive participle of the desiderative form of the causal form of the root '*prathi+padh*', meaning '*prathipaadhayithum ishta:*' or 'desired to be conveyed' / 'intended to be conveyed'.

But, how can it be claimed that *sruthi* wants to convey only the *nirgunaa* component of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, by *thvampadhaartha* and *thadhpadhaartha* and that it does not want to convey the *saguna* components of the two?

This is a very big *poorva pakshaa* raised by the *visishtaadvathins* and the *dvaithins*, both of whom believe that *sruthi* conveys only the *saguna* components. They assert that there is no question of any *nirguna* component being conveyed by *sruthi* and that, there is no question of any *eiyyam* also.

According to the *visishtaadvathins* and *dvaithins*, *Sruthi* wants to convey only the *saguna* / 'limitation' component of the *jeevaathmaa*, and the *saguna* / 'remoteness' component of *Paramaathmaa*. They hold that the *Veda* wants to impart the teaching that the *jeevaathmaa* should *continue* to be 'limited' as '*daasoham*'; and, as *saguna jeeva*, should *continue* to do *upaasanaa* of *saguna Iswara*; and, after practicing *upaasanaa* throughout life, the *saguna jeevaathmaa* should pass through *sushumnaa naadi*, exit the physical body through *brahma randiram* and travelling through *sukla gathi*, reach *Paramapadam* / *Vaikuntaa*, the remote abode of *Paramaathmaa*. This is the vehement stand of the *visishtaadvathins* and *dvaithins*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa takes on these two powerful *poorva pakshins* on this topic. He says, that, the *Upanishad* does not want to convey the *saguna chidhaabhaasaa* of *jeevaathmaa* or the *saguna chidhaabhaasaa* of *Paramaathma*, by the words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'. He asserts, that, that is not the intention of the *sruthi* at all.

Now, he has to explain his stand, which is an important technical argument. In essence, it is: "Any *pramaanam* need not talk about something which the student already has in his mind. Naturally, an idea which is already firmly rooted in the mind of the listener need not be conveyed / repeated by the speaker".

This is a very, very important law of communication. The student should register this in his / her mind, because this is a very powerful argument, which is used by the *Aachaaryaa* to dismiss both *visishtaadvaitam* and *dvaitham*.

What is this law of communication? Ans: "A speaker should / need not convey an idea which is there already, firmly rooted in the mind of the listener. A speaker should convey only something which is **not** in the mind of the listener". An example: Even a person without any advanced education, but who has a basic knowledge of arithmetic, need not be told that $2 + 2 = 4$, because that is already in his / her mind.

In the context of a *pramaanam* itself, there is this important clause, viz. that, "a *pramaanam* should convey only ideas which are not already known to the listener". This is called the *anadhigathathvam* clause, otherwise as *apoorvathaa*. According to this *anadhigathathvam* or *apoorvathaa* clause, "a *pramaanam* is meant to convey to the listener an idea, which is not already in the mind of the listener".

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out : "The concept, that 'I am a 'limited entity, far away from God' need not be taught to me, by the *Veda anthaa* portions, very elaborately, through *pancha kosa viveka*, *avasthaathraya vivekaa* etc., since I already entertain that concept strongly in my mind, because of the *karma kaandaa*, the *Veda poorvaa*.

"The entire *jnaana kaandaa* is struggling to teach 'something' to the aspirant and how can that 'something' be an idea which is already there in *karma kaandaa* ? In *karma kaandaa*, the *jeeva* has been doing *puja-s* and *upaasanaa-s* and, as a helpless human being, has been appealing to *saguna Isvara* for succour. This is the religious mind, which is engaged in the *karma kaandaa* of the *Veda*. Why should an elaborate *jnaana kaandaa* also again tell the *jeeva*: 'you are *samsaari*; you are different from God; God is far away' etc.?"

"On the other hand, does not the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* take the trouble of repeating '*thaththvamas'* nine times (*Chaandhoghya Upanishad* - VI.8.7, VI.9.4, VI.10.3, VI.11.3, VI.12.3, VI.13.3, VI.14.3, VI.15.3 and VI.16.3)?"

"Does not *Thaithreeya Upanishad* (*Bhrugu Valli* – 10.6) declare "*Sa: yaschaayam purushe / yaschasaavaadhithye / sa eka:*" – "That (*Aanandaa*) which is in the human being and that (*Aanandaa*) which is in the sun – that is one"?"

"Does not *Aithreya Upanishad* (III.1.3) conclude "*Pragnyaanam Brahma*" – "Consciousness is *Brahma*"?"

"Does not *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (I.iv.1) proclaim "Aham Brahma Asmi" – "I am Brahman" ?

"Does not *Katopanishad* (II.i.11) assert "*Neha naanaasthi kinchana*" – "There is no plurality at all here"?"

"Why should *sruthi* make thousands of such statements, if its intention is to keep the *samsaari* a *nithya samsaari* and a remote God even remoter?"

"The *saguna* idea is 'already *pratheetham*' (which means 'already present in the mind of the student')".

An interesting 'aside' (discussed earlier, in other contexts): Before taking to study of *Veda*, an average individual has *iha loka bhayam* i.e., 'fear of this world'. *Samsaaraa* is *bhayam*, fear of the world. *Veda's* aim is to remove the '*iha loka bhayam*' of aspirants. In other words, *Veda* is meant for removing this fear. When the aspirant enters the *karma kaandaa* of the *Veda*, it introduces a *Bhagavaan*, who is also the *karma pala dhaathaa*, i.e. One Who

grants 'results' for the 'actions' of any individual, **depending on the individual's past karma**. In this context, *Veda* talks of three types of *karmaa* – *sanchitha*, *praarabhda* and *aagaami*. It also talks of the *nava grahaas*, such as *raahu*, *kethu* etc. and the different *dasaas* that the individual goes through etc. It further talks of the different types of *para lokaas*; and tells the aspirant that it is the nature of the aspirant's *karmaas* which decides that *para loka* to which the aspirant will be taken, after his / her death.

So, what is the result of this teaching by *karma kaandaa*? Ans: Before exposure to *karma kaandaa*, the individual was blissfully ignorant of these different *para lokaas*. Now, after completion of the entire *karma kaandaa*, the aspirant is stuck with more fear. Previously, as a non-religious person, the individual was suffering only from *iha loka bhayam* – including fear of old age. Now, after exposure to the *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedas*, the individual adds the fear of *punar janmaa* also to his/ her list of fears.

Now, if study of *jnaana kaandam* also results only in retention of these fears, continuing to maintain the aspirant in the triangular format, hooked to the two-fold *iha loka* and *para loka bhayam*, in that case, study of *Vedas*, assimilation of *Vedic* truths and leading a *Vaidhika* life etc. would all appear unnecessary or even undesirable. Being a non-believer might appear more sensible.

The *jnaana kaandam* of the *Vedas* is meant to remove both the fears – *iha loka bhayam* and *para loka bhayam*. It is, of course, the *Sruthi*, which introduces *paraloka bhayam*, through *karma kaandaa*; but, only with the specific intention of steering the aspirant towards *dharma anushtaanam* and *karma yoga*. And, the *jnaana kaandam* of *sruthi* is meant to remove both *iha loka bhayam* and *paraloka bhayam*. These fears can never be got over, as long as an individual is in *saguna chidhaabhaasa*; as long as the individual is in the 'triangular format' of *jeeva*, *jagath* and *Isvara*, with the concept "I am *jeeva*, *Bhagavaan* is 'elsewhere' and there is a world separate from me and *Bhagavaan*, holding out threats to me".

The aspirant has to discard both *jeeva chidhaabhaasaa* and *Isvara chidhaabhaasaa*. The *saguna* outlook should disappear. The 'triangle' of *jeeva*, *jagath* and *Isvara* should be transcended. The aspirant's conviction should be: "There is only the *niruguna* 'I'. The 'triangle' of *jeeva* – *Jagath* - *Isvara* belongs to *mithyaa naama-roopaa*. Whether this 'triangle' of *jeeva* – *Jagath* - *Isvara* is there or not, does not make a difference to me at all, because it is *mithyaa* and, at best, an entertainment".

Since, *saguna chidhaabhaasaa*-s, introduced by *karma kaandaa* **have** to be discarded, *Jnaana kaandaa* cannot again introduce them; on the other hand, *Jnaana Kaandaa* has to remove them. *Saguna* concepts must disappear; all the three, viz., *saguna Isvara*, *saguna*

Jeeva and *saguna prapanchaa* should become *mithyaa*. They should all be falsified. There is absolutely no other way out of bondage and *samsaaraa*.

“Na kaschith jaayathe jeeva: sambhavasya na vidhyathe | Ethath thadh utthama sathyam yathra kinchith na jaayathe” – “No jeeva is born; this jeeva has no cause. This Brahman is the absolute Truth, in which nothing is born” asserts Gouda Paadhaachaarya in his Maandookya Kaarika (Advaita Prakaranam – verse 48).

Gouda Paadhaachaarya also declares: “Na nirodho na chothpatthi: na baddho na cha saadhaka: na mumukshur naiva muktha: ithyeshaa paraamaarthathaa” – “There is no dissolution, no creation, none who is bound, none who strives for liberation, none who desires liberation and none who is liberated. This is the absolute truth (Maandookya Kaarika – Vaithithya prakaranam - Verse 32.)

Without the aspirant coming to this conclusion, there is no remedy for him / her. The alternative concept, viz., ‘to continue as *ahamkaaraa* till this body falls, to ‘escape’ from this world to some other *loka* after death and to never come back again to this world’ is wrong and will only be futile. ‘Running away’ from this world will never work. It will make the world only more real. Instead, the effort of the seeker should be to falsify the world, even while remaining in the world. Other than that course, there is no remedy for *samsaaraa*. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* is also conveying. He wants to say “*saguna* is already a known idea. *Jnaana kaandaa* does not want to teach *saguna*”. Therefore, he says:

- एतस्य प्रतीतत्वात् - since these two ideas (paarokshyam of Paramaathmaa and sadhvitheeyathvam of jeevaathmaa) are already in the seeker’s mind,
- प्राक् अपि - even before coming to jnaana kaandaa (mahaa vaakya sravnaath poorvameva).

The term ‘*ethasya*’ means ‘*paarokshya sadhvitheeya arthasya*’ / ‘*saguna arthasya*’ / ‘*vyaavahaarika arthasya*’ / of the two ideas of ‘limitation’ and ‘remoteness’. The two ideas, viz., the ‘limitation’ of *jeeva* and ‘remoteness’ of *Isvara* are already there in the mind of the student. Those need not be stressed by *mahaa vaakyam* once again.

- इति इमं अर्थं आह - The author is conveying this important / significant idea in the ensuing verse (23).

Chapter III: Verse 23 – **तदित्येतत्पदं लोके बह्वर्थप्रतिपादकम् ।**

अपरित्यज्य पारोक्ष्यमभिधानोत्थमेव तत् ॥ २३ ॥

The term 'That' has many meanings in popular parlance. In all its meanings, it contains an intimation of remoteness.

- तद् इति एतत् पदं - This word thadh
- लोके - in common or *loukikaa* communications / popular parlance ('as well as in *vaidika vyavahaare'* is to be understood)

In the *maahaa vaakyam`thatthvaması'*, there is the word `thadh'. That word, by grammar itself, refers to something which is `remote'. To express the same idea in different words: "remoteness' is conveyed as the *vaachyaartha* of the word `thadh'". But, in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*, though the `remoteness' is conveyed by the word *thadh'*, it is really not the *thaathparyam* / intended object of the word. This is what Sureswaraachaarya wants to convey, by saying: " It is granted that the word `thadh' conveys `remoteness' as its in-built meaning; but, that meaning is not intended to be retained while understanding *mahaa vaakyam'*. The banana example may be recalled, in which the shopkeeper gives the skin also to the buyer; but, he expects and knows, that, the buyer will discard the skin. In a similar manner, *sruthi* `hands over' the `remoteness'; but the `remoteness' is not intended to be `retained'; it is to be discarded.

- बहु अर्थ प्रतिपादकम् - conveys many meanings (depending upon the context).

The reason for this follows, though it is quite obvious: `thadh' means `that'; and, the word `that' is a pronoun i.e. a `proxy noun'. `Proxy' means `representative'. Pronoun is `representative' for a noun. The word `thadh', therefore, can stand for any object that is far away; it can be used to represent a distant range of hills, a distant planet, a distant star and so on. But, in and through all the meanings which the pronoun `thadh' gives, one message is common to all. What is that common message? Ans: `*Paarokshyam'*, meaning `remoteness'. `Remoteness' is common to all the nouns denoted by the pronoun `that', as in *that* range of hills, *that* star etc. If there is no `remoteness' in the object to be referred to , the pronoun `that' or `thadh' will not be used to denote it. Instead, the pronoun `*idham'* or `this' will be used.

An interesting aside: There is a specific verse in Sanskrit grammar related to the two pronouns, `this' and `that': "***Idhamasthu sannikrishtam sameepathara varthi ethadho roopam adhasasthu viprakrushtam thadhithi parokshe vijaaneeyaath'***". This verse points out, that, in Sanskrit, we have two types of `this' (*idham'* and `*ethadh'*) and two types of

'that' ('*adhas*' and '*thadh*'), to denote 'proximate' and 'very proximate' and similarly 'remote' and 'very remote'.

Reverting to the topic under discussion, '*paarokshyam*' is included in all the nouns, denoted by the pronoun '*thadh*'. Therefore, when '*thadh*' is used to refer to *Paramaathmaa*, not only does *Paramaathmaa* enter the intellect as the meaning of the word '*thadh*', 'remoteness' also enters as the *vaachyaartha* of '*thadh*'.

- पारोक्ष्यं अपरित्यज्य तत् - (But) such a meaning which includes remoteness,

The word '*parithyajya*' means 'excluding'; therefore, '*aparithyajya*' means 'not excluding', which, in turn means 'including'.

- अभिधानोत्थम् एव - is only the *vaachyaartha* / primary / direct meaning only

This *vaachyaartha* / primary / direct meaning, conveyed by the word '*thadh*', is a mixture of '*chith*' and '*chidhaabhaasa*' / '*paaramaarthika*' and '*vyaavaharika*' / '*nirguna*' and '*saguna*'. Two components together enter the mind, on hearing the word '*thadh*'.

'*Abhidhaanottham*' means 'born out of the word primarily' / '*vaachyaartha*'.

Chapter III: Verse 24 –

त्वमित्यपि पदं तद्वत्साक्षान्मात्रार्थवाचि तु ।

संसारितामसंत्यज्य सापि स्यादभिधानजा ॥ २४ ॥

The term 'Thou' is connotative of the direct knower. But it also contains in its meaning an intimation that what it signifies is a *samsarin*, a soul caught up in transmigratory existence.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says the same rule is applicable to the word '*thvam*' also. When the word '*thvam*' enters the mind through the ears, in that word also, a mixture of '*chith*' and '*chidhaabhaassa*' / '*paaramaarthika*' and '*vyaavahaarika*' / '*nirguna*' and '*saguna*' enters. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- तद्वत् - In a similar manner,
- त्वं इति पदं अपि - the word '*thvam*' also.
- साक्षात् मात्र अर्थवाचि - (The word) signifies something intimately available.

Whether in *Vedhaanthic* context or in *loukikaa* / worldly parlance, the moment one hears the word '*thvam*' or the word 'you' in English, one conceives an entity which is not far away, not even just close by, but, an intimately available entity. Sureswaraacharya uses the word '*saakshaath*', meaning 'intimacy' / 'proximity' / 'immediacy'. Since the word '*thvam*' refers to the listener's own self, it conveys the idea of something, which has is intimate / close / proximate / immediate.

The *Aacharyaa*, in addition, uses the word '*maathra*', which usage is significant. How? Ans: There are certain objects which are intimately close by – for instance the clothing one wears. It is intimate to the wearer. One's physical body also is intimate. But, what is the difference between the 'intimacy' of the clothing and the 'intimacy' of myself ; or even the 'intimacy' of the body and the 'intimacy' of 'myself'?

The usage of the word *maathraa* answers this: "The cloth, body etc. are intimate now, at a given moment. But, they can become remote later. Therefore, they are intimate at times; they can be far away also at other times. Whereas, 'I', my'self, is also intimate, but, 'I' can never become remote; 'Self' has an intimacy which can never become remote. In other words, the word 'you' refers to an intimate thing which can never become remote from you, at any time, which, in fact, is 'You'. The usage of the word '*maathram*', in this verse, highlights this fact.

An object becomes *saakshaath* when one perceives it; later, when the object goes away, it becomes *asaakshaath*. On the other hand, 'I' am *always saakshaath*. '*Thvam*' refers to a *nithya saakhsaath vasthu*. 'This' refers to an *anithya saakshaath vasthu*.

137. Chapter III, Verse 24 to 26(04-04-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is analyzing the three stages through which the mahaa vaakyam functions and conveys its meaning to the student, the first stage being saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa, the second stage being viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa and the third being lakshya lakshana sambhandhaa.

In the first stage, the relationship between the two words is called '*saamaanaadhikaranyam*', roughly translated in English as 'relationship between two words related without any preposition in between the two' or as 'preposition-less relationship' or as 'appositional relationship'.

Numerous examples of sentences **with** prepositions can be given, such as 'I write with a pen', 'he is on the ground' and 'water is in the bottle' etc. In the first example, between the two nouns 'I' and 'pen', there is an intermediary preposition 'with'. Similarly, in the second example, between the two nouns 'he' and 'ground', there is the preposition 'on' and in the third example, between the two nouns 'water' and 'bottle', there is the preposition 'in'. In these examples, two nouns are linked with a preposition in between. When the words are thus linked with prepositions, the relationship between the words is called *vaiyadhikaranya sambhandhaa*.

In contrast, relationship between two words in a sentence, **without** any preposition in between, is called *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that, in the mahaa vaakyam, '*thatthvamasI*', in between the two words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', there is only *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa*. That means there is no prepositional relationship between the words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'. The vaakyam does not convey the meanings that *jeevaathmaa* is **in** *Paramaathmaa* or *jeevaathmaa* is **with** *Paramaathmaa* etc. Between the two words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', these prepositions 'on', 'at', 'with', 'in' etc. are all absent. This is a very, very important fact to be noticed, because, use of a preposition between two nouns in any statement, conveys a relationship between the two objects denoted by the nouns, while the absence of preposition reveals *eikyam* between the two objects.

Therefore, for *Advaitam*, the absence of preposition between the two words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', in the mahaa vaakyam, '*thatthvamasI*' is a very, very significant fact to be observed and mentally recorded, since, it, at once, reveals the *eikyam* between '*thadh padha arthaa*' and '*thvam padha arthaa*', viz., the *Paramaathmaa* and the *jeevaathmaa*.

This *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa* in the mahaa vaakyam is the first stage in the process of understanding the mahaa vaakyam.

In the current portion (verses 23 and 24), the *Aachaaryaa* is discussing the second stage, termed *viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa*, which exists between the two primary meanings of the '*thadh padhaa*' and the '*thvam padhaa*'. The earlier *Saaamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa* is the relationship between the two **words**, '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', whereas, the '*viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa*' is between the two **primary meanings of the two words**, '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'.

This '*viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa*' between the primary meanings of the two words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*' can be translated as 'qualifier-qualified relationship'. *Jeevaathmaa* 'qualifies' *Paramaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* 'qualifies' *jeevaathmaa*. What is conveyed by the term 'qualifies', is that "*jeevaathmaa* transfers its status to *Paramaathmaa*" and similarly "*Paramaathmaa* transfers its status to *jeevaathmaa*". This may again be stated as "*Jeevaathma-hood* is gifted to *Paramaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa-hood* is gifted to *jeevaathmaa*", where, *Jeevaathma-hood* means *jeevathvam* and *Paramaathmaa-hood* means *Paramaathvathvam*. *Jeevathvam* qualifies *Paramaathmaa* and *Paramaathvathvam* qualifies *jeevaathmaa*. This 'hood exchange' relationship is called 'qualifier-qualified relationship' or '*viseshana-viseshya sambhandhaa*'. The student has to understand this *viseshana-viseshya* relationship properly, while studying the second stage of the process of understanding the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Of these two primary meanings, Sureswaraachaarya first talked about the primary meaning of the word '*thadh*' in verse no. 23. In the primary meaning of the word *thadh* or *Paramaathmaa*, there is *chaithanyam* / Consciousness. "But" the *Aachaaryaa* pointed out "in the primary meaning of '*thadh*', there is also an unwanted component". This fact again has to be marked carefully by the student. What is that unwanted component, in the primary meaning of '*thadh*'? Ans: When *Paramaathmaa* is referred to, by the word '*thadh*' or 'that', since the word '*thadh*' literally means 'that', which is a pronoun used to refer to a remote object, the use of the word results in a 'remoteness' being attributed to *Paramaathmaa*.

This is very much an obstruction for *eigyka jnaanam*, because the more 'remote' or 'away' *Paramaathmaa* is considered or understood to be, the greater is the *samsaaram*. But, unfortunately, this *paarokshya uktha artha*: also is conveyed by the use of the word '*thadh*', in the *mahaa vaakyam*. The wanted component in the meaning of '*thadh*' or *Paramaathmaa* is *asamsaarithvam* or *mukthi*: / The unwanted, but inevitable component is 'remoteness'. This was said in verse no. 23.

Now, in verse 24, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about the primary meaning of the word '*thvam*', which is the *jeevathmaa*. This word also has got an unwanted component which has to be

ultimately scraped off. Similar to the word '*thadh*', there is a wanted component and an unwanted component in the primary meaning of the word '*thvam*' also.

It was said, that, in *Paramaathmaa* there is a wanted component and there is an unwanted component. What are they? The wanted component of *Paramaathmaa* is *asamsaarithvam*. The *mukthi* in *Paramaathmaa* - not even ordinary *mukthi*, but *nithya mukthi* - is the wanted component of *Paramaathmaa*. But, 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* is something, which an aspirant to *mukthi* does not want. The reason is obvious, viz., because if *Paramaathmaa* is remote, *nithya mukthi* also will become remote.

In a similar manner, in the *thvam padha vaachyaartha* or the *jeevaathmaa* also, there is a wanted component and there is an unwanted component. What is the wanted component of *jeevaathmaa*? Ans: *Jeevaathmaa* is in proximity, meaning that it is close to 'me'. How close? Ans: It is me, myself.

This wanted component is called 'proximity' or 'immediacy'. 'Proximity' or 'immediacy' is the wanted component of *jeevaathmaa*, which component should be 'retained' by the seeker. Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the term *saakshaath*, which word means 'directness' / 'immediacy' / 'proximity' / 'closeness' etc.

The word *saakshaath* is also of two types. There is one type of proximity / *saakshaathvam*, which proximity is a temporary proximity or *anithya saakshaathvam*.

What is the example of *anithya saakshaathvam*? When *puraanaas* talk about *devathaa saakshaathkaara:*, i.e. when they talk of a *bhakthaa* having direct experience of a *devathaa* like Rama or Krishna or Devi, the *bhakthaa* is said to have *saakshaathkaaraa*. The *devatha* was directly available to the *bhakthaa*, because of the *thapas* and devotion of the *bhaktha*. *Bhagavaan* Rama appeared in front of His devotee-par-excellence, Saint Thiagaraja.

In a like manner, *Bhagavaan* Krishna made His appearance in front of Meera. *Bhagavaan* Krishna became *saakshaath* available to Meera; Meera's *Krishnadharsanam* became *saakshaathkaara:* | And, *Bhagavaan* Krishna enjoyed the status of *saakshaathvam* / immediacy / directness. But, what type of directness was it? Was it *nithyam* or *anithyam*? Ans: The very fact that the *bhakthaas* lament, in most such instances "I **had** the *saakshaathkaaram* of *Bhagavaan*; but, He has gone away now" shows that it was only *anithya saakshaathkaaraa*. This type of *saakshaathvam*, which is temporary, belongs to *prathyaksha padhaartha*.

There is another type of 'directness' called *nithya saakshaathvam*, which means 'permanent immediacy'.

Every *prathyaksha vasthu* has got temporary directness, whereas, 'I', the *jeevaathmaa*, is not temporarily *saakshaath* ; 'I' am permanently available to 'myself'. *Bhagavaan* Krishna comes and goes ; *Bhagavaan* Rama comes and goes; They have temporary *saakshaathvam*. But, 'I', the *jeevaathmaa* is not temporarily *saakshaath*, but permanently available, directly.

To emphasize this permanency, the *Aachaaryaa* uses the extra word *maathraa*, which usage stresses "'I' am **permanently** 'directly available' for 'myself' ".

The term '*Saakshaathmaathram*' stresses this 'permanent directness of oneself to oneself', which is conveyed through the word '*thvam*'. To sum up, the word '*thvam*' reveals 'permanent directness' of 'oneself to oneself'.

If the question "Is this permanent immediacy of *jeevaathmaa* is a wanted component or unwanted component?" is raised, the answer is "it *is* a wanted component". That "'I' am always available for 'myself'" *is* the wanted component.

But, there is an unwanted component also, in the word '*thvam*'. What is that? The answer is in the verse (verse no. 23):

- संसारितां असंत्यज्य - Including the *samsaarithvam* (the unwanted component),

'*Asamthyajya*' means 'without giving up' / 'retaining' / 'including' . '

- सा अपि अभिधानजा स्यात् - that word '*thvam*' denotes a *samsaari* (as the meaning of '*thvam*').

'*Abhidhaanam*' means 'denotation' / 'intimation' and '*Abhidhaanamam*' means *vaachyaartha: / mukhyaartha: / primary meaning / direct meaning*.

The two verses (23 and 24) indicate that in both the primary meanings of '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', unwanted components are included – '*paarokshyam*' / 'remoteness' in '*thadh*' or '*Paramaathmaa* and '*samsaarithaa*' / 'bondage' in '*thvam*' or '*jeevaathmaa*. As in the 'banana' example, the primary meanings of the words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*' still have the unwanted 'skins', in the second stage. In the third stage alone the 'skins' will be peeled off.

The unwanted component in 'me', the *jeevaathmaa*, is the *samsaari* status. In the *jeevaathmaa*, *samsaarithvam* is unwanted. In the *Paramaathmaa*, 'remoteness' is unwanted. If the aspirant scrapes off both of them in the third stage, *Paramaathmaa* ceases to be

remote and *jeevaathmaa* ceases to be a *samsaari*, and then they are ready for *eikyam*. This 'scraping off' in the third stage is called *bhaagha thyaaga lakshanam*. This is being discussed in the subsequent portion.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 25 – Chapter III:

विरुद्धोद्देशनत्वाच्च पारोक्ष्यदुःखित्वयोरविवक्षितत्वमित्याह ।

As the two terms equated, contain contradictory connotations, these conflicting elements, namely, mediateness and subjection to misery, are not intended to be asserted. That is brought out now.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "When you take the primary meanings of the words 'thadh' and 'thvam' you have the unwanted components included in them - *samsaarithvam* in *jeevaathmaa* and remoteness in *Paramaathmaa*. As a sequel to the *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha* between the two words in the first stage, which *sambhandha* signifies *eikyam* between the two, in the second stage, we have to apply *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*, the qualifier-qualified relationship between the primary meanings of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*. But, when you try to apply this relationship, *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha* to *thadh padha vaachyaarthaa* and 'thvam padha vaachyaarthaa', they will not join together. *Jeevaathma* status cannot go to *Paramaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* status will not go to *Jeevaathmaa*, because the two unwanted components make them repel each other. 'Remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* makes it difficult to approach *jeevaathmaa*. And, similarly, the *samsaarithvam* of *jeevaathmaa* makes it impossible to approach *Paramaathmaa*".

As long as these two components which cause the 'repelling' between *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* are there in the meanings of the words 'thadh' and 'thvam', there cannot be *eikyam* between 'thadh' and 'thvam'. Therefore, the *Upanishad* does not want to retain the repelling components and expects the student / seeker to remove the unwanted components, so that 'thadh' and 'thvam' can be equated.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- पारोक्ष्य दुःखित्वयोः - The remoteness in the *Paramaathmaa* and the *samsaara dhu:khithvam* in the *jeevaathmaa*

The term 'Paarokshya dhu:khithvayo:' is 'dwandva samaasam', arrived at as 'paarokshyam cha dhu:kithvam cha – thayo:' |

- अविवक्षितत्वं - are not intended to be taught / conveyed / communicated (by *sruthi*),

The example of the banana is to be recollected again ; when the shopkeeper sells the banana, even though he hands over the banana with the skin, he expects the buyer to peel off and discard the skin, the unwanted component. Similarly, the *sruthi*, gives two components in each of the words '*thadh'* and '*thvam'*'; but, it does not want the student to retain one component in each, viz. 'remoteness' in *Paramaathmaa* and '*samsaarithvam'* in the *jeevaathmaa*, since they are the causes for the *jeevaathmaa* maintaining separation from *Paramaathmaa*.

- विरुद्ध उद्देशनत्वात् - because the components of *Paramaathmaa* and of the *jeevaathmaa* are contradictory.

'*Paramaathmaa'* is 'remote'; '*jeevaathmaa'* is 'intimately proximate'. '*Paramaathmaa'* is '*nithya muktha:'*; '*jeevaathmaa'* is a '*samsaar'*.

This may be likened to a married couple with incompatible natures; if the couple desires to live together, they should give up the mutually incompatible natures, which 'giving up' may be called *bhaagha thyaagha lakshanam*. If there is no *bhaaga thyaaga lakshanam*, *eikyam* between the couple is not possible. They have to separate. The *vaachyaarthaas* of the words '*thadh'* and '*thvam'* may be compared to the incompatible *svabhaavaas* of the husband and wife. *Bhaagha thyaagha lakshanam* has to be applied to the *vaachyaarthaas*, to achieve *eikyam* between the *Paramaathmaa* and the *jeevaathmaa*.

'*Uddhesanam'* here means 'primary meaning' and '*viruddha'* means 'contradictory' or 'mutually exclusive'.

- इति आह - That is clarified (in the following *sloka*).

At the moment, we (the teacher and the student) are in the secondary stage of *viseshana viseshya sambhandhaa* .

Chapter III: Verse 25 –

उद्दिश्यमानं वाक्यस्थं नोद्देशनगुणान्वितम् ।

आकाङ्क्षितपदार्थेन संसर्गं प्रतिपद्यते ॥ २५ ॥

The subject does not get related to the predicate, along with the aspect that seems natural to it but really conflicts with the predicate.

When the student is in the second stage, he is yet to scrape off the *samasaarithvam* of *jeevaathmaa* and the remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*. As a consequence, the '*thathvamas/ mahaavaakyam*' does not reach his intellect.

At this intermediary stage, when the *Advaita guru* assures the student "you are *nithya muktha*:", the student may not protest and appear to agree because of his respect for the *guru*; but, is unable to really appreciate or accept that he is a *nithya muktha*: | He wants to continue either in *visishtaadvaitam* or *dvaitam*; *advaitam* is unacceptable to him. This is because of the reason, that, he is still holding on to the unwanted components in the primary meanings of '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- वाक्यस्थं - In the mahaa vaakyam
- उद्दिश्यमानं - the subject of the sentence viz., *jeevaathmaa*,

In the *mahaa vaakuam 'thaththvamas/*, the subject of the sentence is '*thvam*' or *jeevaathmaa*. The word '*thadh*' in the sentence is the 'predicate'. In Sanskrit, 'subject' is called '*uddhisyaamaanam*' and 'predicate' is called '*vidheeyamaanam*' or '*aakaankshitham*'.

How does one know that '*thvam*' is the subject of the sentence? In fact, the word '*thadh*' comes first in the sentence and, therefore, '*thadh*' looks like the subject of the sentence. But, a grammatical analysis will show that it is only '*thvam*' which is the subject of this statement and not '*thadh*'.

The grammatical analysis would run as follows: The verb used in the sentence is '*asi*' and in Sanskrit grammar, '*asi*' is a second-person verb / *madhyama purusha ekavachanam* verb. Since the verb in the sentence is in the 'second' person, the subject has to be in the 'second' person only. Out of the two nouns in the sentence, '*Thvam*' is in second person, while '*thadh*' is not. It follows, therefore, that '*thvam*' is the subject of the sentence, '*thadh*' is the predicate and '*asi*' is the verb.

And, therefore, the '*uddhisyaamaanam vaakyastham*', which means, 'the subject of the *mahaa vaakyam*', mentioned in this verse, refers to '*thvam*' or '*jeevaathmaad*'. What is the nature of *jeevaathmaa* at this second stage?

- उद्देशन गुण अन्वितम् - which has got the unwanted component included in its primary meaning,

'*uddhesana guna.*' means 'primary meaning'; '*anvitham*' means 'endowed with'. The primary meaning, the *vaachyaartha* of the word '*thvam*' includes the unwanted component of *samsaarithvam* in it. Only in the secondary meaning or *lakshyaartha*, the unwanted component is removed / rejected.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says "The subject of the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., the *jeevaathmaa*, with its primary meaning, which primary meaning includes the unwanted component of *samsaarithvam*",

- न सम्सर्ग प्रतिपद्यते - can never have connection or oneness / will not jell or join

With what?

- आकाङ्क्षित पदार्थेन - with the predicate.

What is the predicate? Ans: '*Thadh'* or *Paramaathmaa* with its primary meaning, which primary meaning includes the unwanted element of 'remoteness'.

As long as primary meanings are taken for '*thadh'* and '*thvam*', the unwanted elements will be included in them and the *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava- sambhandha* will not work at all. Because of the unwanted components, *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* cannot mutually exchange their statuses. The *jeevaathmaa* including the unwanted element of *samsaarithvam*, can never combine with the *Paramaathmaa* including the unwanted element 'remoteness'. With the unwanted elements in them, *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* cannot be equated. The concept "*Aham brahma asmi*" will appear a sacrilege. That is the reason why the *visishtaadvaitin* is highly irritated at the *advaitin* claiming '*aham brahma asmi*', '*soham*' etc. According to the *visishtaadvaitin*, the *jeeva* should always say only '*dasoham*' and therefore, has to keep a distance from *Bhagavaan*, since *Bhagavaan* is great, while the *jeeva* is only a miserable *samsaari*. These repelling *gunaas* in them, viz., the 'greatness' in *Bhagavaan* and the miserable *samsaarithvam* in the *Jeeva* prevent the *eiyyam* or 'oneness' between them.

'Samsargam' can be translated as 'eiyyam'; 'samsargam na pradhipadhyathe' means 'cannot have eiyyam'; 'aakaankshitha padhaarthena' means 'Paramaathma vaachyaarthena'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 26:

यत एतदेवमतोऽनुपादिस्त्वयोरपि तत्त्वमर्थयोः विशेषणविशेष्यभावः भेदसंसर्गरहित
वाक्यार्थलक्षणायैवेत्युपसंहारः ।

Therefore, the subject-predicate relationship of the imports of 'That' and 'Thou', which are not really intended, is for indicating a meaning of the proposition devoid of association with difference:

Sureswaraacharya asks: "What is the object of all these discussions? Why is there such an elaborate discussion on these topics, such as the *vaachyaarthaas*, the *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa* between them etc.?"; and, answers that this intermediary stage discussion *is* necessary, to show the importance of the third stage.

He says: "Only if we come to the intermediary stage, take the *vaachyaarthas* initially and try to apply the *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa*, at that time of applying the *sambhandhaa*, we will become intensely aware of the mutual repulsion between *jeevaathma vaachyarthaa* and *Paramaathma vaachyarthaa*. The repulsion must be intensely experienced. Only when we find that they are not coming together, we will get to analyze as to what the repelling components are. And, on a diligent analysis, we will come to know the repelling components in the primary meanings. And, then, we will have to drop them".

For instance, *Sruthi* expects the seeker to remove *deha abhimaana* ; if the academic language is reduced to practical experience, the seeker will realize that as long as he/ she has *deha abhimaana*, the *mahaa vaakyam* will not work. *Deha abhimaanaa* is one repelling component. There are other repelling components - like *abhimaanaas* for wife, son, family, property etc. If all these have to be discovered, the seeker should come to the intermediary stage and experience the 'repulsions' by himself / herself. Once the 'repulsions' are established, the seeker will proceed to the third stage of *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa*, between *vaachyaarthaa* and *lakshyaarthaa*.

The Aacharya says:

- यतः एतद् एवं - Because of this above mentioned condition (namely the mutual repulsion / incompatibility)
- तत्त्वमर्थयोः - between the primary meanings (*vaachyaarthaa-s*) of '*thadh*' and *thvam*'
- अनुपादित्सितयोः अपि - which meanings are not intended by the *Upanishad*,

But, how can it be said that the *Upanishad* does not intend the primary meanings? To the seeker who has total and unquestionable faith in *sruthi*, this doubt is answered as follows: "If you take the primary meanings for the words '*thadh*' and '*thvam*', '*eykyam*' between them does not appear possible. On the other hand, *Sruthi* confidently asserts '*thadh thvam as*', the verb '*as*' positively revealing the *eykyam*. Since, thus, you come to know from the

mahaa vaakyam, that, *sruthi* is sure of the *eykyam* between `thadh' and `thvam', and is also keen to communicate the *eykyam*, you should understand that *sruthi* cannot be intending the primary meanings of the words `thadh' and `thvam', since the primary meanings include the unwanted components of 'remoteness' (in `thadh') and `samsaarithvam' (in `thvam').

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the adjective `anupaadhisithayo:' – 'not intended', for `thatthvamarthayo:' /

- ((:तत्त्वमर्तयो)विशेषणविशेष्यभावः - this 'qualifier-qualified' relationship / exchange of mutual statuses (between `thadh' and `thvam'),

The *Aachaaryaa* says "this mutual exchange of statuses of *jeeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, with their primary meanings, is of the above mentioned condition". `Evam' conveys the meaning 'above mentioned condition'. What is that 'above mentioned condition'? Ans: It (mutual exchange of statuses) is impossible; the *Paramaathmaa* and *jeeevaathmaa*, in their primary meanings are repelling each other; they are not able to come together; *Na samsargam prathipadhyathe ; samsarga aprathipaddhi:* |

Therefore, what is the aim of the *Upanishad*? Ans: The *Upanishad* expects the seeker to come to the intermediary stage of the primary meanings and the *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha:*, only to use it as a stepping stone and wants the seeker to go to the third stage thereafter.

In this context, the *Githa Dhyaana Sloka*, quoted in an earlier session, as an example for the use of *saamaanaadhikaranam* is to be recollected and compared with the *mahaavaakyam*. In that *Githa Dhyaana Sloka* "*prapanaanpaarijaathaaya thothra vethraika paananye jnaana mudhraaya Krishnaya geethamruthaduhe nama:*" also, there is *saamaanaadhikaranyam* i.e., there are no prepositions connecting the various nouns. But, we find an advantage in this sentence. When we take the primary meanings for the five different nouns and apply the *viseshana-viseshya-sambhaandhaa* between them, with those primary meanings themselves, the message of the *sloka* is clear. This is because there are no contradictions in the primary meanings of the different nouns. The primary meanings of the nouns jell with Krishna, without any difficulty.

But, here, in the *mahaa vaakyam*, the primary meanings of the two nouns used, do not jell. Therefore, the seeker's journey has to continue further. For what purpose?

- वाक्यार्थ लक्षणाय - should be applied to the secondary / target meanings of the words `thadh' and `thvam',

- भेद संसर्ग रहित - which target meanings are free from all types of divisions and all types of relationships.

'*Bedham*' means 'division' and '*samsargam*' means 'relationship'. '*Bedha samsarga rahitham*' indicates the final meaning of '*eiyyam* / total oneness'. There are not only no divisions, but, no relationships also between the secondary meanings of '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'- the *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*. Any type of relationship will convey that there are two separate entities, related to each other. Between *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* there is neither any division nor any relationship. *Paramaathmaa is jeevaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa is Paramaathmaa*.

Once the seeker goes to this third stage and understands all the three stages thoroughly, then, in one sweep, the intellect will grasp the grand picture. An analogy to emphasize this assurance: An individual arriving in a City for the first time, finds himself / herself at a loss to locate the different places to be visited by him / her and the routes to be taken from one place to another. But, once he / she gets used to the new City, there are no more confusions. The task of visiting and identifying different places is not found difficult at all. In a like manner, initially, the seeker may find the three different stages of understanding the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., (i) *saamaanaadhikaranya bhaava:*, (ii) *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandha bhaava:* and (iii) *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha bhaava:*, a daunting task, with each aspect appearing mind-boggling; but, later, the seeker can land in *eiyyam* effortlessly and claim "I am free; I was free; there is no *samsaaraa* for me at all".

Once the seeker goes through the secondary meanings and the third stage, the seeker arrives at a *jeevathmaa*, which is pure *sath* and *chith*, rid of *ahamkaara* and also *mamakaara* with regard any of the *anaathmaa* ; *anaathma-ahamkaara-mamakaara-rahitha-kevala-sacchith* is arrived at, as the secondary meaning of the word *jeevaathmaa*, who is free from all the inferior attributes. Similarly, after going through the third stage, *Paramaathmaa* also will lose its primary meaning and the seeker will get pure 'Existence-Consciousness', freed from all the superior attributes of *Paramaathmaa*, as the target meaning. Remoteness of *Paramaathmaa* will go away; *Samsaaraa* of *jeevaathmaa* will also go away. The pure *sath-chith-Paramaathmaa* and the pure *sath-chith-jeevaathmaa* can now be happily together, as one identity.

Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the phrase '*bedha samsarga rahitha vaakyartha*', conveying final meaning of '*eiyyam*', the 'total oneness', between *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*. '*Bedha rahitha*' means 'which is free from all types of divisions'.

'*Samsarga rahitha*' means 'free from any type of relationship'. Between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, there is no relationship at all. Any type of relationship will convey that they are two separate entities. *Jeevaathmaa* is not related to *Paramaathmaa*. If it is said "*jeevaathmaa* is related to *Paramaathmaa*", an unwanted preposition is introduced.

Therefore, what is the ultimate meaning of '*bedha samsarga rahitha vaakyarthā*' ? "*Jeevaathmaa is Paramaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa is jeevaathmaa*". That concept is called '*bedha samsarga rahitham*' / 'free form division and free from relationship'.

The use of the term '*lakshanaaya*' indicates that such a *vaakyartham* / *bedha samsarga rahitha vaakyartham* should be arrived at, through *lakshanaa*, i.e. by applying the *lakshanaa*, the secondary meanings.

The intermediate stage is to be used by the seeker as a stepping stone for that ultimate purpose alone.

- इति उपसंहारः - This is the end of the second stage of *mahaa vaakya vichaaram* (as a stepping stone for the third stage).

Chapter III: Verse 26 –

तदो विशेषणार्थत्वं विशेष्यत्वं त्वमस्तथा ।

लक्ष्यलक्षणसंबन्धस्तयोः स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मना ॥ २६ ॥

The term 'Thou' signifies the subject. The term 'That' signifies the predicate. The proposition as a whole relates them to the inner Self as their indicated import.

This verse can be considered a 'threshold' *sloka*, connecting the second and third stages. It marks the completion of the second stage and the beginning of the third stage. In this verse, Sureswaraacharya talks of the second stage, the *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandhaa*, in the first line of the verse; and, he talks of the third stage, the *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa*, in the second line.

- विशेषणार्थत्वं - The primary meaning
- तदः - of the word '*thadH*,
- विशेष्यत्वं - is a qualification
- त्वमः - for the word '*thvam*', with its primary meaning.

In the second stage, *Paramaathmaa* becomes an adjective /attribute of *jeevaathmaa*, the noun / the qualified substance or object.

The term '*Thadha:*' is a peculiar expression. The word '*thadh*' itself is declined. '*Thadha:*' is the *shashti vibhakti* of the word '*thadh*'. The '*Thadh padha:*' refers to *Paramaathmaa*. '*Viseshanaarthavam*' serves as a '*viseshanam*'; '*viseshanam*' means 'qualifier'. '*Thvama:*' is also a peculiar grammatical usage. The word '*thvam*' is declined here. '*Thvama:*' is also *shashti vibhakti* of the word '*thvam*'. '*Thvam*' refers to *jeevaathmaa*. *Paramaathmaa* is '*viseshanam*', the 'qualifier' and *jeevaathmaa* is '*viseshyam*', the 'qualified'.

138. Chapter III, Verse 26 and 27(11-04-2009)

In this verse (Verse 26), Sureswaraachaaryaa is referring to the second and third stages of maahaa vaakya vicharaa, the second stage being viseshana-viseshya- sambhandhaa, the relationship obtaining between the vaachyaartha-s of thvam padhaa and thadh padhaa. Only when the student goes through the second stage, he / she is able to discover the contradictions in the vaachyaartha-s. And, only after seeing this contradiction he/ she is allowed to go to the lakshyaartha-s. This is obviously logical, because, the vaachyaartha-s or direct/ primary meanings are more powerful, compared to the lakshyaartha-s. Therefore, the more powerful vaachyaartha-s alone will have to be used first. Only when it is realized that the vaachyaartha-s have got contradictions, the student has to reject the vaachyaartha-s and go to the secondary meanings or lakshyaartha-s.

Sureswaraachaarya is talking about both these two stages in this verse. In the first half of the verse, he mentioned the second stage: "*thadha: viseshanaarthathvam viseshyathvam thvamasthathaa*" |

The 'subject' of a sentence is called *viseshyam*. In any sentence, the 'subject' is a known factor. The subject of a sentence is already known to the speaker as well as the listener. The predicate alone is the new information that is given by the speaker to the listener. For example, when somebody says "Rama is the king of Ayodhya", the understanding is that Rama is already known to the speaker as well as the spoken-to and that the new information is that he (Rama) is the king of Ayodhya. Subject is always a known entity and therefore, it is called '*viseshyam*' meaning 'the substance'. The predicate is defined as an information which is unknown to the listener; it is a new information that is given by the speaker. Therefore, the predicate is called '*viseshanam*', meaning 'a new information' (on the *viseshyam*).

Coming to the *mahaa vaakyaa*, when the *sruthi* or *guru* says '*thadh thvam asI, thvam*' is said to be the subject of the sentence, because it is known to the student also. Therefore, '*thvam*' is '*viseshyam*', a known entity and '*thadh*' is '*viseshanam*', a new information given by the *sruthi*. The student does not yet know "'I' am *Brahman*". Therefore, *Brahmathvam* is called predicate; it is also called *vidheeyamaanam / aakaankshitha padhaartha: / apoorva:* etc. The 'predicate' must always be the 'unknown'.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says '*thvama: viseshyathvam*' meaning 'the *thvam padhaa*, (that is 'You'), is the subject, the already known' and '*thadha: viseshanaarthathvam*' meaning '*thadh padha:* (the *thadhpadhaartha* called *Brahman*) is *viseshanam*, the predicate, a new information given'.

When we apply the *viseshana-viseshya-sambhandha* to the *vaachyaartha*-s of *thadh* and *thvam*, we experience twofold contradictions. One contradiction is in terms of 'remoteness and proximity'. *Viseshyam* (*thvam*) has got 'proximity', while *Brahman* has got 'remoteness'. This 'Proximity-remoteness- contradiction' is the first contradiction. The second contradiction is *samsaarithvam* and *asamsaarithvam*, the 'bound status' of *thvam* and the 'liberated status' of *Brahman*. This is the second contradiction. Because of this twofold contradiction, the student has to go the third stage of *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha*:

"*Thvama: viseshyathvam (bhavathi); Thadh padhasya viseshanaarthvam cha (bhavathi)*" is the first half of the verse, meaning "The term *thvam* ('thou') signifies the subject and the term *thadh* ('that') signifies the predicate". This is the second stage, in brief.

Moving to the second half of the verse, in the third stage of the *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*, termed *lakshya lakshana sambhandha*; these two primary meanings or *vaachyaartha*-s of the *Paramaathmaa* and the *jeevaathmaa*, which contradict each other mutually, must be considered together, to arrive at what is termed '*lakshanam*'. The 'coupled' *vaachyaartha* pair will be called '*lakshanam*'. What happens when they come together thus? Ans: In order to resolve the contradictions, both *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*, will drop some of their components as *mithyaa*. *Paramaathmaa* will drop some of its components as *mithyaa*; *jeevaathmaa* also will drop some of its components as *mithyaa*.

What are the components dropped? The *Paramaathmaa* will drop *maayaa* or *prapanchathrayam*, which is the *upaadhi* of *Paramaathmaa*. All the superior attributes of the *Paramaathmaa*, mentioned in the *Vibhuthi Yoga* of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, such as *sarvagnyathvam*, *sarveswarathvam* and *sarvasakthimathvam* will be dropped. The *kaaranam* status of *Paramaathmaa* will also be dropped. The thus 'undressed' *Paramaathmaa* will be called *aathmaa*.

Similarly, the *jeevaathmaa vaachyaartha* also has several attributes contradictory to those of *Paramaathmaa* and some of the components will therefore be dropped. What are these dropped components of *jeevaathmaa*? *Sareerathrayam* will be dropped; all the inferior attributes, including the *sanchitha*, *praarabhdha* and *aagami karmaas* will be dropped. It must be specially noted that *Praarabhdham* is also dropped. Finally, the *kaaryam* status i.e., the 'created' or 'creature' status also gets rubbed off the *jeevaathmaa*, by the *Paramaathmaa*.

Thus, *Paramaathmaa* rubs off some of the attributes of *jeevaathmaa*. And, what is left behind when these contradictory components of the primary meaning of the *jeevaathmaa* are knocked off? Ans: The '*jeeva*' adjective will go away and what is left behind is '*aathma*'.

The *Visishtadvaitin*, on the other hand, will answer this question, viz., "what is left behind when all the attributes are dropped?" as "nothing is left behind". This is because he believes a *nirguna padhaartha* is not possible at all. That is *his* philosophy. Therefore, he answers this question as 'nothing', whereas we, *Advaitins*, say "when the *jeeva* adjective goes, *aathmaa* is left behind".

Expressed arithmetically,

'Paramaathmaa' minus 'Parama' = nirguna aathmaa .

'Jeevathma' minus 'jeeva' = nirguna aathmaa.

And, these *nirguna aathmaa*-s are one and the same. There are not two *nirguna aathmaas*. The one and only left-behind entity is called '*ekaathmaa*'.

To repeat, the process of the third stage is: "Take the *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*; pair together their *vaachyaartha*-s; this *vaachyaartha* pair is called *lakshanam*; and this *lakshanam* is *sagunam* only, because the *Paramathmaa vaachyaartha* has got superior attributes and the *jeevaathma vaachyaartha* has got inferior attributes; but, when they are intentionally coupled or equated, both of them lose their *upaadhis*/'skins' / 'dresses' and what comes out is the *ekaathmaa* and this *ekaathmaa* is called *lakshyam*. In the third stage, when the *saguna jeevaathma* and *saguna Paramaathmaa* 'rub' each other, because of their mutual rubbing, what comes out after this 'rubbing', is not two separate *aathmaa*-s but, one *nirguna aathmaa*. This *lakshya ekaathmaa* is free from *prapanchathrayam* and free from *sareerathrayam* also. All the superior attributes and all the inferior attributes will also be dropped. Lastly, the *kaaarnam* status of the *Paramaathmaa* and the *kaaryam* status of the *jeevaathmaa* are also dismissed "

When it is said that the *ekaathmaa* is free from *prapanchathrayam* and *sareerathrayam*, it should be carefully understood that the *prapanchathrayam* and *sareerathrayam* do not 'disappear'; they are only falsified. In the third stage alone, *prapanchathrayam* and *sareerathrayam* will be falsified as *mithyaa anaathmaa*. Similarly, the 'dropping of the superior attributes and inferior attributes' also does not mean that the attributes will 'go away'; but, that, they will be understood as *mithyaa*. The dismissal of *sareerathrayaa*, dismissal of the *prapanchathrayaa*, dismissal of the superior and interior attributes, and dismissal of the *kaaranam* and *kaaryam* statuses is termed 'falsification', in *Vedhaantha*.

What is left behind after all these 'dismissals' or 'falsification' is the *kaarya-kaarana-vilakshanam-Brahman*. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his *Viveka Choodaamani*, sums up all these in a beautiful sloka : "Ekam eva sadh aneka kaaranam kaaranaanthara niraasya

kaaranam kaarya kaarana vilakshanam svayam brahma thatthvamasī bhaavayaathmani” – “Who is One, the cause of many, but, who has no cause and is separate from cause and effect, self-existent Brahman – Thou art That. Think this in thy own self” (Verse 260).

After completing the third stage of the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, what is left behind is one '*thureeya ekaathmaa*'. The *viswa-thyjasa-praagnyaa* triad is gone; the *Viraat-Hirayagarbha-Antharyaami* triad is also gone. Everything goes away. What is left behind is the *kaarya-kaarana- vilakshana nirguna ekaathmaa*.

What is the nature of this *ekaathmaa*? Ans: The nature of Pure Existence and Pure Consciousness.

What is 'Pure Existence'? Ans: (i) Existence is not a product, property or part of matter (ii) Existence is an entity, independent of matter, but, pervading the matter (iii) Existence is not limited by the boundaries of matter – not limited by 'space' (iv) Existence is not limited by 'time' also and (v) Existence, though it continues to survive even after destruction of matter, is not available for transactions, in the absence of the medium, the matter.

And, what is 'Pure Consciousness'? Ans: Similar to 'Pure Existence', 'Pure Consciousness' is also not a product, property or part of matter – the body and the mind, in fact, nor even of the heart.

This is the third stage.

The jeevaathmaa-Paramaathmaa pair is called 'lakshanam' and the 'Ekaathmaa' is called 'lakshyam'. And, there is lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha between nirguna ekaathmaa and the saguna –Paramaathmaa-jeevathmaa pair.

Reverting to the *sloka*, the second half:

- तयोः - For the saguna jeevaathma-Paramaathmaa pair,
- लक्ष्य लक्षण संबन्धः स्यात् - there will be a relationship of 'indicator- indicated' or 'revealer- revealed',
- प्रत्यगात्मना सह) - with the nirguna ekaathmaa.

Here 'prathyagaathmaa' means the 'nirguna ekaathmaa'. What is the adjective to this ekaathmaa? Param or jeeva? Ans: Neither.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 27:

कथं पुनरविवक्षितविरुद्धनिरस्यमानस्य लक्षणार्थत्वम् ।

How can what is not intended, is conflicting and is rejected, serve the purpose of indicating another meaning?

Here a *poorva pakshin* is raising a question. Sureswaraachaarya assumes that somebody has already partially understood the message and that, based on that partial understanding, a new doubt has arisen in him. The doubt, as addressed by that *poorva pakshin* to the *Vedhaanthic guru* is: "You are talking about *lakshya-lakshana sambhandhaa*, between the *vaachyaartha*-s and the *lakshyaartha*, the *vaachyaartha*-s being the *saguna* pair of *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* and the *lakshyaartha* being *nirguna-eka-aathmaa*. And, you are very happy to talk about this *sambhandhaa*, since you are using this *sambhandhaa*, to 'land' into the *Ekaathmaa*. But, the very expression *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa* means that you are accepting duality, since you talk of a *lakshyam* and then of a *lakshanam*, and, also about a relationship between the two. You cannot deny that a relationship can be talked about only between two separate entities. Therefore, once you accept a distinct *lakshyam*, a distinct *lakshanam* and a relationship also between the two, how can you say ***Ekaathmaa***? *Ekathvam* itself is impossible, since you are talking about *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa*. In other words, *sambhandhaa* and *advaitam* can never go together. If you talk of *advaitam*, you should not talk about *sambhandhaa*, since *sambhandhaa* means relationship and relationship requires the existence of a minimum of two separate entities. If, in order to save *advaitam*, you drop *sambhandhaa*, you will not be able to understand *mahaavaakyam*, since, even according to you, *sambhandhaa*-s are necessarily required for successful understanding of the *maha vaakyam*. Therefore, without this *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandhaa*, in the third stage, *maahavaakya vichaara* would become impossible. And, if, therefore, again, you accept *sambhandhaa* for the sake of *maha vaakya vichaara*, *advaitam* becomes impossible. How do you solve this dilemma?"

How does the *Advaita* philosopher solve this problem? Ans: The *Advaitin* does not see a problem in this at all. He answers: "Even though we talk about a *sambhandhaa* between two entities, one of them happens to be *mithyaa* and the other is *Sathyam*. The *vaachyaartha* pair, the *saguna jeevathma-Paramaathmaa* pair, is *mithyaa* and the *lakshyaartha*, the *nirguna eka aathmaa* is *Sathyam*. Since we claim that there is ultimately only one *sathya vasthu*, this relationship between a *mithyaa* entity and the *sathya vasthu* will not rebel against *Advaitam*".

In response, the *poorva pakshin* comes up with another objection. He asks "How can there be a relationship between *sathyam* and *mithyaa*, since, relationship is possible only between two entities belonging to the same order of reality?"

This subject had been discussed many times earlier, in different contexts. An example supporting the *poorva pakshin's* view had also been given, as follows: "A parent is looking for a suitable match for his marriageable daughter. He repeatedly fails in his attempts, since whenever he comes across a suitable groom, he meets with some other problem, such as incompatibility in horoscopes etc. Years roll on. The anxious parent, in his dream, on a particular day, comes across an ideal match for his daughter, satisfying all conditions. The question is: Can that dream boy get married to the daughter in *jaagrath avasthaa*? Obviously not, because they belong to two different orders of reality".

Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* asks: "If the *saguna-Paramaathma-jeevaathma* pair, the *vaachyaarthaa-s*, is *mithyaa* and the *lakshya ekaathmaa* is *sathyam*, how can there be *lakshya lakshana sambhandhaa* between them, when they have different orders of reality?"

Sureswaraachaarya gives the answer in the following *sloka* (verse 27). The *sambhandha gadhyam* to the verse, is the *poorva pakshin's* question:

- अविवक्षित विरुद्ध निरस्यमानस्य - For the 'unintended', contradictory and 'to-be- rejected' *vaachyaarthaa* pair of *saguna jeevaathma* and *saguna Paramaathmaa*,

'*Avivakshitham*' means 'not intended' ('by the *Upanishad* is to be understood). Then what is intended by the *Upanishad*? *Lakshyaarthaa* alone is intended. *Vaachyaarthaa* comes under 'unintended component'. Going back to the banana example, though the shopkeeper does not intend to sell the 'peel' portion, and the buyer does not really intend to buy it, since the peel will not remove his hunger, the shopkeeper hands over the banana, with both the fruit and the peel portions. The fruit portion is the '*vivakshitha amsad*', while the peel portion is the '*avivakshitha amsad*'. Similarly, the *vaachyaarthaa* in the *mahaa vaakyam* is '*avivakshitam*'. This is actually the stand of the *Advaithin*. The *poorva pakshin* is quoting the *Advaithin* alone, when he uses this adjective.

The second adjective is '*viruddham*'. The two constituents of the *vaachyaarthaa* pair, the *saguna Paramaathmaa* and the *saguna jeevaathmaa* are mutually contradictory.

The third adjective is '*nirasyamaanam*' meaning 'to be rejected / falsified'. The *vaachyaarthaa* pair is *mithyaa*, to be falsified, which again is the view of the *Advaithin* and which alone is quoted by the *poorva pakshin*.

Thus, *vaachyaarthaa-s* have got three features (i) they are in unintended (ii) they are mutually contradictory and (iii) they are *mithyaa*. "How can this *mithyaa vaachyaarthaa-s* and *sathya lakshyaartham* have *lakshana-lakshya- sambhandhaa*?" is the doubt of the *poorva pakshin*.

- कथं पुनः लक्षणार्थत्वम् - how can there be the role of being an indicator (of the *sathya lakshana vasthu* - the *Ekaathmaa*) ?

In brief, the *poorva pakshin's* objection to the *Advaitin* is: "How can the **mithyaa** *vaachyaartha* serve as a *lakshanam* to reveal the *lakshya nirguna sathya aathmaa*, through a *lakshya lakshana sambhandhaa*, because *sambhandhaa* is never possible between *mithyaa* and *sathyam*?"

If the *poorva pakshin's* objection is conceded, the *Advaitin* should either accept that both, viz., (i) the *saguna Paramaathma-jeevaathmaa* pair and (ii) the *Ekaathmaa* are *sathyam*; or accept that both are *mithyaa*. If he says both are *sathyam*, he will end up as a *dvaitin*. If, on the other hand, he says both are *mithyaa*, he will end up as a *soonya vaadhi mahaa yaana Buddhist* – a nihilist. *Sureswaraachaaryaa* has, therefore, to wriggle out of both *dvaitam* and *soonya vaadhaa*.

As an *Advaitin*, he asserts: "Both of them are not *mithyaa* ; and, both of them are not *sathyam* also. One is *sathyam* and the other is *mithyaa*. And, they do have *lakshya-lakshana- sambhandhaa*. They do have a *revealer-revealed relationship*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa also gives an explanation. He says: "Even though normally *mithyaa* and *sathyam* cannot have any relationship, in a mysterious manner, *mithyaa* **can** reveal *sathyam*. And, when it reveals *sathyam*, they have a mysterious relationship, which is one form of *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha*:" |

To indicate this mysterious relationship, the *Advaitin* has coined two new words and those two words are '*upalakshanam*' and '*upalakshyam*'. The relationship is termed *upalakshana-upalakshya-sambhandha*: | This mysterious relationship is talked about, by *Sureswaraachaaryaa*, in the 27th verse.

Chapter III: Verse 27 –

लक्षणं सर्पवद्रज्जाः प्रतीचः स्यादहं तथा ।

तद्वाधेनैव वाक्यार्थं वेत्ति सोऽपि तदाश्रयात् ॥ २७ ॥

Even as the snake indicates the rope, the ego is the indicator of the inner Self. The import of the sentence is grasped by a sublation of the ego and the Self is capable of being so indicated because it is the substratum of the ego.

So what is the topic here? Given briefly: "*Mithyaa* and *sathyam* can never have any real relationship. But, even though they do not have any real relationship, they have got a mysterious relationship of *mithyaa* revealing the *sathyam*. And, *mithyaa* can reveal the *sathyam* because of a peculiar situation. What is that peculiar situation?

"Wherever *mithyaa* is there, *sathyam* is very much there, 'lending' existence to *mithyaa*, as an *aasryaaa*. Expressed in a different manner: Since *sathyam* exists as the lender of existence to any *mithyaa padhaartha*, wherever *mithyaa* is there, there itself, *sathyam* is also there. Therefore, by showing the *mithyaa*, I can reveal the *sathyam*, which is the lender of existence behind the *mithyaa padhaartha*".

And, Sureswaraachaarya gives the well known example of 'revealing the rope with the help of the false snake'. A *guru* can make use of the 'false snake', even though false snake cannot do any other function; it cannot produce poison; it cannot be used by the snake-charmer for earning money; even though the false snake is thus useless for anything, the *guru* can still use the false snake to reveal the rope.

Where is the rope? Ans: In the very same place where the snake is. And, the snake reveals the rope.

And, how does the *guru* do that? (Incidentally, all these are issues of epistemology; the study is called 'epistemology' / the 'process of knowing', which is being analyzed. Also, the argument is being presented as a dialogue between a *guru* and a *sishyaa* for the purpose of clarity). The *guru* reveals the rope by using the snake in an ingenious manner. What is that ingenious method? In the vision of the *guru*, there is no snake. It is the *sishyaa* who sees the snake there and is agitated. Since in the vision of the *guru*, the snake does not exist, the *guru* should not, in fact, use the word 'snake' at all. If at all there is a snake, it is only a 'false' snake, which is as good as non-existent for the *guru*. But, what the *guru* does, is, that he introduces the word 'snake'. This method is called *anuvada*:| He is quoting the 'snake', not from his view point, but, from the view point of the *sishyaa*. Since a snake exists in the view of the *sishyaa*, the *guru* compromises and deliberately uses the word 'snake', even though the snake does not exist. Not only does the *guru* use the word snake, he does not even use the adjective 'false'. This is because the snake is false only for the *guru*, while for the *sishyaa*, until the teaching is complete, not only the snake is there, the snake is real also. Therefore, the *guru* compromises and merely says "that snake". Even as he says this, the *guru* knows that he is not mentioning facts, since there is no snake at all. Deliberately, the *guru* is using the word 'snake', of which (false) snake the *sishyaa* is tremendously afraid.

The *guru's* statement is: "That snake is rope". The moment that sentence is used, because of using the word 'that snake', the *sishyaa* scrutinizes that place, where he is seeing the

snake. And, because of the scrutiny of 'that snake', what does he understand? Ans: With the help of the statement of the teacher, he understands the rope. What type of rope? Ans: The real rope. In effect, to make the *sishtyaa* understand the 'real rope', what did the guru utilize? Ans: He used the false snake. If he did not use the false snake to show the real rope, the *sishtyaa* would have continued to be frightened of the snake. He would never 'discover' the rope.

By using the 'false' snake, the 'real' rope has been revealed. Therefore, in this instance, what is the relationship between the 'false' snake and the 'real' rope? Ans: There **is** a mysterious *lakshya lakshana sambhaandhaa*, which is called *upalakshanam*.

The *guru* can extend this principle to *Vedhaantha* also, by saying "This world that you see, is nothing but *Brahmar*". When the *guru* gives this teaching, the 'false' world, which is nonexistent in the vision of the *guru*, is used by him, to reveal the 'real' *Brahman*.

What is that real Brahman? Ans: The Pure Existence. And, where is that Pure Existence? Ans: Not somewhere else. Just as the rope is where the snake is, similarly the 'Pure Existence *Brahmar*' is in this world itself.

The 'real' Pure Existence is there and the *sishtyaa* has to grasp that 'real' Pure Existence ; and in the discovery of Pure Existence, what should happen to the world? Ans: The world should get falsified as *mithyaa*.

And, when this revelation takes place, the *vaachyaartha* has become *lakshanam* and the *lakshyaartha* becomes the *lakshyam*. If the 'false' snake can reveal the 'real' rope, the *mithyaa saguna Paramaathmaa-jeevaathmaa* pair **can** reveal the *sathya nirguna Ekaathmaa*. It **is** possible. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* points out.

Referring to the verse:

- सर्पवत् - Like the false snake,
- लक्षणं - which serves as the 'revealer'
- रज्ज्वाः - of the real rope,

The revelation of the 'real rope' by the 'false snake'. is through a mysterious relationship. When both the *lakshanam* and the *lakshyam* are equally real, the 'revealer-revealed relationship' is termed '*lakshana-lakshya-sambhandha*.'| When one of them is real and the other is unreal, the 'revealer-revealed relationship' is called '*upalakshana-upalakshya*-

sambhandha:' | In the context of the *rajju-sarpaa*, the relationship, therefore, is *upalakshana-upalakshya-sambhandha:* |

- तथा - in the same way,
- अहं - the *vaachyaartha jeevaathmaa Paramaathmaa pair*' (which is false),

Though the literal meaning of the word '*aham*' is the *vaachyaartha jaavaathmaa*, in this context, in the meaning of the word, the *vaachyaartha Paramaathmaa* also should be included. The final meaning of the word '*aham*', should, therefore, be understood as the '*vaachyaartha jeevaathmaa Paramaathmaa pair*'.

- (लक्षणं)स्यात् - can become the 'revealer'
- प्रतीच :- of the *nirguna ekaathmaa*, (which is the *lakshyam*- the 'revealed')

'Pratheecha:' means 'of the *thureeyam* / the *nirguna ekaathmaa*, (which is *sathyam*)'. The word 'Pratheecha:' is 'shashti vibhakthi' of the noun 'prathyang'.

In the second half of the verse, the *Aachaaryaa* talks of the phenomenon, that takes place for the listener. Coming back to the rope-snake example, when the guru says "this snake is rope", two important phenomena take place. Both of them are extremely important for *advaitam*.

What is the first phenomenon? 'Mysteriously', the 'false' snake is able to reveal the 'real' rope, because *guru* has used the false snake alone to point out the rope. The 'false' snake has been utilized to reveal the 'real' rope; or, in other words, the 'false' snake has lead to the 'real' rope. This fact, viz., 'false leading to the real' is a fantastic phenomenon. The famous *Upanishadic* prayer runs: "*asatho maam sathgamaya; thamaso maam jyothigamaya; mrithyor maam amritham gamaya*". Mysteriously the 'finite' leads to the 'infinite', which does not seem logically possible. How can the finite lead to infinite? But, mysteriously, it **has** happened. This is fantastic phenomenon no. 1, viz. 'false snake leading to real rope'.

What is the second equally or more important phenomenon? "That snake is rope" is the statement of the *guru*. The first part of the sentence is 'that snake is'. Even till the time the *sishyaa* listens to this part, he takes the snake as real and existent, i.e., the "isness" is attributed by him to the snake. The portion 'that snake is', is the statement of the 'subject'. 'Rope' is the 'predicate'. Before listening to the 'predicate', viz., the 'rope', when the student is listening to the part of the sentence 'that snake is', the 'isness' / existence / reality had been given by him to the snake, because, even up to this point of time, i.e. even till the time

'that snake is', is being said by the *guru*, the *sishtyaa* remains in fright of the 'snake'. But, the moment the *guru* completes the sentence by stating the predicate 'rope', the *sishtyaa* transfers the "isness" from the snake to the rope. The moment the predicate is stated, the predicate 'absorbs' / 'swallows' the "isness". It must be noted that, there is only one 'is' in the sentence. Once, thus, the rope absorbs the "isness" i.e., once the "isness" goes to the rope from the snake, another fantastic phenomenon takes place. What happens? The frightening / terrible snake loses its "isness". What does that mean? The snake gets falsified. The falsification of the snake takes place, after the job of revelation - not before, but after the revelation job. The snake 'goes away', just as a lighted *agarbatthi* burns, gives fragrance and in the process, destroys itself.

To recap: "The snake reveals" is phenomenon no. 1. What is the second phenomenon? Ans: "After the revelation, the snake loses its 'isness'; it gets falsified".

Similarly, when the teacher says "*saguna-jeevaathma-paramaathma* pair is *nirguna ekaathmaa*", the first phenomenon is "*saguna-jeevaathma-paramaathma* pair revealing the *nirguna ekaathmaa*"; and, the second phenomenon is: "The 'isness' goes to the *nirguna ekaathmaa* and both the *saguna jeevaathmaa* and *saguna paramaathmaa* (*saguna paramaathmaa* means the *Isvara* with all His attributes) get 'falsified. *Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa* in his *Advaita Makarandaa* says: "*upasaantha jagath jeeva sishya aachaaryaa Isvara bhrama thadaaseetha giraa lakshyam aham ekarasam maha:*". *Sankara Bhavadh Paadhaa* calls them all, including *Isvara*, as '*bhramaad*' or misapprehension / delusion. *Saguna jeeva* is false; *saguna Isvara* is also false; *nirguna ekaathmaa* **alone is**.

This phenomenon (the second level phenomenon) of falsification of *vaachyaarthaa* is called *baadha*: | That is said in the second half of the verse.

139. Chapter III, Verse 27 to 29 (18-04-2009)

In this 27th verse, Sureswaraacharya is dealing with the third stage of understanding the *mahaa vaakyam*, through *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha*: | Here, the word *lakshanaa* refers to the *vaachyaartha*-s of *thvam padhaa* and *thadh padhaa* in the form of *saguna-jeevaathma-Parmaathma* pair and the word *lakshyam* refers to the *lakshyaartha* of *thvam padhaa* and *thadh padhaa*, which is in the form of *nirguna ekaathma*. Between the *saguna-jeevaathma -Parmaathma* pair and the *nirguna ekaathma*, the relationship is *lakshana-lakshya-sambhandha*; or, to express this in a different manner, *saguna-jeevaathma-Parmaatmaa* pair reveals the *nirguna ekaathma*. And, therefore the relationship between them is 'revealer-revealed relationship'.

In this verse, Sureswaraacharya is answering a possible question. The *saguna-jeevaathma – Parmaathma* pair is said to be 'revealer' and *nirguna Ekaathma* is said to be the 'revealed'. In *Advaita*, *saguna jeevaathma* is *mithyaa*; *saguna Paramathma* is also *mithyaa*. And, *nirguna ekaathma* is considered to be *sathyam*. The question is "how can the *mithyaa* reveal *sathyam*, having a 'revealer-revealed' relationship, because of the law / fact that any relationship is possible only between two things having the same order of reality?". In other words, "How can *mithyaa* and *sathyam* have *lakshya-lakshana-sambhandha*?" is the question.

Sureswaraacharya gave the answer to this question, which answer was discussed in the earlier session also. He asserted: "It *does* happen sometimes – '*mithyaa* revealing *sathyam*'". The example which Sureswaraacharya quoted was: "revealing the (real) rope, with the help of the (false) snake". When a person has mistakenly seen a snake in a rope, the very same snake is used by another person to reveal the real rope as the *adhishtaanam* for the false snake. In this example, the *mithyaa* snake is capable of revealing the *sathyam* rope, through the statement "That snake is nothing but rope". In this statement "that snake is a rope", the false snake itself is utilized to reveal the real rope. The interesting fact is, the moment the rope is revealed, the 'isness', which is in between the snake and the rope, like the proverbial cat on the wall, changes its position. Before the teaching, the 'isness' was associated with the snake; after the teaching, the 'isness', which the snake carried, is 'donated' to the rope, by the snake. The snake donates the 'isness' to the rope and after donating the 'isness' to the rope, the snake gets falsified. But, even though, the snake is to be falsified later, before falsification, the very snake was useful. In what way? Ans: It was carrying 'isness' or 'existence' for donating. This can be likened to a disposable coffee cup, which cup carries the coffee until the coffee is drunk. Thereafter, the cup becomes useless and is therefore disposable. The false snake serves as a disposable cup 'carrying' the existence and donates the existence to the rope. Thus, the false snake **can** reveal real the rope. And, how?

- तद्वाधेन एव - through its falsification.

Through the falsification of the snake, the rope is revealed. If that is possible, in a similar manner, *saguna-jeevathmaa* and *saguna-Paramaathmaa* **can** reveal *nirguna ekaathmaa*. *Saguna Jeevaathmaa* and *saguna Parmaathmaa* are both *mithyaa*, for which fact, the *Advaitha Aaachaarya* has *saasthric* support.

Even though *mithyaa*, *Saguna Jeevathmaa* and *saguna Parmaathmaa* 'carry' 'existence' temporarily and the temporarily-borrowed 'existence', is handed over to the *nirguna ekaathmaa* at the time of *mahaa vakyaa*. *Nirguna ekaathmaa* receives the 'existence' and the student comes to know that *nirguna ekaathmaa* **alone** is. Once the 'isness' is transferred, *jeevaathmaa* is falsified; *Paramaathmaa* is also falsified. But, until then, both of them were useful. Therefore, *mithyaa* **can** reveal *sathyam*, by transferring the 'existence'. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- सर्पवत् - Like the false snake,
- लक्षणं - which serves as the 'revealer'
- रज्ज्वाः - of the real rope,
- तद्वाधेन एव - through its own falsification;
- वाक्यार्थं वेत्ति - (and) the listener understands the statement ,

What is the statement, in the example given? 'the snake is the rope' is the statement, which the listener understands.

- तथा - in the same way,
- अहं - the saguna vaachyaartha jeevaathmaa Paramaathma pair (which is false),
- (लक्षणं)स्यात् - can become the 'revealer'
- प्रतीचः - of the nirguna ekaathmaa, (which is the lakshyam- the 'revealed').

'*Lakshanam*' means 'revealer'. '*Aham*' means the false '*jeevaathmaa*' and by implication, includes the false *Paramaathmaa* also. The adjective '*saguna*' should also be added to both the *jeevaathmaa* and the *Paramaathmaa*.

Just as the false snake becomes the revealer of the real rope, the *mithyaa-saguna-jeevaathma-Paramaathma* pair also serves as the revealer of the real *nirguna ekaathmaa*.

And, in the process, i.e. even as the *nirguna ekaathmaa* gets revealed, which really means that, the existence is transferred to *ekaathmaa* from the *jeevaathma-Paramaathma* pair, both *saguna jeevaathmaa* and *saguna Paramaathmaa* get naturally falsified. 'Baadhitam' means 'getting falsified'. The term 'falsify' should be understood carefully. 'Falsify' does not mean that the perception or experience of *jeevaathmaa* or *Paramaathmaa* is lost. The perception will continue. The *jeevaathmaa* will continue to be seen; the *Viswaroopa Saguna Paramaathmaa / Isvara* will also continue to be seen, with all His glories / *vibhuthies*. For perception, all of them will be there; but, the seeker will not attribute reality to them.

Now we go to the 4th quarter of the verse, which is a separate sentence.

- सःअपि - (In the same way) the *mahaavaakyam* listener also,

'Sa:', in this context, means *mahaavaakyasrothaa* / the listener of the *mahaavaakyam*. 'api', of course, means 'also'.

The sentence is incomplete. We have to use '*vaakyartham vetthi*' and '*thadhbaadhena*' again.

- वाक्यार्थं वेत्ति - understands the final meaning of *mahaavaakyam*,

'Vaakyartham', in this context, should be understood as 'mahaavaakyartham'. What is 'mahaavaakyartham'? Ans: 'Nirguna ekaathmaa aham' is the *mahaavaakyartham*.

- तद्बाधेन एव - merely by the falsification of the *vaachyaarthaa*,

'Vaachyaarthaa' includes both 'thvam padha vaachyaartham', and 'thadh padha vaachyaartham'. 'Thvam padha vaachyaartham' is the *saguna jeevaathmaa* and 'thadh padha vaachyaartham' is 'saguna Paramaathmaa'. Both of them are falsified. 'Alpagnya:' is *mithyaa* ; 'Sarvagnya: is also *mithyaa* ; 'alpa sakthimaan' is *mithyaa* ; 'Sarva sakthimaan' is also *mithyaa*. All attributes, inferior or superior, all of them are *mithyaa*.

The verse declares: '*Thadh (vaachyaartha) baadhena eva vetthi*'. But, how is this possible? This is answered in the verse itself:

- तदाश्रयात् - because the nirguna ekaathmaa is the aasrayam / adhishtaanam of both the sagunas.

'Thadh', in this term, includes both saguna jeevaathmaa and saguna Paramaathmaa. For both of them, nirguna ekaathmaa is aasrayam.

And, in *Vedhaanthaa*, when you say *aasrayam*, the meaning must be very, very clear. '*Aasrayam*' means '*adhishtaanam*'. *Nirgunam* is *adhishtaanam* for *sagunam*. But, when this is said, i.e. when it is said that '*Nirgunam* is *adhishtaanam* for *sagunam*', it does not mean that two things are there in the manner "*nirgunam* is there and, *sagunam* is sitting upon that *nirgunam*". On the other hand, it means: "*Nirgunam* **alone** is there ; *sagunam* does not at all exist as a second thing. *Sagunam* is a false thing, which only **borrow**s existence from the *nirgunam*." In other words, '*aasrayam*' only means "they, viz., the *nirguna ekaathmaa* and the *saguna-jeevaathma-Paramaathmaa* pair, have got *sathya mithyaa sambhandhaa*'. Therefore, the 'false' can reveal the 'real'.

Quite often, the *Advaita Aaacharyaas* give another example (part from the rope-snake example) also, to convey this idea, viz., 'the false can reveal the real'. It is also a quite well known, popular support for this view. When one wants to apply a *thilakam* on one's forehead, one would naturally want to look at one's face. Unfortunately, there is no possibility of seeing one's own real / original forehead. One has no way of looking at one's forehead directly. What is done? A mirror is used; the mirror produces a reflected forehead, which is used to know the real forehead; looking at the unreal forehead, the *thilakam* is applied to the real forehead. For the purpose of revealing the real forehead, the unreal reflection is used as a means. The unreal reflection is used to know the real face. If, thus, *mithyaa prathibhimbham* can reveal the *sathya bhimbham*, the *mithyaa sagunaa* can reveal *sathya nirguna*. There is no problem at all.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 28:

इयं चावाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तिरन्वयव्यतिरेखाभिन्नस्येव । यस्मात् ।

This grasp of the meaning of the sentence which goes beyond its obvious verbal sense, is possible only for him who has known the discrimination between the Self and non-Self. For:

- इयं अवाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तिः च - This dvaita visishtadvaita bhinna nirguna advaita artha: / (or simply) nirguna advaita arthaa:

The term '*avaakyartha prathipatthi*:' calls for a detailed explanation. '*Prathipatthi*:' means *jnaanam* / *vidhyaa* / understanding / *avabodha*: / *avagathi*: |

'*Chaavakyarthaprathipatthi:*' should be split as '*cha + vaakyarthaprathipatthi:*' | '*Vaakyam*' means sentence. What we understand from a sentence, is called '*vaakyartham*'. But, Sureswaraacharya says that, when it comes to understanding the *maha vaakyam*, an unique phenomenon happens. Once you understand the *mahaavaakyartham*, it becomes *avaakyartham*, meaning, "from the sentence you get / gather the non-sentential meaning".

'*Avaakyarthaprathipatthi:*' is an unique expression coined by Sureswaraacharya. Why does he coin this expression? To answer this, the student should know the background. Then only it will be clear.

Any sentence has got a plurality of words ; a single word, by itself, cannot become a sentence. A sentence consisting of plurality of words can obviously reveal only plurality of meanings. Therefore, normally, all the sentences can reveal either *dvaitham* or *visishtaadvaitam* only,

(In a lighter vein, Swamiji says there *is* a word, which can become a sentence and that word is 'marriage'. Of course, 'sentence', in this context, means 'punishment')

To revert: Normally a sentence has plurality of words; therefore, it should reveal plurality of meanings. And, the plurality can be related only in two ways: (1) The sentence can reveal many objects or (2) it can reveal one object with many attributes. If a sentence is revealing many objects, then the meaning is called *dvaitha vaakyartha:* | If it reveals one object with many attributes, as in the popular *sloka*, "*prapannapaarijaathaaya thothra vethraika paanaye jnaana mudhraaya Krishnaaya Geethamruthaduhe nama:*", which is a sentence revealing one Krishna with many attributes, the meaning is *visishtaadvaita vaakyartha:* |

Based on this principle only, *dvaithins* and *visishtaadvaitins* argue that *Vedavaakyas* also can reveal only *dvaitham* or *visishtaadvaitam* and therefore, revelation of *nirguna ekaartha* by a *Vedavaakyam* is not at all possible. *Advaitins* vehemently refute this view point. They hold, that, while it is granted, that, in the first two stages, *mahaavaakyam* talks of *saguna vasthu-s*, in the third stage, *maha vaakyam* **does reveal** only one entity without a second object and without any attribute also – the *nirguna ekaathmaa*.

And, to convey this unique idea, Sureswaraacharya uses the expression '*avaakyartham*'. '*Avaakyartham*' means '*dvaitha visishtaadvaita bhinna nirguna advaita artha:*' | In English, it can be translated as "an attributeless non-dual entity, which is different from duality as well as attributed non-duality". Such a meaning is called '*avaakyartham*', by the *Aacharya*.

The term '*dvaita visishtaadvaita bhinna nirguna advaita artha:*' can be called, in brief, as '*nirguna advaita jnanam*'. It is also important to note that, the statement '*nirguna advaitam asthi*', should never be made, because, it would mean "it is existing somewhere as an object" ; the verb '*asthi*' should not be used. The first person verb '*asm*' alone can be used and the statement should be "*nirguna advaitam aham asm*".

But, this profound knowledge is achieved only by certain students, who fulfill an essential condition. What is that condition, which should be fulfilled by the student, for the rise of this knowledge? Sureswaraacharya answers:

- अन्वयव्यतिरेखा अभिज्ञस्य एव - only for a student who has gone through *anvaya vyathirekha* enquiry.

'*Anvaya vyathirekha abhignya:*' means 'one who is thoroughly conversant with the *anvaya vyathirekha* enquiry and its result' / 'a person who has removed identification with the body mind complex, by *anvaya vyathirekha* enquiry'.

Such a seeker has removed identification - both *ahamkaara* and *mamakaara* - with the five *anaathmaas* – which *anaathmaas* are (i) possessions (ii) profession (iii) family (iv) body and (v) mind. With regard to these *pancha anaathmaas*, *ahamkaara* and *mamakaara* must have been given up, through 'CLASP REJECTION' method. These *pancha anaathmaas* must be 'washed off' the seeker's hands and should be handed over to *Viswaroopa Isvara*. In the word 'I', none of these five should be included. When the statement '*Aham Brahma smi*' is made, in the word '*aham*' none of these five items should be allowed to find a place.

An example from mundane experiences can be given. It is common practice (or it was) to prepare **बलप्लव-स** in households, during the summer season, and lay them out for drying in the sun on the terraces. To protect the drying **बलप्लव-स** from crows and other birds, a youngster from the household will be asked to stand sentry; the youngster would chase away the crows with a stick in hand. In a similar manner, the seeker studying the *mahaa vaakya*, when uttering '*aham brahma sm*' will be inevitably disturbed by thoughts of the family, profession or possession - all of them waiting, as it were, to hold the seeker by the neck. The seeker should therefore be on guard, chasing them away with the stick of '*anvaya vyathirekha* argument', to the *Viswaroopa Isvara*, thus saving the '*moksha बलप्लव-स*', which he / she can enjoy as a result. The *anaathmaa* crows should be chased away, using the *anvaya vyathirekha* stick to attain the '*moksha बलप्लव-स*'.

By the term '*anvaya vyathirekhaabignyasya eva*', the *Aachaaryaa* means '*Pancha anaathma niraakarthu: eva*' / '*Anvaya*' means the 'persistent / immortal *aathmaa*' and '*vyathirekha*' means the 'incidental *anaathmaa*', which *anaathmaa* must be dismissed.

- यस्मात् - The reason is as follows (in the verse):

Chapter III: Verse 28 –

यावध्यावन्निरस्यायं देहादीन्प्रत्यगञ्चति ।

तावतावत्तदर्थोऽपि त्वमर्थं प्रविविक्षति ॥ २८ ॥

As one approaches the inmost Self progressively rejecting the non-Self, aspect by aspect, from the body onwards, exactly concomitant with the process is the tendency of the meaning of 'That' to merge in the meaning of 'Thou'.

This is a very important and beautiful *sloka*, which clearly gives the reason why the conviction '*aham brahma asmi*' is strong or weak in an individual. What is the reason for the conviction '*aham brahma asmi*' being strong in one individual and what is the reason for the same conviction being weak in another? Reasons for both are given in this *sloka*.

The student can visualize this in the form of an imagery : "Imagine I am a *jeevaathmaa* standing at a particular spot; on my left hand side, the *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind, is standing, wooing me strongly, as a candidate contesting a Public election would woo his voters. The *pancha anaathmaa*-s 'pull' me very strongly towards them – to my left. On my right hand side, *Paramaathmaa* is standing. I am the *jeevathma* in the centre – on one side is the *anaathmaa* and on the other side, is *Paramaathmaa*'.

Now, what Sureswaraachaaryaa says is "the more you go closer to *anaathmaa*, obviously you will get farther away from *Paramaathmaa* and the more you get away from *anaathmaa*, the closer you get to *Paramaathmaa*. Thus, what you want, whether *anaathmaa* or *Paramaathmaa*, is your choice. You have to choose between the two." Therefore, he says:

- यावत् यावत् निरस्य अयं देहादीन् - The more one negates the *anaathmaa* such as one's physical body etc.,

'*Nirasya*' means 'to negate'; but, here the 'negation' is not physically throwing away or physically abandoning. '*Niraasa:*', literally, means 'ejection / expulsion / throwing out / removal' etc. But, on the pretext of '*niraasa:*', the seeker need/ should not abandon his / her

family. They (the seeker and his / her family) may continue to live, as and where they are living. '*Niraasa:*', in this context, is only mental – it means '*abhimaana thyaga:*'; this '*abhimaana thyaga:*' is a compulsory process, in understanding the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

But, how does one know whether one is overwhelmed by *abhimaanam* or not? This subject, viz., '*aanthara sanyaasa:*' or 'inner renunciation' was discussed during a *Guru Poornima* talk. Two methods were given for identification of *abhimaanaa*. The first acid test is 'anxiety'. The more the *abhimaanam* the more is the anxiety. The second test is 'special prayers' or '*sakaama bakthi:*'. This is the second strong indication of *abhimaanaa*. The more the *abhimaanaa*, the more the special *poojas*. '*Abhimaana thyaga:*' means *thyaga:* of worry and special prayers, (which the Swamiji calls 'CLASP Rejection').

And, what is the significance of the term '*yaavath yaavath:*', meaning 'more and more'? Ans: All the five *anaathmaas* cannot be rejected in one stroke. *Abhimaanaa* for the external *anaathmaas*, such as possessions and profession is relatively weaker, whereas the *abhimaanaa* for family, body and mind is more strong. Therefore, the seeker should first start with rejection of *abhimaanaa* for the external 'possessions' and *abhimaanaa* for the external 'career'. The tougher proposition is dropping of *abhimaanaa* towards family members. This attachment is so strong that the seeker may have to resort to special meditation on the son, the daughter etc., and deliberately hand over each one to *Viswaroopa Isvara*. Family *abhimaana thyaghaa* is tougher than *thyaghaa* of *abhimaanaa* for profession and possessions.

Still stronger is the *abhimaanaa* in one's body, especially, when the body is ill. Later, even if the seeker manages to give up body *abhimaanaa*, he / she has the problem of tackling *abhimaana* with regard to the mind. The very *videha mukthi* prayer is from the standpoint of the mind only.

Greater the prayer for *videha mukthi*, greater is the *abhimaanaa* on the mind. That's why it is said that prayers for even *videha mukthi* should be dropped; mind *abhimaanaa* also should be dropped. Let the mind, along with the body, come again or not come again; why should it disturb an informed seeker?

Since, thus, dropping of *abhimaanaa* is understandably a gradual process, Sureswaraacharya uses the expression '*yaavath yaavath:*' to convey this idea; the usage can be compared to the usage in verse 25, Chapter VI, of the *Bhagavadh Geetha*, where Lord Krishna uses the term '*sanai: sanai:*', giving the same meaning 'gradually'. (The relevant portion of the verse runs "***sanai: sanai: upamedh:***" – "One should withdraw the mind **gradually** (from all desires) ").

The *abhimaanaa* for the *pancha anaathmaa* should be gradually given up. '*Dehaadheerl*' means '*anaathmaa* such as the body etc.'. '*Dehaadheerl*' is the object of '*nirasya*'. As even as the seeker gives up the *pancha abhimaanaa* and withdraws himself / herself from them, what is the result?

- प्रत्यक् अञ्चति - the more he / she goes towards *prathyak aathmaa* , the inner Self.

'*Prathyak*' refers to the '*saakshi chiatanyam*', which is the *saakshi* to the *pancha anaathmaa*. (Incidentally, this term '*pancha anaathmaa*' is not a traditionally used term; '*panchakosam*' is a term traditionally used, in *Vedhaanthic* scriptures. '*Pancha anaathmaa*' is a term coined by Swamiji, to refer in short and as a group, to the five factors which commonly disturb and worry people – possessions, profession, family, body and mind.)

'*anchathl*' mean '*gacchathl*'. '*Prathyak anchathl*' means 'travels inwards towards *saakshi chaithanyam*'. The seeker, through *avasthaathraya viveka*, *sareerathraya vivekaa*, *pancha kosa vivekaa* etc., 'travels inwards'. Then what happens?

- तावत् तावत् - In a gradual manner,

Gradually, the *mahaavaakyam* seems to become more and more a fact. When the student first listens to the *Advaita Aachaarya* saying "You are free", the statement appears to him/ her , to be a joke or a consoling statement - as if the *guru* is only trying to console the listener by saying that the listener is 'free' / is '*aanandasvaroopa*.' etc.

But, what initially appeared as a jocular or consoling statement to the student, viz., the *maha vaakyam*, is realized to be more and more meaningful, as even as the student gradually but surely reduces *pancha anaathma abhimaanaa*. It is not a sudden realization. The 'realization' cannot be a sudden, mysterious event. What appears as a joke, later becomes 'possible'; from 'possible' to 'probable'; and, finally, from 'probable' to an absolute fact.

The more and more one gives up *abhimaanaa*, more and more will one have questions such as: "What am I waiting for? Why am I postponing my liberation? Is my liberation not a fact right now? Can I not straightaway claim 'I am free; I am in the binary format?' " etc. 'Liberation' will appear very, very possible.

Ultimately, if and when, for the seeker, the word 'I' excludes *pancha anaathmaa*, the seeker can happily claim "*aham nithya muktha aathmaa asmI'*".

'*Thaavath thaavath*' means 'gradually'.

- तदर्थःअपि - the thadh padha lakshyaartha: / the lakshyaartham of thadh padha
- प्रविविक्षति - enters / merges into
- त्वमर्थ - the thvam padha lakshyaartham.

'Praveshtum icchathi' is 'pravivikshathi' | The 'thvam padha lakshyaartham' means 'nirguna ekaathmaanam'.

'*Thadh padha lakshyaartham*' will get closer and closer to '*thvam padha lakshyaartham*', as and when the *anaathma abhimaanam* gets further and further away and ultimately they merge together. Recalling the imagery described earlier, as the *jeevaathmaa* moves more and more away from *anaathmaa*, it will move more and more towards *Paramaathmaa*, until it merges with *Paramaathmaa*.

This great idea alone is symbolically presented in the form of the *Chin mudhrra*. When a human palm is stretched out, it is seen that the index finger is set apart from the thumb, while it appears closely associated with the other three fingers, the middle finger, the ring finger and the small finger, all four of them standing together in a line. In interpreting the *Chin mudhrra*, the thumb is taken to symbolize *Paramaathmaa*, the index finger is taken to symbolize *jeevaathmaa* and the other three fingers, the middle finger, the ring finger and the little finger are taken to represent the *avasthaathraya anaathmaa*, *sareerathraya anaathmaa* etc. The natural observation during the normal stretching out of the palm, of the index finger staying close to the middle, ring and small fingers, while separated from the thumb, can be read as the natural close association of *jeevaathmaa* with *anaathmaa*, and, also the natural tendency of the *jeevaathmaa* to maintain a distance from *Paramaathmaa*. Lord Krishna also points out in the *Bhagavadh Githa* : "*Sarva bhhothaani sangham sarge yaanthi paranthapa'*", conveying the idea that "everyone tends to 'join' *anaathmaa* only".

In the *Chin mudhrra*, the top of the index finger is bent to touch the top of the thumb, the two together forming a circle, while the other three fingers are left erect, keeping away from the index finger. This symbolizes the *Vedhaanthic* idea that when *anaathmaa* is kept away from the *jeevaathmaa*, the *jeevaathmaa* can get closer to and ultimately merge with *Paramaathmaa*.

In guiding the *sishyaa*, the *guru* has to forcefully draw the index finger (representing the *jeevaathmaa*) away from *anaathmathrayam* (represented by the middle, ring and small

fingers) and forcefully join the index finger *jeevaathmaa* to the '*angushta maathra: purusha:*' (of the *Katopanishad*). '*Angushta maathra:*' is *Paramaathmaa*. And, in the *Advaithic chin mudhraa*, the index finger representing *jeevaathmaa*, should join with the top of the thumb, thus symbolically merging with *Paramaathmaa*. (In contrast, in *Saiva Siddhaantha Mudhraa*, the index finger touches the root of the thumb, to show that *jeevaathmaa* is eternally the *dhaasaa* of *Paramaathmaa*).

Further, the index finger going to the top of the thumb, forms a full circle, a *Poorna*, the circle indicating that there is no beginning or end. The '*anaadhi anantha nirguna Ekaathma*' is indicated by the circle. The *chin mudhraa*, thus, conveys *jeevaathma-Paramaathma eikyam*, the entire *anaathmaa* becoming *mithyaa*.

"Angushta darjani yoga mudhraa vyajena dehinaam sruthyartham brahma jeeva eikyam darsayanahaa avathaath Siva:" is a beautiful sloka on Lord Dakshinamurthy.

Sambhandha Gadhyaam (part) to Verse 29:

कस्मात्पुनःकारणादेहाध्यनात्मत्वप्रतिपत्तावेवात्मा तदर्थमात्मत्वेनाभिलिङ्गते न विपर्यय इति ।

Why is it that the Self fuses with the meaning of 'That', only on our understanding that the non-Self such as the body is not the Self?

In the previous verse, Sureswaraachaarya had declared, that, 'merging into *Paramaathmaa* requires a pre-requisite, viz., 'distancing from *anaathma*'. He had said that '*pancha anaathma thyagha:*' is compulsory; that, attachment to *anaathmaa* should be given up. This is compulsory for *mahaa vaakyam* to do its job.

When this much is said, many seekers with lingering attachments, will certainly be disturbed; because, it is a natural tendency for everyone including a diligent seeker to desire (as the English saying goes) to 'have the cake and eat it also'. Or as the Tamil proverb goes '*koozukkum aasai meesaikum aasai*'.

People do not want to give up their attachment towards their children, grandchildren, possessions etc. (termed *aasaa paasam*). They want to strongly hold on, with one hand, to the possessions, profession, family etc. and add to them *Paramaathmaa* and *moksham* also, trying to 'grab' them with the other hand. Sureswaraachaarya warns it is never possible. He declares that '*Anaathma abhimaana thyagha:*' is compulsory for *mahaa vaakyam* to be effective. If the attachment to *anaathmaa* is not given up, the knowledge of *mahaa vaakyam* will be purely academic. Such an aspirant, i.e. the one who studies *Vedhaantha* diligently, but, does not give up attachments, may become a scholar in *Vedhaantha*, but, will continue to be a *samsaari*.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa also declares somewhere "*sanyaasena eva moksha:*"| By this statement, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* is not referring to the external symbols of *sanyaasaa*, like *kaashaaya vasthram* etc. What he means by *sanyaasaa* is 'giving up attachment to the *pancha anaathma* | '*pancha anaathma abhimaana thyaaagha:*'| That is compulsory.

Manthraa 3 of the *Kaivalya Upanishad manthraa* runs: "*Na karmanaa na prajayaa (na) dhanena thyaaagene eke amruthathvam aanasu:*"- "People attained immortality not through *karma*; not through offspring; nor through wealth; but, only through *thyaaghaa*". In this *manthraa* also, the word '*thyaagha:*' does not mean "running away from home or putting on ochre robes". After assuming ochre robes, one can get attached even to the ochre robes. Even if one joins or acquires an *aashramaa* (a hermitage), *aasrama abhimaanam* might result. Merely moving to *sanyaasa aasramaa* from *grihastha aasramaa* does not guarantee *abhimaanathyaagha:* | One can renounce one's family, possessions, position etc. to take to *aasrama sanyaasaa*. But, one's body will still go along with him / her. Even if a person is able to give up attachment to the physical body and forgetting the body, sits in meditation, the mind will continue to function and cause disturbances. So, what is required is firm **mental** renunciation of all *anaathmaa*

This is *sanyaasa:* and that *sanyaasa sahitha jnaanam* alone will work in giving 'liberation'. *Jnaanam* will never work alone without *sanyaasaa* – the word *sanyaasa* (to be noted again) meaning *abhimaana thyagha:* |

Abhimaana thyagha: / 'Clasp rejection', as explained, is a silent inner phenomenon, which the aspirant has to develop gradually.

Towards this end, the student, in fact, can make use of even every instance of 'anxiety' as an opportunity for practicing *sanyaasaa*. Any time anxiety arises, the student should remember these exhortations of Sureswaraacharya and remind himself/ herself that *abhimaanaa* is indicating its presence, through the anxiety. He/ she should refuse to worry and thus, get over *abhimaanaa*.

This does not mean that duties should be given up. 'Performance of duty' is **not** *abhimaanaa* ; worry alone **is** *abhimaanaa*. Performance of duty is 'role playing', i.e. playing one's mandatory role in society. 'Role Playing', by itself, does not cause *samsaraa*. *Abhimaanaa* and worry alone cause *samsaraa*. Role playing is *saamaanya adhyaasa:* ; worry is *visesha adhyaasa:* | A diligent seeker should give up this *visesha adhyaasa:* of worry and *abhimaanaa*.

But, majority of people do not do this, because, they think that worry is an indication of care and love. They wrongly assume that anxiety about children indicate 'their love for their children and also conversely, that, absence of anxiety indicates 'lack of love' and 'irresponsibility'. People want to worry, thinking that 'worrying' is their responsibility. *Vedhaanthaa* points out, that, one can love and be responsible, without worrying / getting anxious. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya advises "Give up that wrong thinking".

- देहादि अनात्मत्व प्रतिपत्तौ एव - "Only when a person understands the *anaathmaa* status of the body etc.,

'*anaathmathvam*' means '*anaathmaa* status' ; the compound term '*prathipatthaveva*' should be split properly as '*prathipatthau + eva*'. '*prathipatthi*:' means 'understanding' / 'knowledge'. '*Anaathmathva prathipatthi*:' means 'understanding the *anaathmaa* status'. This 'understanding of the *anaathmaa* status of the body etc.' leads to '*abhimaana thyaagha*:' or 'renunciation of attachments'. Therefore, '*Anaathmathva prathipatthau eva*', may be interpreted as '*abhimaana thyaaghaath eva*'.

Only by renouncing the attachments:

- आत्मा - I, the jeevaathmaa
- तदर्थं अभिलिङ्गते - will embrace / merge with the Paramathmaa,

Only by giving up the *abhimaanam* on *anaathmaa*, the jeevaathmaa will 'embrace' *Paramaathmaa*. '*abhilingathe*' means '*aalingathe*' / will embrace. '*Thadhartham*' means '*thadh padha lakshyaarthaam*' which, in turn, means '*Paramaathmaa*'.

- आत्मत्वेन - in the form of '*eiykyam*' or in the form of total 'one-ness';
- न विपर्ययः - not otherwise"
- इति कस्मात् कारणात् - Why is it so ?

The *Aachaaryaa* foresees the questions / objections: "Why do you insist on *abhimaana thyaagha*:? Why can I not have attachment to *anaathmaa* on one hand and simultaneously have attachment to *Paramathmaa* also. Why can I not hold on to both?"

'*viparyayam*' or 'otherwise' indicates the questions 'why not have *abhimaanaa* **and** gain *Brahman* also?. Why can I not have both? Why are you insisting upon *sanyaasa*?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts that without *sanyaasaa*, *Naishmarmya Siddhi* will not work.

140. Chapter III, Verse 29 (06-06-2009)

In these portions of the third chapter of this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is pointing out that '*thvam padhaartha vichaaraa*' is the crucial first step, if '*mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*' has to be successfully concluded. The successful conclusion of '*mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*' is possible only when there is a strong foundation of '*thvam padha vichaaraa*', done through *anvayaa* and *vyathirkhaa*; and, through this '*anvaya vyathireka vichaaraa*', one has to come to the conclusion that, 'I', the observer – the *dhruk* - am *aathmaa* and the entire observed universe- the *dhrusyam*- is *anaathmaa* . To repeat (in view of its importance) the conclusion to be arrived at, is: "'I', the *dhruk saakshi*, am *aathmaa* ; and the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *anaathmaa*". This '*dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam*' is very important. And, when this term '*dhrusya prapanchaa*', meaning the 'observed universe', is used, the *dhrusya prapanchaa* should be understood to include five significant components: (1) property (2) profession (3) family (4) body and (5) mind. Care must be taken to include all these significant components in *dhrusya prapanchaa* and also to ensure that *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* takes place, during *thvam padha vichaaraa*, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* method.

This *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* has a further corollary, which also must be understood. *Dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* must mean *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagha*: | '*Anaathmathva dharsanam*' should be understood as '*abhimaanaa thyaagha*:'; and, in this term, by the word *abhimaanaa*, what are meant are '*ahamkaaraa*' and '*mamakaaraa*'| Both the *bhaavanaas*, 'me' and 'mine', must be given up. *Anaathmathva dharsanam* includes *abhimaana thyaagha*:; and, this *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagha*: alone is called *dhrusya prapancha sanyaasa*: or just *sanyaasa*: |

Thus, *thvam padhaartha vichaara* should lead to *sanyaasa*:| And, without *sanyaasaa*, *mahaavaakyavichaaraa* cannot be fruitfully concluded. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* also repeatedly says "*sanyaasa poorvaka jnaath eva moksha*:" | Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam*, *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagha*: and *dhrusya prapancha sanyaasa* are all very important. In fact, *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* = *dhrusya prapancha abhimaanaa thyaagha*: = *dhrusya prapancha sanyaasaa*: | And, '*Thvam padha vichaaraa*' and '*sanyaasaa*' may even be considered synonymous, since *thvam psdhaartha vichaaraa* leads to *sanyaasa*:|

To recap: "jnaanam includes *sanyaasa*:; *sanyaasa*: means *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagha*:; *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagha*: is the result of *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* ; *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* is the result of *thvam padha vichaaraa* through *anvaya vyathirekhaa*".

This *sanyaasaa* is externally indicated by the *kaashaayaa vasthrraa* and giving up of the *grihastha aasrama*. But, the *kaashaaya vasthrraa* and the formal *sanyaasa aasramaa* are only external aspects. Whether these external aspects are resorted to, or not, is not very significant; what is significant is the mind, which must be a '*kaashaayaa*' mind - a mind without *abhimaanaa*. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa says only when *abhimaanaa*-s are given up, the first layer of ignorance is removed

In the *thvam padhaartha vichaaraa*, in the renunciation of *dhrusya prapancha abhimaanaa* alone, the first layer of ignorance is gone. What is that first layer of ignorance? Ans: '*Dhrusya prapancha aathmathva dharsanam*' (seeing the *dhrusya prapanchaa* as 'myself' or as 'mine') is the first layer of ignorance. And, '*dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam*' (correcting this vision of *dhrusya prapanchaa*, as 'myself' or 'mine') is the removal of this first layer of ignorance.

And, after the successful conclusion of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, a second layer of ignorance also will be removed. What is that second layer? Sureswaraachaaryaa says *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharasanam* is **also** another form of ignorance. This will be discussed later.

Now, in these portions, we are in the process of *dhrusya prapancha anaathamathva dharsanam* – the process of removing the first layer of ignorance, which is 'putting on *kaashaaya vasthram*' or 'dipping the mind in *sanyaasaa*' by *abhimaanaa thyaghaa* of property, profession, family, body and mind. Sureswaraachaaryaa is emphasizing this, in this introductory paragraph under study.

The *sambhandha gadhyam* under study starts with a question from a *poorva pakshin* "Why are you insisting on *sanyaasaa*?". The question arises, because, the very topic of *sanyaasaa* is a painful topic; a normal individual is attached so much to his / her family that the very thought of *sanyaasaa* is a disturbing thought. When one has to choose between *sanyaasaa* and *samsaaraa*, one invariably votes for *samsaaraa*, rather than *sanyaasaa*, because *sanyaasaa* seems to be more painful than *samsaaraa*. One tends to say: "If worry results from my attachment, so be it. But, I do not want to give up attachment". The story of the monkey and groundnuts is well worth remembering in this context. The story is as follows: "A monkey was regularly taking away handfuls of groundnuts spread in the open, by a farmer, for drying. To catch the monkey, the farmer, one day, set a narrow-necked pot with some ground nuts in the pot, as a trap. The monkey thrust its hand into the pot and grabbed a handful of nuts; but, since the neck of the pot was narrow, it could not pull out its hand containing the fistful of groundnuts; the monkey resorted to squealing. The farmer rushed to the spot and started thrashing the monkey. All that the monkey had to do, to escape the thrashing, was to drop the groundnuts, free its hand and run away. But, the

monkey would rather receive the 'thrashing' than 'renounce' the groundnuts". So are most *grihasthaas*; they do not mind the family problems, because their attachment is so strong that they do not want to give up their families. Sureswaraachaaryaa and *Bhagavaan* tell such people: "Go ahead and get the 'thrashing'; but, a time will come, when you will be hurt so much that the 'renunciation' will have to happen helplessly".

The *poorva pakshin*, who obviously has intense attachments, is questioning the need for *sanyaasaa*. He asks: "Is not *jnaanam* enough? Why is *sanyaasaa* necessary?"

- कस्मात्पुनःकारणात् - "What is the reason
- देहादि अनात्मत्वप्रतिपत्तौ एव - that only through the understanding of the *anaathmathvam* of the body etc.,

The term 'dehaadhi' stands for 'pancha vidha dhruhya prapanchaa' | 'anaathmathva prathipatthi:' means 'anaathmathva dharsanam'; anaathmathva dharsanam' results in 'abhimaana thyaagha:;' 'abhimaana thyaagha:' means 'sanyaasa:;' |

- आत्मा तदर्थं अभिलिङ्गते - aathma can merge into Brahman,

'*Aathmad*, in this context, means the '*jeevaathmaa*'. What kind of *jeevaathmaa*? Ans: Which has done *sanyaasaa* / *sanyaasi jeevaathmaa*. '*abhilingathe*' means 'embraces' / '*aalingathe*'. What does it embrace? Ans: '*thadhartham*'; '*thadhartham*' means '*thadh padhaartham*'; '*thadh padhaartham*' means '*thadh padha lakshyaartham*'; '*thadh padha lakshyaartham*' means '*Paramaathmaa*'.

The word '*aalinganam*' does not indicate a physical act, in this context (as Lord Rama is sometimes depicted embracing Lord Anjaneya, His devotee par excellence). It only conveys the intellectual understanding of the seeker of the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*aham brahma asmi*'.

- न विपर्यये - and not otherwise ?"
- "Not otherwise" means "without *sanyaasaa*".
- इति - If such a question is raised:

Sureswaraachaaryaa had earlier stated: "Only after *sanyaasaa*, *jeevaathmaa* can 'embrace' / merge with *Paramaathmaa*". And, the *poorva pakshin* asks the Aachaaryaa, "kasmaath puna; kaaranaath dehaadhi anaathmathva prathipatthau eva aathmaa thadhartham

abhilingathe?" meaning "Why do you insist upon sanyaasaa as a prerequisite for jeevaathma-Paratmaathma eikyam?"

In other words, the *poorva pakshin's* question is: "Why do you insist that *jeevaathma-Paramaathma- eikyam* is not possible without *sanyaasaa*?"

It must be carefully understood and remembered, that, when the word '*sanyaasaa*' is used in this context, what is talked about is **not** the external *aasrama sanyaasaa*. What **is insisted upon** is the internal *sanyaasaa* (for which Swamiji's coined term is 'clasp rejection'). Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives the answer.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 29:

उच्यते । प्रत्यगात्म अनवबोधस्य अनात्मस्वाभाव्यात् तदभिनिर्वृत्तश्च अयं बुद्ध्यादिदेहान्तः। तस्मिन् आत्मत्वं अविध्याकृतमेव । आत्मत्वं इव अनात्मत्वं अपि साविध्यस्य एव । यतो निरविध्यो विद्वान् अवाक्यार्थरूप एव केवलोऽवशिष्यते। तस्मादुच्यते ।

Let me explain. The non-apprehension of the Self is not inherent to the Self. By that non-apprehension itself all this non-Self like the body is set up. Its identification with the Self is due to nescience. Similarly, its distinction from the Self and its presentation as non-Self is also due to nescience. Thus the enlightened one, free from ignorance, abides alone and is himself of the nature of the non-verbal import of 'That thou art'. Therefore, the following is said:

Why do we say that *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* is compulsory?

As already indicated, it should be carefully remembered by the student that '*anaathmathva dharsanam*' and '*sanyaasaa*' are synonymous. '*Anaathmathva dharsanam*' = '*abhimaana thyagha*.' = '*sanyaasaa*'. These three words should be understood as one and the same concept.

Earlier, Sureswaraachaaryaa had said *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharasanam* is compulsory. Now, he gives the reason why. The gist of the *Aachaaryaa's* answer is first gone through, before entering the actual text.

The gist is as below (in steps):

Step 1: The entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is born out of *moolaavidhyaa*. This fact was discussed and established in the introduction to this chapter (Chapter III) and also in the earlier chapter (Chapter II).

Step 2: Moolaavidhyaa or maayaa is of achethanasvaroopam / jada svaroopam.

Step 3: Since maayaa is achethana / jada svaroopam, the dhruya prapanchaa born out of maayaa, is also achethana/ jada svaroopam.

Step 4: Entire *dhruya prapanchaa* being *achethanam*, all the five significant components of *dhruya prapanchaa* are also *achethanam*.

To name the five components again, they are: Property, profession, family, body and mind. Though difficult to assimilate, the entire family, all the perceived bodies, are *achethanam* and one's own body is also *achethanam*, since it is also a product of *moolaavidhyaa* (*moolaavidhyaa kaaryathvaath*) . Not only is the body *achethanam*, the mind is also *achethanam*.

Step 5: Therefore, the entire *pancha achethana dhruya prapanchaa* has to be *anaathmaa* only.

Why do we say it is *anaathmaa*? The explanation: '*Aathmaa*' refers to 'Self'; and 'I', the 'Self', am *chethana*: | 'I' am a Conscious entity. The *pancha dhruya prapanchaa* being ***achethanam***, it obviously cannot be the ***chethana aathmaa aham*** and is, therefore, termed *anaathmaa*, which term means 'different from Self'. /

Step 6: It follows, therefore, that, looking upon the body-mind as ***aathmaa***, is ignorance or *avidhyaa*. (This ignorance is considered as the first layer of *avidhyaa*)

Step 7: It further follows that, correcting this outlook is essential, if *mahaa vaakyam* has to be understood properly. 'Correcting this outlook' i.e., 'cognizing the body-mind as ***anaathmaa*** / '*anaathmathva dharasanam*' is 'peeling off' the first layer of *avidhyaa* . **This 'peeling off' alone is otherwise called *sanyaasa*** | Since this 'peeling off' / correcting is an essential step, '*sanyaasaa*' is said to be compulsory |

Reverting to the text, for clarity, this passage can be split into several sentences.

First sentence:

प्रत्यगात्म अनवबोधस्य अनात्मस्वाभाव्यं (अस्ति) - Maayaa is of the nature jadam.

Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to *maayaa* or *moolaavidhyaa* as '*prathyagaathma anavabodha*.' or as 'Self-ignorance'. | *Prathyagaathma anavabodha*: = *moolaavidhyaa* = *maayaa* |

'*svaabhaavyam*' means 'essential nature'. Since *aathmaa* is *chethanasvaroopam*, the opposite term viz., *anaathmaa* will mean '*jadam*' (as already pointed out above).

In this context, it should be noted, that, in *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*, 'Self ignorance' alone is called *moolaavidhyaa*, whereas, the 'ignorance of anything else that is *anaathmaa*' is called '*sthoolaavidhyaa*'. Ignorance of mathematics is not *moolaavidhyaa*; ignorance of atom is not *moolaavidhyaa*. *Moolaavidhyaa* is the name of only one ignorance, viz. 'self-ignorance' (as seen in the introduction of chapter III).

Second sentence:

तदभिनिर्वृतश्च अयं बुद्ध्यादिदेहान्तः - This entire universe including pancha kosaas is born out of that maayaa.

'*Thadh*' refers to the *avidhyaa / moolaavidhyaa / maayaa*, mentioned in the first sentence. *Moolaavidhyaa* was defined (in the first sentence) as '*prathyak aathma anavabodha:*' or 'ignorance of the inner Self', and, that '*prathyagaathma anavabodha:*' or '*moolaavidhyaa*' or '*maayaa*' is what is being referred to, by the pronoun '*thadh*', occurring in the second sentence. '*Abhinirvruthaa:*' means 'produced'. '*Thadh abhinirvruththa:*', therefore, means 'produced by *maayaa*' | It can be expressed as '*maayaa kaarya bhootha:*' |

Thus, '*Prathyagaathma anavabodha anirvruththa:*' means '*maayaa kaaryam*'. What is that '*maayaa kaaryam*'? The Aachaaryaa says "ayam buddhyaadhi dehaantha:" meaning "all these, beginning with buddhi up to the deham" | The reference is to the pancha kosaa:, which should also include the family, possessions etc. All these are born out of maayaa and are therefore jadam only.

The third sentence:

(तस्मात्)तस्मिन् आत्मत्वं अविध्याकृतं एव - Therefore, in that *panchakosaas*, which are also *jada svaroopam*, the notion of 'I' or the notion of 'mine' (the notions, 'body is myself' and 'body is mine') are both ideas born out of ignorance only.

'*Thasmih*', in this context, means 'in the *buddhyaadhi dehaantha:* / in the *pancha kosaas*; '*aathmathvam*' refers to the notions of 'I' and 'mine', i.e. having the notions 'I am the body' or 'the body is mine'.

The term '*avidhyaa krutham eva*' means 'is born out of ignorance only'.

The reason why it is ignorance, is obvious, because **jada pancha kosaas cannot** be **chethana aham**, as explained already.

And, therefore, during the course of *thvam padha vichaaraa*, the student has to 'peel off' this *avidhyaa*. This 'peeling off' of *avidhyaa* is *anaathmathva dharsanam*, otherwise called *sanyaasaa*. Therefore this *sanyaasaa* becomes compulsory, before the student goes to *thadh padha eikyam*. If the seeker retains this *avidhyaa*, the meaning of the word 'aham' in '*aham brahma asmi*' or '*thvam*' in '*thadh thvam asi*', would continue to include all the layers of *anaathmaa* and as a consequence, when the *guru* teaches the *mahaa vaakyam* and tells the student "You are *Brahman*", the *guru's* statement will sound hollow and unconvincing.

With this, the Aachaaryaa had indicated the necessity for *dhrusya prapancha anaathma dharsanam* / *dhrusya prapancha abhimaana thyaagham* / *sanyaasaa*.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa moves on to the next step, which is akin to a big jump, though, Sureswaraachaaryaa appears to make a 'shocking and surprising' statement, in a very casual manner. What is that 'big jump'?

As before, the gist of the *Aachaaryaa's* statement can be gone through, before entering the actual text.

What is the first layer of ignorance? It was seen that "*dhrusya prapancha aathmathva bhaavanaa* / *dhrusya prapancha aathmathva dharsanam*" is the first layer of ignorance i.e., "looking upon the *dhrusya prapanchaa* as 'I' or 'mine' " is considered as the first layer of ignorance. It was also seen that this first layer of ignorance is to be removed by diligently correcting / changing one's perspective to the contrary, i.e. by realizing that *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *anaathmaa*.

Let us assume that we have crossed this first step successfully. Now, we have got '*dhrusya prapancha anaathma dharsanam*' and we are happy that we have 'peeled off' the first layer of ignorance.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa, to our utter surprise, appears to explode a bombshell. He says that *dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* is **also** *avidhyaa*, i.e., he says that, 'seeing the world as *anaathmaa* is **also** *avidhya*'.

As a first step, Sureswaraachaaryaa said: "World is *anaathmaa*". **Now**, he warns: "Do not say that the world / the family / *pancha kosaas* are *anaathmaa*".

Then, can we say that they are *aathmaa*? Obviously not, because that has already been negated by him.

Now, *anaathmathva dharsanam* is also considered by him, as *avidhyaa*. The reason as to why this is so, is explained by the *Aachaaryaa*, later. Now he says:

आत्मत्वं इव अनात्मत्वं अपि साविध्यस्य एव - Like *dhrusya prapancha*; *aathmathva dharsanam*, *dhrusya prapancha*; *anaathmathva dharsanam* also belongs to an ignorant person only.

'*Saavidhya:*' means 'ignorant person'. '*avidhyayaa saha varthate' ithi 'saavidhya:'* (The word is similar to the well-known name '*Somaaskanda Parameswara:*', wherein the word '*somaaskandha:*' is split as '*sa + Uma + Skandha:*', referring to Lord Siva, as accompanied by *Uma* and *Skandhaa*.)

Sureswaraachaaryaa's statement is: "Seeing *dhrusya prapanchaa* as *anaathmaa* is also a wrong vision, belonging to an ignorant person only".

The question arises: "Why?" Ans: "Because, once you say *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *anaathmaa* **different** from *aathmaa*, you are accepting that there are two things, i.e., you are accepting *dvaitham*, which 'acceptance' will be against the final goal of *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*. Also, the universe is vast and big and 'I' being someone different and away from that vast, *anaathmaa* universe, 'I' will become small; '*aathmaa*' will become limited".

Because of this wrong vision of accepting a *dvaitha prapanchaa* only, people have a wrong concept of *mokshaa* also. They tend to think: "The entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is 'terrible' *anaathmaa* and 'I', the *aathmaa*, am now in the world, helplessly disturbed by the happenings in the *anaathma prapanchaa*. My goal is *mokshaa*, which, therefore, is to escape from this world and to never, never return to the world again".

This wrong concept of *mokshaa* results, because of the perspective of 'two' (*dvaitham*) things – (i) the world, which is *anaathmaa* and (ii) 'I', the *aathmaa*. The goal is, therefore, looked upon as getting *videha mukthi* to attain *mokshaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that both visions, viz., (i) looking upon the world as *anaathmaa* and (ii) looking upon escape from the world as *mokshaa*, belong to the ignorant person.

He says: "World is not even *anaathmaa*. World is not *aathmaa*; world is not *anaathmaa* also, because there is no second thing other than *aathmaa*".

What is the meaning of the word *anaathmaa*? As indicated earlier also, *anaathmaa* means 'that which is different from *aathmaa*'. And, that which is different from the *aathmaa* is possible, only **if** there is a second thing other than *aathmaa*. Only then, the second thing can be called *anaathmaa*. But, since our (*Advaitins'*) ultimate vision is that there is no second thing apart from *aathmaa*, the word *anaathmaa* itself should not exist in the dictionary of an advanced *Advaitic* student. The very word *anaathmaa* should not exist, because to use the word *anaathmaa*, is to accept that there is something other than *aathmaa*. Since there is nothing other than *aathmaa*, the world cannot be called *anaathmaa*. "Therefore" the *Aachaaryaa* concludes "*dhrusya prapancha anaathma dharsanam* is also ignorance".

Then, the next question is: "If the world is not *aathmaa* and if the world is not *anaathmaa* also / if the world is neither *aathmaa* nor *anaathmaa* / if *aathmathva dharsanam* of the world is wrong and *anaathmathva dharasnam* of the world also is wrong, then, what is this world? What other *dharsanam* is right?"

This *dhrusya prapanchaa* has to come under some category. If it does not come under either *aathmaa* category or *anaathmaa* category, then what category does it come under? What *dharsanam* is right?

Sureswraachaaryaa answers: "'aathmathva-anaathmathva-vilakshana- dharsanam' is the right dharsanam. World is something different from *aathmaa* and something different from *anaathmaa*. Therefore, *dhrusya prapancha aathmathva-anaathmathva-vilashana-dharsanam* is alone right".

At the conclusion of *Mahaavaakya vichaara*, the seeker should have 'peeled off' the second layer of ignorance also. When the first layer of ignorance is 'peeled off', '*aathmathva dharsanam*' will go away; and, when the second layer of ignorance is 'peeled off', the *anaathmathva dharsanam* also will go away. After, *maaha vaakya vichaara*, the seeker will have *dhrusya prapancha aathmathva-anaathmathva-vilakshana- dharsanam* only.

Then, the next question is "What do you mean by *aathmathva-anaathmathva-vilakshana dharsanam*". Ans: *Aathmaa* has been defined as '*sath*' i.e. of the nature of 'Existence'. The *Chaandoghya Upanishad Manthraa* (VI.16. 3) which states: "*Eithadh aathmyam idhagum sarvam thath sathyam sa aathmaa*" may be recollected in this context.

'*Aathmaa*' has been defined as '*sath*' principle. What does '*sath*' mean? 'Existence'. And, if '*aathmaa*' means '*sath*', '*anaathma*' should mean '*asath*'. Therefore, '*aathmathva-anaathmathva-vilakshnam*' would mean '*sath-asath-vilakshanam*' | This '*sadhasadvilakshana*

dharsanam' is the right *dharsanam* | And, '*sadhasadhvilakshana dharsanam'* means '*mithyaathva dharsanam'*.

Dhrusya prapanchaa is neither *aathmaa* nor *anaathmaa*. It is *mithyaa*; it is unreal; it is as good as non-existent.

'*Dhrusya prapancha aathmaathva dharsanam'* is *avidhyaa* ; '*dhrusya prapancha anaathmathva dharsanam* is also *avidhyaa*; '*dhrusya prapancha mithyaathva dharsanam'* is alone *vidhyaa*.

The entire universe is *mithyaa*, akin to a movie or a drama. The 5th capsule of *Vedhaanthaa* (as enunciated by Swamiji) exhorts: "By remembering 'my' real nature, I convert life into a drama or an entertainment ; by forgetting 'my' real nature, I convert life into a struggle".

Samsaaraa is "viewing life as a 'meaningless, burdensome and boring struggle'". Looking upon life as a 'drama', at once a 'comedy' and a 'tragedy', is *mithyaathva dharsanam*.

Then the next question: If the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *mithyaa*, then, who am 'I'? Ans: 'I' am the 'dhruk' of the *dhrusya prapanchaa*. 'I' am the spectator, seeing the world as a movie and seeing 'myself' as a mere spectator.

Proceeding further, if the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* is *mithyaa* / unreal, it will require a *sathya adhishtaanam*, which should be something other than *dhrusya prapanchaa*, because, any 'unreal' requires a 'support', different from itself.

What is that *adhishtaanam* for the *mithyaa dhrusya prapanchaa*? Ans: What is there, other than *dhrusyam*, can only be the *adhishtaanam*. What is there, other than *dhrusyam*, is the *dhruk* 'I', 'myself'. Therefore, the '*adhishtaanam*' for the *mithyaa dhrusya prapanchaa* is 'I', myself; 'I' am not only the spectator of the *dhrusya prapanchaa* , 'I', myself, am the *adhishtaanam* also of *dhrusya prapanchaa*.

Therefore, 'I' do not want to escape from *dhrusya prapanchaa*. In fact, how can 'I'? How can the *adhishtaanam* 'I', escape from the world, in the name of *videha mukthi*?

Therefore, an informed seeker should never pray "I should never, in the future, return to this earth". On the other hand, he / she should understand as to what *mokshaa* really is.

Such an informed seeker should first get the conviction: " I do not want to escape from the *mithyaa prapanchaa*, since it is 'I', who am the *adhishtaanam* of the entire *mithyaa prapanchaa* . 'I' am the spectator- cum- *adhishtaanam*".

This gives rise to a further question: "Who has produced this *dhrusya prapanchaa*?" The answer is: "I, am the producer also of this *mithyaa prapanchaa*. 'I' am not only the spectator and the supporter; I am the producer also, through my *moolaavidhyaa* or *maayaa*."

Therefore, what is the final vision ? Ans: "I am the 'producer-cum-spectator-cum-supporter' of the *mithyaa dhrusya prapanchaa*".

But, what is the meaning of 'I', in this context? Is it the body or the mind? Ans: "Neither. 'I', the *saakshi*, am producer-cum-spectator-cum-supporter of the entire *mithyaa dhrusya prapanchaa*. Let the 'entertainment', therefore, eternally continue. Why should I bother about this *mithyaa prapanchaa*?"

Such a firm conviction is the "peeling off the second layer of ignorance". First layer of ignorance is '*dhrusya prapanche aathmathva dharsanam*'. '*Dhrusya prapanche anaathmathva dharsanam*' is the second layer of ignorance.

After peeling away both layers of ignorance, what should be the *dharsanam*? Ans: The *dharsanam* should be "The *dhrusya prapanchaa* is neither *aathmaa* nor *anaathmaa*. It is only *mithyaa naama-roopa*. 'I' **alone** am everywhere, 'lending' existence to the *mithyaa naama roopa dhrusya prapanchaa*".

The first half of Verse 3 of Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram, of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, brings out this fact clearly: "Yasyaiva spuranam sadhaathmakam asath kalpaarthakam bhaasathe saakshaath thath thvam asi ithi veda vachasaa yo bodhayathi aasrithaan" – "He , **whose manifestations** – which are nothing but the Reality – **appear as the objects of the world**; He who imparts to those who have surrendered to him, direct enlightenment, through the Vedic commandment '**That Thou Art**'... " .

This is the teaching of the Upanishads also. All these idea are nicely presented in the latter portion of Kaivalya Upanishad: "Jaagrath svapna sushupthyaadhi prapancham yathprakaasathe thadh Brahma aham ithi jnaathvaa sarva bandhai: pramuchyathe" (manthraa 17) – "Having known that 'I' am that Brahman which illumines the world consisting of the waking stage, dream stage and sleeping stage, one is liberated from all bonds".

"*Thrishu dhaamasu yadboghyam, bokthaa, bhogascha yadh bhaveth thebhyo vilakshana: saakshee chinmaathroham sadaasiva.*" (manthraa 18) – "'I' am distinct from all those which

are subjects of experience, objects of experience and instruments of experience, in all the three states. I am the Witness, which is pure Consciousness and which is ever auspicious”.

“*Mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathishtitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh Brahma advayam asmi aham*” (*manthraa* 19) – “Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolves into me alone. I am that non-dual *Brahman*”.

These *manthraas* are wonderful meditation *slokaas*. After this mediation, can a seeker talk about ‘escaping from this world as *mokshad*’?

Sureswaraacharyaa, therefore exhorts the seekers: “Come to this fantastic vision, i.e. to *mahaavaakya vicharaa*”.

Reverting to the last sentence in this *sambhandha gadhyam*:

यत् :निरविध्यः विद्वान् - That wise person who has removed (both layers of) ignorance,

A person who has removed both layers of ignorance is referred to, here, as ‘*niravidhya*’, derived as ‘*nirgathaa avidhyaadhvayam yasmaath sa*’.

केवलः अवशिष्यते - remains as *kevala aathmaa* / non- dual *aathmaa*, without any second real entity.

‘*Kevala*.’ means ‘non-dual’; for such a *vidvaan*, this world is as good as non-existent, obviously because ‘unreal’ is as good as ‘non-existent’. This fact is also covered in the *Kaivalya Upanishad* (in *manthraa* 22), as “*Na bhhimiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha*” - implying “For me, where is *bhoom*? Where is water? Where is fire? Where is air? Where is *aakaasa*? They are unreal appearances, not worth counting.”

Since *bhoomi*., *aapa*., *vahni*., *anila*., *ambaram* etc. – therefore, the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* - is not there, as *Katopanishad* (II.1.11) declares “ *Na iha naanaasthi kinchana*” – “There is no plurality at all here”.

“I **alone** am there” is conveyed by ‘*kevala: avasishyathe*’.

141. Chapter III, Verse 29 and 30 (13-06-2009)

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that mahaa vaakya vichaaraa goes through two stages. The first stage is 'thvam padhaartha vichaara:', through anvaya vyathirekha: | The second is 'thadh padha eikya vichaara:' |

When the student goes through these two stages of enquiry, two layers of ignorance will go away. Incidentally, this manner of presentation is generally not found in other *Vedhaanthic* texts and is unique to this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

The first layer of ignorance is "wrongly seeing *dhrusya prapanchaa*, as the *aathmaa*". In other words, '*dhrusya prapancha aathmathva dharsanam*' is the first layer of ignorance. The term '*dhrusya prapanchaa*' includes the body-mind complex also. Therefore, 'seeing the body-mind complex as *aathmaa*' is the first layer of ignorance. And, by '*thvam padha vichaaraa*', we dismiss the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa*, as something different from 'me'. 'I' am not the world, because the world is an object of experience. Similarly, 'I' am not the body nor the mind. In this manner, I reduce the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* into *anaathmaa*. Thus, converting *dhrusya prapanchaa* from *aathmaa* to *anaathmaa* – *anaathmathva dharsanam* - is the completion of the first enquiry.

And, in this completion, the first layer of ignorance is gone. But, we are still in the second layer of ignorance, because "seeing the world as *anaathmaa*" is **also** another form of ignorance. Why it is so, is explained as follows: "As long as there is something called *anaathmaa*, there is duality, since *aathmaa* is already there; as long as there is duality, there is limitation; as long as there is limitation, there is suffering; And, as long as there is suffering, *mokshaa* will be looked upon as 'running away' or 'escaping' from the world". Therefore, there should not be an *anaathmaa* also.

Towards this end, through *thadh padha vichaaraa*, we negate the world, by saying that, there is no *anaathmaa* also / that, there is nothing other than *aathmaa*.

Through the *Vedic nishedha vaakyaas* such as "*Neha naanaa asthi kinchana*" (*Katopanishad* – II. 1 . 11) – "there is no plurality at all here", "*Sa esha nethi nethyaathmaa*" – (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – IV. iv. 22) - "This Self is That which has been described as 'not this, not this'" and "*Na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha*" – (*Kaivalya Upanishad* – *manthraa* 22) – "For me, earth and water are not there; fire is not there; air is not there; space also is not there", the student concludes that there is nothing other than *aathmaa*, which would mean there is no *anaathmaa* at all.

Then, naturally the question arises: "If the experienced universe is not *aathmaa* and if the experienced universe is not *anaathmaa* also, then what is the nature of this 'experienced universe'?" This will be an inevitable question. *Vedhaanthaa* gives an unique answer. It says: "The world comes under a category which is other than *aathma* and *anaathmaa*" or "*aathmathva anaathmathva vilakshanam dhrusya jagath*".

But, what do you mean by 'aathmathva anaathmathva vilakshanam'? 'Aathmathvam' means 'sath'; 'anaathmathvam' means 'asath'. 'Aathmathva anaathmathva vilakshanam' means 'sath asath vilakshanam'.

Therefore, after the completion of the second stage of enquiry the world is reduced to '*sadhasath vilakshanam*'. It does not come under 'existent' category; nor does it come under 'non-existent' category. Is the world existent? Ans: 'No'. Is it non-existent? Ans: Again 'no'.

It comes under a third category, which is a category unique to *Advaitam* only. Other philosophies such as *saamkhyaa*, *yoga*, *dvaitam* or *visishtadvaitam* do not accept this. Only in *Advaita*, there is this unique third category, which is "something different from existent **and** different from non-existent". If you then ask "What do you mean by that?", the *Advaita* philosopher answers "It is the *seemingly* existent category". This term 'seemingly existent' category means 'appearance for experience; but, disappearance on enquiry', which is called by the terse term '*mithyaa*'.

The conclusion is: "The entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* has to be reduced into *mithyaa*, at the end of *mahaavakya vichaaram*." As mentioned repeatedly earlier, '*dhrusya prapanchaa*' should importantly include the five items, viz. (1) all possessions or property (2) profession (3) family (4) the intimate body and (5) the disturbed mind, (which mind can be looked upon either as 'terrible' or 'wonderful'). The aspirant should understand and see the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa* as a movie or a drama programme, a *naatakaa* running continuously, except for short breaks provided by the 'deep sleep' state (the *sushupthi avasthaa*).

But, it is not sufficient to see the *dhrusya prapanchaa* as a drama or movie. One should also understand that the *dhrusya prapanchaa* requires an *aadhaaram* – even a movie is not possible without a screen as *aadhaaraa* or *adhistaanam*.

What is that *aadhaaram* or *adhistaanam*? Ans: That *aadhaaram* for the *dhrusya prapanchaa* is 'myself'. '*Brahma*' as answer is acceptable in the earlier stages of *Vedhaanthic* study. But, for an advanced *Vedhaanthic* aspirant, '*Brahman*' is not the *aadhaaram* for this *jagath*; '*Aathmaa*' is also not the *aadhaaram*. '**I** **am**' the *aadhaaram*. Proceeding a further step, 'I' am, in fact, the 'producer' also. 'I' am the producer-cum-supporter-cum-spectator of this

world. And, 'I' am thoroughly enjoying the drama of this world. Whether tragedy or comedy, 'I' look upon *jagath*, as a type of entertainment.

But, it should be carefully understood, that the word 'I', in this context, does not mean the body or the mind. When it is said "'I' am not affected", the word 'I' does not mean the body which is *mithyaa*; nor the mind which is also *mithyaa*. They *are* affected. What is meant by 'I', is the '*aathmaa*', the '*saaksh*'. This vision alone is 'liberation'; nothing else will solve the human problem of *samsaaraa*.

And, therefore "everything experienced is *mithyaa*; 'I', the *adhishtaanam* alone am *sathyam*". With this knowledge / conviction, the second layer of ignorance is also gone.

To recap: What is the second layer? The concept "*Dhrusya prapanchaa* is *anaathmaa*" is also ignorance and is the second layer of ignorance.

The conclusion is: "*Dhrusya prapanchaa* is *aathma vilakshanam* *anaathma vilakshanam* *cha*". This '*dhrusya prapancha aathmathva- anaathmathva- vilakshana dharsanam*' or '*dhrusya prapancha mithyaathva dharsanam*' **is** 'wisdom'.

This view alone Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa presents in the first verse of his Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram, very casually, like a child's play: " *visvam dharpana dhrusyamaana nagareethulyam nijaanthargatham pasyan aathmani maayayaa bahirivodhbhoottam yathaa nidhrayaa yath saakshaath kuruthe prabodha samaye svaathmaanam eva advayam*" - "He, who experiences at the time of realization, his own immutable Self, which Self alone plays as the universe of names and forms, like a city seen in a mirror, due to the *maayaa* power, as though produced outside, as in a dream". The *mayaa* is 'my' own *maayaa*.

And, that is said here (*sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 29) also.

- यतः - Thus
- विद्वान् निरविध्यः - the wise person, who has managed to grasp this teaching
- अवशिष्यते - remains
- केवल एव - as the Advaita *aathmaa*,
- अवाक्यार्थरूपः - which is the 'non-sentential' meaning born out of the sentence '*that thvam asi*'.

'*Avaakyartham*' means 'non-sentential meaning'. '*Avaakyarthad*' is not a regular sentential meaning but non-regular meaning. Though this has been discussed earlier, a few more important aspects are worth noting. Two types of interpretation can be given.

The first interpretation had already been discussed; but, is explained again as follows:

Normally, a sentence has got several words; and therefore, one possibility is that the sentence can reveal many objects. Such a sentence is called '*dvaitha artha bodhaka vaakyam*'. i.e. when a statement is made with its many words revealing many objects, such a sentence is called '*dvaitha artha bodhaka vaakyam*'.

There is a second possibility: 'a sentence with many words, can reveal one substance, but, with several attributes'. The substance revealed by such a sentence is only one. All the other words in the sentence reveal several attributes of the substance revealed. An example given earlier was the *Geetha Dhyana Sloka* – "*Prapanaa paarijaathaaya thothra vethraika paanaye jnaana mudhraaya Krishnaaya Geethaamurutha duhe nama:*"| This sentence has many words but reveals only one Krishna, with several attributes. Therefore, this sentence is revealing '*ekam*' or '*advaitam*'; but, because it reveals a substance with attributes, it is termed a '*visishta advaita bodhaka vaakyam*'.

Normally, all sentences reveal either *dvaitha padhaartha* or *visishta advaita padhaartha*. This is the convention.

But, '*thath thvam asi*' is an unique sentence which does not reveal *dvaitham*; it does not reveal *visishta advaitam* also. It reveals '*nirvisishta advaitam*'. Since, thus, the *maha vaakyam* is non-conventionally / uniquely a '*nirvisesha artha bodhaka vaakyam*', what is revealed by it, is called '*avaakyartham*'.

And, how does '*thath thvam asi*' sentence manage to reveal '*nirvisishta advaitam*? (This was also discussed before).

'*Thvam padhaa*' reveals only a '*savisesha jeevaathma*'; '*thadh padhaa*' also reveals only *savisesha* – the '*saguna Parmaathma*'. But, the '*asi padham*' does something unique. What is that? Because of the '*as*' equation, '*saguna jaavaathma*' and '*saguna Paramathma*' will 'rub' each other; and, because of the 'rub'bing process, the *saguna jeevaathma* will 'rub off' all the attributes of *Paramaathma* and *saguna Pramaathma* will 'rub off' all the attributes of the *jeevaathma*. *Jeevaathma* and *Paramaathma* thus come together, each one rubbing off the other's attributes, leaving behind one '*nirvisesha advaita vasthu*' which is called *avaakyartha*: |

This alone Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa had given in his famous 'vaakya vrutthi' – verse 38: "samsargo vaa visishto vaa vaakyartho naathra sammatha: akanda eka rasathvena vaakyartha: vidhushaam matha:" meaning "What is meant by the sentence (viz., thath thvam asi) is not accepted either to be connected with or qualified by anything else. The meaning of the sentence, according to the wise, is an indivisible Being consisting of Bliss only"| In this 'vaakya vrutthi' verse, 'samsarga:' is referring to 'dvaitha bodhaka vaakyam'; 'visishta:' means 'visishta advaita bodhaka vaakyam'. 'Vaakyartho na athra sammatha:' means 'both interpretations should not be taken here'. What, then, should be the interpretation? Ans: 'akanda eka rasathvena vaakyartha: vidhushaam matha:' | 'akanda eka rasathvena' means 'nirvishesha advaita bodhakathvena'; 'vaakyartha: vidhushaam matha:' means 'the wise understand the meaning of the sentence'. They understand it as ('akanda, eka, rasathva') **the** indivisible Being, of the nature of Bliss only'.

This is one type of interpretation for '*avaakyartham*', which had been already discussed.

There is a second grammatical interpretation which is explained as below:

In a sentence, there are several words – nouns and verbs. There may be one noun or several nouns. And, generally, one verb alone will be there. And, in Sanskrit, in a given sentence, nouns occur in different cases, known as '*kaaraka vibkathl*'; by the word '*kaaraka vibakthl*', what Sanskrit grammar conveys is that "the noun contributes to the production of action represented by the verb in one manner or other"; and, all the nouns in a sentence, put together also, are contributing to the production of the action represented by the verb.

To understand this clearly, an example of a sentence may be considered: "Rama writes a letter, with a pen, in his room". In this sentence, 'Rama', 'letter', 'pen' and 'room' are four different nouns. 'Writes' is the verb. Each noun is called a '*kaarakam*', represented by a '*kaaraka vibakthl*', i.e. a 'case ending', termed in English, as 'preposition'. The four nouns in this sentence, are serving as either 'subject' or 'object' or 'instrument' or 'location'. 'Rama' is the subject. As the 'subject', he is contributing to the action of 'writing'. 'Letter' is also contributing to the 'writing' action, but not as the 'subject' but, as an 'object'; 'Pen' is a contributor as an 'instrument' of 'writing' and 'room' is contributing to the 'writing', as location of the 'writing' action.

Thus, the contributions of the nouns are done in various capacities. In English, this capacity or nature of contribution is conveyed through prepositions, such as '*with* the pen; '*in* the room etc.

To consolidate: What does a sentence do? The sentence can have several nouns; all the nouns will have '*kaaraka vibkathi*'; the nouns will serve as '*kaarakam*' or as 'contributors' for the action represented by the verb in the sentence.

Therefore, whenever one reads a sentence, what should be one's perception? One should understand that all the nouns in the sentence are '*kaarakam*'-s contributing to 'action', and the verb is the 'action'. In other words, a sentence reveals the contributors or generators of action, represented by nouns and the action itself is represented by a verb.

To repeat: the many words of a sentence reveal (i) the generators of the action represented by nouns and (ii) also the action itself, represented by the verb. Expressed differently, *kaarakam*-s and *kriyaa* are represented by the words of a sentence. As explained, *kaarakam* means 'generator of action'; *kriyaa* means an action. Subject is a generator of action; object is a generator and so on. In fact, 'action' is defined as '*kaaraka janyaa kriyaa*'.

This being the explanation of a 'sentence', the question may arise: "Can *aathmaa* be revealed by a sentence?" If *aathmaa* is revealed by any sentence, *aathmaa* will come under one of these two i.e., either a *kaarakam* or a *kriyaa*. If *kaarakam*, what type of *kaarakam*? Either subject *kaarakam* or object *kaarakam* or locus *kaarakam* or instrument *kaarakam*. And, if *aathmaa* comes under any one of the *kaarakam*-s, then *aathmaa* will become a producer / generator of something, whereas *Vedhaantha* (*sruthi*) wants to reveal an *aathmaa*, which is neither a producer nor a producer entity. "Anyathra dharmaath anyathra adharmaath anyathra asmaath kruthakruthaath" – "Different from *dharma*, different from *adharma*, different from this cause and effect" is the definition of *aathmaa* / *Brahman* given by the *Katopanishad* (I. 2.14).

But, still, *mahaa vaakyam*, in an ingenious manner, cancels all the subjects, objects, instrument, attributes etc.; and, the finally revealed *aathmaa* is neither a *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*. Because of this, i.e. "*kaaraka-kriyaa-vilakshana-aathma- bodhakathvaath*", *mahaa vaakyam* is *avaakyam*. *Mahaa vakyyam*, even though it is a *vaakyam*, for all practical purposes, should be looked upon as *avaakyam*, because, when one finally arrive at the meaning, one arrives at an *aathma*, which is neither a *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*, whereas, any word in a normal sentence can either by only a *kaarakam* or *kriyaa*.

There may be an objection to this view, which objection also has to be discussed in this context. As indicated earlier, normally, in a sentence, most of the words will come under *kaarakam*, generating a *kriyaa*. But, exceptionally, there can be certain words in a sentence, which will be neither *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*; there may be words which reveal something, which is neither *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*.

An example is the sentence: "Dasarathaa's son goes to forest". In this sentence, there are three nouns, viz., 'Dasarathaa', 'son' and 'forest' ; and, an action is there, viz., the 'going' action.

In this sentence, the word 'son' comes under *kaarakam*, because it is the 'subject' going to the forest i.e. the 'going' action is done by the son; therefore the son is a 'generator' of the action. Similarly, the word 'forest' is also a generator, serving as destination or object; therefore, the word 'forest' is also a *kaarakam*.

But, what about the word 'Dasarathaa'?

All these are elaborately analyzed in Panini's grammar, in a portion called '*kaaraka prakaranam*'. What is attempted here is only a 'glimpse' of Panini's detailed / elaborate analysis.

Panini admits, in the *kaaraka prakaranam*, while discussing this particular sentence, that, the word 'Dasarathaa' is not contributing to the action of 'going' in any manner; because, it is neither the subject nor the object nor the instrument nor the destination nor the location. The word 'Dasarathaa' does not come under any *kaaraka*, because the word does not contribute to the action / the movement.

Then, can it be said that 'Dasarathaa' is a *kriyaa*? Certainly not. "Going" is the *kriyaa*. 'Dasarathaa' is neither *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*. But, the word **is** appearing in the sentence. The, what is its function?

Panini points out the obvious, that, the word is revealing a relationship. The 'apostrophe' sign following the word 'Dasarathaa', reveals a relationship. (Alternately, the sentence can run 'Son of Dasarathaa goes to the forest', in which sentence, the preposition 'of' will reveal the relationship). Such a word in a sentence, like 'Dasarathaa' in this particular sentence, revealing a relationship is neither a *kaarakam* nor *kriyaa*. Expressed in Sanskrit, it is a '*Kriyaa-kaaraka- vilakshana sambhandha bodhaka padham*'.

Therefore, what is Panini's teaching? He says: "A sentence has several words; and the words can reveal either '*kaarakam*' or '*kriyaa*' or '*sambhandha*'. A sentence can reveal either a *kaarakam* ('generator of action' is the definition of *kaarakam*), a *kriyaa* (an action) or a *sambhandha* (relationship). Every sentence can reveal only one of these three".

But, *mahaa vaakyam* is a most unique sentence in the entire *Vedhaanthic* teaching. What is that uniqueness? That sentence reveals an *aathmaa* which does not come under *kaarakam*, because it is not associated with any action and therefore is not a *kaarakam*. It is not a

kriyaa also; it is not an action. In fact, according to *Vedhaantha*, even 'awareness' / 'knowing' is not an action. 'Opening the eye' to perceive or know, is an action; but, the actual 'knowing' process is not an action. *Aathma* is not a *sambhandhaa* – relationship also. It cannot even have a *sambhandhaa*, leave alone being considered a '*sambhandhaa*'. *Sruthi* declares "*asangho hi ayam purusha:*" *Aathmaa* cannot have relationship with any object in the creation. This '*kriyaa-kaaraka-sambhandha-vilakshana aathmaa*' is revealed through a sentence, which, ironically, is full of *kaaraka vibakthi* and *kriyaa padham*. Uniquely this is the *aathmaa* revealed by the *mahaa vaakyam*.

To convey this *Paninian* message, Sureswaraachaaryaa is using the technical word '*avaakyartham*'. '*Avaakyartham*' / 'non-sentential meaning' is a 'loaded' word, and means a '*kriyaa-kaaraka-sambhandha-vilakshana aathma bodhaka vaakyam*'.

This is the second interpretation of '*avaakyartham*'.

A diligent aspirant understands such an *aathmaa* viz., '*kriyaa-kaaraka-sambhandha-vilakshana aathma*', through the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Reverting to the text, significantly, instead of saying "the *vidvaan* **understands** *avaakyartha aathmaa*", Sureswaraachaaryaa says "the *vidvaan* **remains** as *avaakyartha aathmaa*".

Why does he say so? Ans: If it is said "the wise man *understands* the *avaakyartha aathmaa*", it will be akin to reverting to a *vaakyartham*, in the form of subject/ object / understanding etc. Even this *kriyaa-kaaraka sambhandhaa* cannot be there, in relation to the '*kriyaa-kaaraka-sambhandha-vilakshana aathma*'.

Therefore, after *mahaa vaakyam*, what is there? 'I', the *aathmaa* **alone** is left out as Reality. Thereafter, everything else becomes *mithyaa*. The 5th capsule of *Vedhaantha* (as enunciated in other contexts), viz., "For a person who remembers the nature of oneself, the entire life is an entertainment" should be recollected in this context. The conviction should be "*kriyaa-kaaraka-sambhandha-vilakshana aathmaa asmi aham*. 'I' am a *nithya muktha:* /" The word '*avasishyathe*' meaning '**remains**' is, therefore, very significant and important

तस्मात् उच्यते - Therefore, the following *sloka* is presented.

Chapter III: Verse 29 –

देहादिव्यवधानत्वात्तदर्थं स्वयमप्यतः ।

पारोक्ष्येणैव जानाति साक्षात्त्वं तदनात्मनः ॥ २९ ॥

It is owing to the intervention of factors like the body, the meaning of 'That', though intrinsic to the Self, appears as if remote and mediately given and the non-Self seems to be immediately apprehended.

The *aathmaa* understood by the *mahaa vaakyam* is not an object of understanding. It is neither a remote object nor is it a proximate object; *aathmaa* happens to be 'I', the Subject; therefore, the knowledge of *aathmaa* is called *aparoksha jnaanam*.

To explain this statement: The knowledge of a remote object or indirect object is called *paroksha jnaanam*; the knowledge of a close-by / proximate or direct object is called *prathyaksha jnaanam*.

Even the knowledge of one's own body comes under *prathyaksha jnaanam* only, because body is also an object, though it is an intimate object. Knowledge of the mind is also *prathyaksha jnaanam*, because mind is also only an object, though very intimate. The knowledge of every experience in the mind is also *prathyaksha jnaanam*, because every experience is also an object, though, again, an intimate object. Thus, Body knowledge is also *prathyaksha jnaanam*; mind knowledge is also *prathyaksha jnaanam*; thought-knowledge is also *prathyaksha jnaanam*.

Of course, two marginally different terms are used, when one talks of *prathyaksha jnaanam*, viz., '*indriya prathyaksha jnaanam*' and '*saakshi prathyaksha jnaanam*'. Knowledge of an external object, say, the clip (on Swamiji's desk) is called *indriya prathyaksha jnaanam*; knowledge of one's own body, mind etc., is called *saakshi prathyaksha jnaanam*. The term '*saakshi prathyaksha jnaanam*' is used for awareness of one's own body and mind etc., since even if one's eyes are closed, one is aware of one's own body, mind and thoughts, since, they are very intimate objects and do not require the use of sense organs for 'knowing / awaring' them.

To recap: The knowledge of a remote object or place is termed '*paroksha jnaanam*'; the awareness or knowledge of another individual or an object, in proximity i.e. right in front of the perceiver is '*indriya prathyaksha jnaanam*'; the knowledge of one's own body, mind and thoughts, which does not require the use of sense organs is '*saakshi prathyaksha jnaanam*'.

But, what about the knowledge of Consciousness / the *saakshi chaithanyam* itself, when one claims "I am a Conscious being"? Does that 'knowledge of Consciousness' come under *paroksham* or *indriya prathyaksham* or *saakshi prathyaksham*? If these questions are raised, the answer will be "It (*Jnaanam* of Consciousness) does not come under *paroksham* or *indriya prathyaksham* or *saakshi prathyaksham*". But, nevertheless, Consciousness is 'known'

by me, proved by the very fact that, I say "I am conscious". Therefore, that *jnaanam* should come under some category, other than all the above three, namely, *paroksha jnaanam*, *indriya prathyaksha jnaanam* and *saakshi prathyaksha jnaanam*. Expressed in Sanskrit: "*Paroksha jnaana indriya prathyaksha jnaana saakshi prathyaksha jnaana vilakshanam saakshi chaithanya jnaanam asthi.*" *Advaita dharsanam* uses the word '*aparoksha jnaanam*' for this unique category. '*Aparoksham*' conveys the meaning "it is experienced in the form of 'I', the Subject of all experiences". According to *Advaita Vedhaanthaa*, '*aathma jnaanam*' is always '*aparoksha jnaanam*'.

Having known **what** is meant by '*aparoksha jnaanam*', the next question is: "**When** is the *aathmaa aparoksham*?" Ans: "*Aathmaa* is *aparokshaa all the time*".

The nature of knowledge of other objects in the world will gradually change. For instance, the knowledge of a mango in the shop is *paroksham*; when the mango is bought from the shop, brought home, cut into pieces and is on the table, ready to be eaten, the knowledge of the same mango, comes under *indriya prathyaksha jnaanam*; later, when the mango is eaten and its taste is experienced in the mind, at that time, the knowledge of the mango is converted from *indriya prathyaksham* to *saakshi prathyaksham*, as the taste of the mango is 'experienced' in the mind. In the same manner, all the other objects will change from *paroksham* to *prathyaksham* - *indriya prathyaksham* or *saakshi prathyaksham*; but, *aathmaa* is **nithya** *aparoksham* / *aathma jnaanam* is *aparoksha jnaanam* only.

Now, Sureswaraacharya says, that, even though the *chaithanyam* is *aparoksham all the time*, because of *deha abhimaanaa*, *aathmaa* is mistaken as *paroksham*. The *nithya aparoksha aathmaa* appears as *paroksham*, because of *deha abhimaanaa*.

How do we know this? Ans: Because many people are 'waiting' for *aathma aparoksha jnaanam*. Even though *aathmaa* **is** *nithya aparoksham*, they are wrongly 'waiting' for *aathma aparoksha jnaanam*, because, they think that *aathmaa* is a remote object; some even think, that, in meditation, it will 'arrive' from somewhere outside the body or maybe from inside one's own body. They have the wrong notion "It (*aathma jnaanam*) will be arriving shortly; I will be experiencing it". Thus, a non-remote *aathmaa* is made to appear remote. This mistaken notion is because of *deha abhimaanaa*. That is what, the *Aacharya* also says here:

- देहादि व्यवधानत्वात् - Because of the distance caused by the body, '*vyavadhaanam*' means 'distance' or 'remoteness'.

By whom or what is that 'distance' or 'remoteness' caused? Ans: By '*dehaadhi*' / by the body etc.

How does the body cause the distance? Ans: Because of *deha abhimaanaa*. The term '*Dehaadhi vyavadhaanam*' should be understood as '*dehaadhi abhimaana janitha vyavadhaanam*'. The 'remoteness' is not real; it is false.

- तदर्थ - Paramaathmaa or Brahman,

'Thadhartham' means 'thadh padha lakshyaartham', viz., Brahman.

- स्वयम् अपि - though ever experienced in the form 'I' am,

'Svayam api' implies 'nithya anubootha svaroopaa: api' / 'nithya upalabhdha svaroopaa: api'

The experience of *Brahman* or *aathmaa* is there, all the time. Dayananda Swamiji stresses this and says: "There is only one *anubhava* you need not work for. For every other *anubhavaa*, you have to put forth effort. There is one *anubhavaa* for which you need not put forth any effort whatsoever. That *anubhavaa* is *Brahma anubhavaa* or *aathma anubhavaa*, because we have *brahma anubhavaa* all the time, in the form of Consciousness. In fact, it is because of the experience of Consciousness, you want to experience / you do experience all the other things in the world".

But, even though *brahma anubhava* is there all the time as *saakshi* or Consciousness i.e. even though *Brahman* / *aathmaa* is thus experienced all the time, the ignorant individual conceives of that *Brahman*, as though it is remote. Sureswaraachaarya points this out:

- पारोक्षेण इव जानाति - is understood as though it is remote.

It is commonly seen, that, quite a number of persons, even after the study of *Vedhaanthaa* for a number of years, tend to state: "I have got book / theoretical / intellectual knowledge of *Brahman*. But, I do not have the 'experience' of *Brahman* at all" and yearn "When will I get that *anubhavam*?" They think that they have failed in their *saadhanaas* and wonder if an increase in the duration of their 'meditation' will help them 'experience' *Brahman*. Even advanced students of *Vedhaanthaa* thus 'wait' for *Brahma anubhavaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa, elsewhere, strongly chastises such students as: "*Tham katham bodhayeth saasthram loshtam nara samaakruthim*" – "How can I teach *saasthram* to such a student made up of solid clay?" He implies: "I have repeated several times that *Brahman* is *chaithanyam*; and, that, you have that *chaithanya abubhavaa* all the time; still, you have the foolish notion that you are yet to 'experience' that *chaithanyam*".

What the *Vedhaanthic* aspirant has to learn and be convinced of, is that (i) *chaithanyam* is not a product or property (ii) he / she always has that *Chaithanya anubhavam* and (iii) he / she does not have to 'get' it afresh from elsewhere.

But, "*dehaadhi vyavadhaanathvaath paarokshyenaive jaanaathi*" – "because of *deha abhimaanaa*, (wrongly) understands that *Brahman* as though, it is remote". Not only that, an ignorant person wrongly views the *body* as *aparoksham*.

- तत् साक्षात्त्वं - That *aparoksha jnaanam*,
- अनात्मन(जानाति) : - is associated with *anaathmaa*.

The *aparoksha jnaanam*, which should be associated with Consciousness or *aathmaa* and which should be expressed as " 'I' am *aathmaa*", is wrongly associated with the body instead of *aathmaa* ; and , the ignorant person reveals that wrong notion, by the expression "I am the body". Instead of '*aathma aparoksha jnaanam*', he has come down to '*deha aparoksha jnaanam*'. *Aathma aproksha jnaanam* is expressed as "I am *aathmaa*"; *deha aparoksha jnaanam* is expressed as "I am *deha*." This is an universal and common problem. Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an example for this.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 30:

यथोक्तार्थप्रतिपत्तिसौकर्याय दृष्टान्तोपादानम् ।

To put this point in a clearer light, an analogy is given:

Sureswaraachaarya says: "I will give you an example to convey this idea".

- प्रतिपत्ति सौकर्याय - For the facility of understanding '*saukaryam*' means 'facility'; '*prathipatthi*.' means 'knowledge' or 'understanding'.
- यथोक्त अर्थ - the above mentioned idea,

What is the 'above mentioned idea'? Ans: "The ever Conscious, ever available, proximate *Brahman* is considered as remote".

- दृष्टान्त उपादानम् - an example is given.

'*dhrushtaantham*' means 'example' and '*upaadhaanam*' means 'presentation' or 'introduction.'

Chapter III: Verse 30 –

प्रत्यगुद्भूतपित्तस्य यथा बाह्यार्थपीतता ।

चैतन्यं प्रत्यगात्मीयं बहिर्वत् दृश्यते तथा ॥ ३० ॥

One who suffers from jaundice in himself sees all things as yellow. Similarly, the Consciousness that is constitutive of the Self appears as if it were an external reality.

An example often quoted in the *Vedhaantha Saasthra* is given, by Sureswaraachaaryaa. The example is based on common experience. When a person gets diseased by jaundice, too much of bile (*pittham* in Tamil) is produced in his body. Bile is yellow in colour. As a consequence, the whole body of the patient turns yellow; the eyes also get yellow, commonly termed as 'jaundiced eye'. When the eyes are thus yellow, the patient tends to attribute the yellowness of the eye to every object that he sees. The patient reports, even a conch, which is reputed to be pure white, as '*peetha: sankha:*' – 'the conch is yellow'. What has happened here? The yellow colour which is 'proximate' to the patient, has been falsely seen as though 'outside'. A different modern example can also be given. A person wearing dark glasses attributes darkness to the external world.

In a similar fashion, though *Brahman* is available as Consciousness, close by, that *Brahman* is made remote; the *Visishtaadvaitin* wants to go to *Vaikunta* to meet that *Brahman*. There are some other people 'meditate' for the 'arrival' of *Brahman*. All these people have got the mistaken notion that *Brahman* is 'away', because of the 'jaundiced' understanding called *adhyaasa:* /

142. Chapter III, Verse 30 and 31 (20-06-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is emphasizing the importance of thvam padha vichaaraa, which consists in using the technique of anvaya vyathirekha and arriving at 'myself' as a self revealing Consciousness principle, which is always available, evident and experienced, whenever we use the expression "'I' am".

Whenever we say "'I' am", the Consciousness principle is available as the self revealing *chaithanyam*; to express it differently, when the Consciousness is revealing itself as "'I' am", that Consciousness is alone called the *saakshi chaithanyam*. And, it is this *saakshi chaithanyam*, which is always evident and available, that is equated with *Brahman*, the *sarva adhishtaanam*.

But, when I say "'I' am", it is not only the *saakshi* that reveals itself, as 'I', the *chaithanyam*; simultaneously, the body-mind complex also reveals itself in the expression "I am". This body-mind complex, which is also revealing itself along with the word 'I', is not an integral part of the *saakshi*; it is only '*saakshi prathyaksham*', i.e. it is '*revealed* by the *saakshi*', as an object only.

Even though, thus, in addition to the *saakshi chaithanyam*, this body-mind complex also is revealed, as *ahamkaaraa*, in the expression "I am", the seeker's attempt should be "to intellectually exclude the body-mind complex, from the expression 'I am', through *anvaya vyathirekha* logic and to understand this body-mind complex as only an 'object' of this self revealing *saakshi*".

Why do we consider the body-mind complex as an 'object'? Ans : Because body-mind complex being inert matter, it does not have self-revealing capacity. If body has got self revealing capacity, even a statue can say "I am". That does not happen. The body-mind complex, being similar to an inert statue, does not have self-revealing capacity and therefore is only an object. And, what type of object? Ans: It is not '*indriya vishaya*'; i.e. it is not an object of 'sense organs'; but is an object of *saakshi*. The external world is an object of sense organs – *indriya prathyaksham*, whereas body-mind complex is not *indriya prathyaksham* but *saakshi prathyaksham*.

To re-cap: When I say "'I' am", two things are simultaneously revealed. One is the self revealing *saakshi* (Consciousness); and, mixed with *saakshi*, the *saakshi prathyaksha vishaya* / the object of *saakshi*, the body-mind complex, is also simultaneously revealed.

An example for this, which example has been given on earlier occasions also, is: "When you stretch your palm and look at your outstretched palm, you are experiencing the 'palm'; and,

along with the 'palm', the light that makes the 'palm' visible, is also experienced. The self-revealing light and the hand which is revealed by the light are both there, though, invariably, the presence of the light goes unnoticed".

In a similar manner, whenever you say "'I' am", *saakshi* is also evident; and *saakshi*-revealed body-mind is also evident; but, while the body-mind is realized in the statement "'I' am", the general tendency is to ignore or overlook the *saakshi chaithanyam* component.

The aim of *thvam padha vicharaa* is to consciously do the reverse, viz., "excluding the *saakshi*-revealed body mind complex and taking only the formless Consciousness part as 'I am'".

But, ironically, to exclude the body-mind complex and claim "I am the Consciousness", one has to use the body-mind complex. Because, *saakshi*, by itself, cannot exclude the body and mind and say "I am *saakshi*". To say "I am the *saakshi*", the *saakshi* requires the body-mind complex.

Thus, one has to use the body-mind complex and exclude the body-mind complex and say "I am the *saakshi*". One should entertain this thought *through* the mind, but learn to exclude the mind, in understanding the *saakshi* component of "'I' am".

If a seeker can successfully do this, which is the subtlest part of *thvam padha vicharaa*, thereafter, he / she can understand and claim: "(i) 'I' am not a part, product or property of the body-mind complex. (ii) 'I' am not even a part, product or property of the thought 'I' am'. 'I' am an independent principle, different from not only the body-mind complex, but, different from even the thought 'I' am'. When I say "'I' am", the thought part is not me; but, in the thought, the Consciousness is there. That Consciousness is independent of the body-mind complex. (iii) 'I' am not limited by the boundaries of the body mind complex and (iv) 'I' continue to survive even after the disintegration of the body-mind complex".

If the seeker can, thus, arrive at that *saakshi chaithanyam* independent of the body-mind complex, as the meaning of "'I' am", through *thvam padha vicharaa*, which is only a cognitive, discriminating process, if that part is diligently taken care of, Sureswaraacharya assures that such a seeker can very easily claim "*aham Brahma asmi*", without feeling any 'jerk' or disturbance in the intellect.

But, the problem is, that, it is at this stage, that most students 'goof' up ; when they say "'I' am", instead of taking the Consciousness component in the body mind complex as 'I', they leave out or ignore the Consciousness component, and take the body-mind complex itself as 'I'. This is because the body-mind complex is always very, very dominant.

Body-mind complex is dominant, because it has got beauty, variety, novelty etc. Because of this, when one says "'I' am", instead of claiming the *saakshi* component as 'I', one has the tendency to claim the *sakshi prathyaksha* body-mind component as 'I'. And, once the *saakshi*, very much available in the body mind complex, is thus ignored, that *saakshi* cannot be recognized elsewhere. It **has** to be recognized as the Consciousness available in "'I' am"; if the Consciousness in "'I' am", is missed out, then, that Consciousness is missed for good, because, it can never be perceived outside as *indriya prathyaksham*.

To repeat: The *aparoksha saaksi* is ignored. (What is meant by *aparoksha saaksh*? Ans: The *saakshi* component readily available in "'I' am" experience.) *Prathyaksha saakshi* is not available, because *saakshi* is not an object of sense organs. Then, as an inevitable consequence, a blunder is committed. That blunder alone is described in this *sloka*.

What is the blunder that is committed? Ans: Such a seeker, who has missed the *saakshi chaitanyam* component in the experience "'I' am", makes that *saakshi* a *paroksha vasthu*, as something available elsewhere, which he / she has to 'wait for', to experience through a mystical event. Such a seeker introduces mysticism in *Vedhaanthetaa*, where no mysticism is involved. Therefore, what does he / she think that he / she should do? Ans: "Sit in meditation, enter into *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* and expect that mysterious *saakshi* to 'arrive' in the fourth *avasthaa*, viz., *samaadhi*." After meditating for years and years, some experience or other might 'arrive' – the vision of a light or some stars or a circle and this tired meditator concludes that, that is *Brahman* and claims "I had *Brahman* experience". *Brahman* or *saakshi* will never 'arrive' in this manner.

This blunder is a natural consequence of missing the *saakshi* in the experience "'I' am". Therefore, Sureswaraacharya warns the seekers: "avoid this pitfall".

The blunder that is committed by the seeker is discussed in this *sloka*, with an example. (This was partly covered in the earlier session also).

The example given by the *Aacharyaa* is: "When a person suffers from jaundice, the bile or *pittham* in his body is increased or enhanced; as a consequence, the patient's body and eyes turn yellow; the patient, because of *adhyasaa*, erroneously sees the yellowness of the bile or *pittham*, which is inside the body, in external objects perceived by him. Even pearl-white objects are seen as yellow objects by him and the patient even says "*peetha: sankha:*", though an yellow conch does not exist at all. Just as, in this example, something which is available within the body, is falsely thrown outside the body, in a similar manner, *Brahman* which is available within, all the time in the "'I' experience", is thrown out falsely, as a *paroksha vasthu*".

Aparoksha brahmana: parokshee karanam is a blunder, like aparoksha pitthasya parokshee karanam or prathyak pitthasya bahishkaranam.

Reverting to the text (verse 30),

- यथा - Just as
- प्रत्यक् उद्भूत पित्तस्य - for a person who has got 'enhanced' *pittham* inside,

In this context, the term '*prathyak udhbootha pittha:*' is *bahuvreehi samaasam*, referring to a person who is endowed with the condition of 'enhanced *pittham*' inside the body. '*Udhbootham*' means 'enhanced'. Why does the *Aachaaryaa* say 'enhanced'? Ans: Some amount of *pittham* is required by all the people. But, for a jaundiced person, *pittham* is enhanced, because of which, 'yellowness' becomes pronounced within the body, including the eye. For such a person:

- बाह्यार्थ पीतता - there is 'yellowness' seen in external objects (even though the perceived 'yellowness' is not true),

'*Baahyaartham*' means 'external object'.

- तथा - in a similar manner,
- प्रत्यगात्मीयं चैतन्यं - the *saakshi chaithanyam*, which is always experienced in the " 'I' am" self-experience,

"*chaithanyam prathyagathmeeyam*" means "*prathyagaathma sambhandhi chaithanyam*" or "the Consciousness that is constitutive of the Self".

The very beginning of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa's Maneeshaa Panchakam* refers to the same idea. It is "*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa yaa samvidhujjrumbathe*" – "That which shines forth very clearly in the three states of 'waking', 'dream' and 'deep sleep'", '*yaa*' referring to the *saakshi chaithanyam*. This *Maneeshaa Panchakam* verse also, implies: " In the " 'I' am" experience of all the three states, *saakshi* is clearly experienced (*sputatharaa samvidhujjrumbathe*); others 'come and go' / 'arrive and depart'; but, *saakshi* is always experienced".

Even though that is the fact, for the spiritually ignorant person,

- बहिरवत् दृश्यते - (the prathyagaathmeeyam chaithanyam) appears as an external object

For such a person (who has got 'spiritual jaundice'), *Brahman* becomes an external object, as it were, 'waiting' to be experienced, in the 'white heat' of meditation or during some other *saadhanaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 31:

यस्मादेवमतो विशुद्धमवसीयताम् ।

Such being the case, let this be firmly understood.

Introducing the 31st verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes his discourse on the importance of *thvam padha vichaaraa*. He says:

- अतः यस्मात् - Because of this reason,
- एवं विशुद्धं अवसीयताम् - let the following be clearly ascertained :

'*Visuddham*' means 'clearly' or 'firmly'; '*Avaseeyathaam*' is passive voice, meaning '*thvayaa avaseeyathaam*' or "let it be ascertained / understood by you".

What should be ascertained? That is said in the *slokaa* that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 31 -

पदान्युद्धृत्य वाक्येभ्यो ह्यन्वयव्यतिरेकतः ।

पदार्थाल्लोकतो बुद्ध्वा वेत्ति वाक्यार्थमञ्जसा ॥ ३१ ॥

Let the words be properly taken and let their meanings be properly understood through rational discrimination and the usage of the world. Then the final import of the proposition is rightly grasped.

In this verse, Sureswaraachaarya is entering into another important topic as a corollary of the earlier discussion. The essence of the new topic is: "*Mahaa vaakyam* will give the direct knowledge of *Brahman*, only under one condition. That condition is, that, every word in the *mahaa vaakyam* should be fully comprehended at the time of listening. Conversely, if every word of the *mahaa vaakyam* is fully comprehended, for the thus prepared student, the *mahaa vaakyam* can directly give *aparoksha jnaanam*".

The student might require a number of years for the full comprehension of each of the words `thvam` and `thadh`. The student's efforts can be considered as fructified, only as and when he listens to the word `thvam` or says the word `aham`, at that very moment, he is able to exclude the *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of the possessions, profession, family, body and mind, and understand the expression `thvam` or `aham` as referring to the independent, formless, space-like Consciousness only. The understanding must be instantaneous.

Similarly, the moment he listens to the word `thadh`, he should understand the word as referring to "that *Brahman*, which is in the form of Pure Existence, which is not a part, product or property of matter and which is a formless, all-pervading, space-like principle". This understanding also must be instantaneous.

Thus, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, the student must have independently practiced `thvam padha vicharaa` and independently practiced `thadh padha vicharaa`, both, if necessary, for a number of years, till the practice gives him such a skill, that, as even as the words `thadh` and `thvam` are listened to, they should refer to the `sath` and `chith` part alone. `Chith` being formless and `sath` also being formless, the `sath-chith` equation must immediately become meaningful. The conviction "'I' am the Consciousness, who happen to be the Existence also" should be so firm, that the *Kaivalya Upanishad* declaration "*mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathishtatham mayi sarvam layam yaati thad brahmaadvayam asmi aham*" will not be mere 'lip service', but, a heart-felt fact.

In essence, Sureswaraachaarya says, that, (i) for a prepared student, *mahaa vaakyam* **can** directly give *aparoksha jnaanam* (ii) *mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can give *aparoksha jnaanam* and (iii) if *mahaa vaakyam* does not give *aparoksha jnaanam*, **nothing else**, including meditation, can. Any amount of meditation cannot produce *aparoksha jnaanam*.

This is the thesis of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*: (1) *mahaa vakyam* **can** give *aparoksha jnaanam* at the time of listening; (2) *mahaa vaakyam* **does** give *aparoksha jnaanam* at the time of *sravanam*; (3) *mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can give *aparoksha jnaanam* and (4) most importantly, if *mahaa vaakyam* does not give *aparoksha jnaanam* at the time of *sravanam*, meditation cannot give *aparoksha jnaanam*.

That is because, in *Vedhaantha*, meditation is never accepted as a source of knowledge. According to *Advaita Vedhaantha Saasthraas*, there are only six sources of knowledge: (1) *Prathyakshaa* (2) *anumaana* (3) *upamaana* (4) *arthaa patthi* (5) *anupalabdhi* and (6) *sabdaa*. *Dhyaanam* is not at all considered a *pramaanam* / source of knowledge.

Sureswaraacharya says *aparoksha jnaanam* is only through *sabda pramaanam*. Therefore, if a student complains "I have listened; but I do not have *aparoksha jnaanam*", the *Aachaaryaa* would only advise "Listen again". And "Again, if necessary". *Sravanam* and repeated *sravanam* has to / will make it clear to a seeker, that '*aham brahma asmi*' is a fact, so that the seeker can successfully follow 'binary' format.

In other words, "*sabda paramaanam* for *aparoksha jnaanam*" is the thesis of the *Aachaaryaa*. *Sabda* means *vaakyam*, in this context.

The *Aachaaryaa* divides the general term *vaakyam* into two types (i) *loukika vaakyaani* - worldly sentences and (ii) *vaidhika vaakyaani* – *saasthric* sentences.

Sureswaraacharya avers: "*Loukika vaakyaani* will give only theoretical knowledge, which will have to be confirmed or validated through another experience or *pramaanam*. *Loukika sabda pramaanam*, is, therefore, non-final. On the other hand, *mahaavaakya janya jnaanam*, the knowledge resulting from the *maha vaakyam*, is final knowledge, which does not require validation or confirmation through any other mystic experience or through any other *pramaanam*, because, there is no other *pramaanam* also to confirm this knowledge".

In the case of *loukika sabdaa*, if one gains any knowledge through a book, for instance, about Gangodhri, that knowledge can be confirmed through a sensory experience. But, in the case of *maha vaakya jnaanam*, a different confirming mystic experience is not possible, because if there is a confirming experience, that will become another *pramaanam*; but, in the *Vedhaanthic* tradition, no other *pramaanam* is accepted to confirm the knowledge of the Self / *aathma jnaanam*. Except *sabda pramaanam*, no other *pramaanam* is either possible or needed.

"Therefore" the *Aachaaryaa* appeals "may you approach *vaakya pramaanam* diligently. Do not dismiss the study of *Vedhaanthaa* as mere book-knowledge. You have to respectfully approach *sabda pramaanam*."

As a part of that appeal, Sureswaraacharya talks about how *sabda pramaanam* comes into the life of a human being. For acquisition of knowledge through sense organs or through *prathyaksha pramaanaa*, the *pramaanaa* 'comes into' the life of a human being even at the time of the birth of the human being; it need not 'come into' the life of a human being later. In other words, *prathyaksha pramaanam* is 'inborn' in a human being, in the form of sense organs like eyes, ears, tongue, skin etc. On the other hand, *sabda pramaanam* is not 'in-born'. It is an acquired *pramaanam*, which comes into existence, through a gradual educational process; it comes into existence gradually as the child gets older and older. The *saasthraas* analyze as to how a child picks up *sabda pramaanam*, as

the child grows. Interestingly, this analysis and related topics are used as parts of *mahaa vaakya vicharaa* by Sureswaraacharya.

How does a child pick up *sabda pramaanam*? 'Picking up *sabdapraamaanam*' is 'understanding the relationship between a *padha* and its *artha* - the relationship between a word and its meaning'; in other words, 'picking up *sabdapraamaanam*' is nothing but understanding the *sambhandha* between a sound symbol and the corresponding external object in the creation. For instance, consider the word 'table'; it is a sound; the sound symbolizes an external object. The 'table' *sabda* and the 'table' *artha*: have got a relationship known as '*prakaasya prakaasaka sambhandha*.' a 'revealer- revealed relationship'. The sound is the revealer.

Considering another example, when a class is conducted by a teacher, what does the teacher do? He generates a 'series of sounds' and, as even as the teacher generates the sounds, mysteriously meanings are 'striking' the students and the 'teachings' are conveyed. Of course, if an individual, who does not know the language in which the class is conducted, is present during the course of the class, the teacher's words would not communicate anything to him.

As for the listener who knows and understands the language of the communication, actually two *pramaanam*-s work. Assuming that the listener's hearing faculty is in order, *prathyaksha pramaanam* works in the first stage. The sound is 'heard' by the listener. After the working of *prathyaksha pramaanam*, the second *pramaanam* viz., the *sabda pramaanam* takes over. How? A particular sound reveals a particular object. Thus, *prathyaksha pramaanaa* is separate; and, the *sabda pramaanaa* is separate.

In the case of a person, whose hearing faculty is sound, but, who does not know the language of the communication, only the *prathyaksha pramaanam* works for him. *Sabda pramaanam* does not work.

What Sureswaraacharya points out is "*Sabda pramaanam* is an acquired *pramaanam*; one has to know the '*prakaasya prakaasaka sambhandha*' existing between a sound symbol and a corresponding sense object".

How is the *sabda pramaanam* acquired? All these are analyzed very elaborately in the *pramaana saasthraa*; Sureswaraacharya briefly covers these topics, in this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. These topics are not found in other *Vedhaanthic* treatises and is therefore an unique feature of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

How does a child acquire *sabda pramaanam*? The methodology of acquisition of *sabda pramaana* by a child is called '*vruddha vyavahaara*.' | For this to happen, the child, of course, should have its hearing faculty in order. If a child is born deaf, it cannot acquire *sabda pramaanam*. Other methods, like lip movement, gestures etc. have to be used. *Sabda pramaanaa* is not available for a child born with impaired hearing.

A normal child gathers *sabda pramaanaa* through *vruddha vyavahaaraa*. What is *vruddha vyavahaaraa*? To explain this term:

"Assume that the child is in the presence of two adults, who are communicating through *sabda* i.e., words and sentences. One of the adults is *utthama vruddha*., meaning an elder adult and the other is a *madhyama vruddha*., meaning a younger adult. They are interacting. *Utthama madhyama vruddhayo: sabda vyavahaara* is taking place. And, the child is present during the *vyavahaaraa*. What kind of *vyavahaaraa* is taking place? The elderly adult is giving a series of commandments to the younger adult; and, the younger adult is implementing the commandments. The child is *hearing* the 'words' of commandments from the *utthama vruddha*: and is also *watching* the corresponding 'actions' by the *madhyama vruddha*:. 'Action' follows, after every commandment. Therefore, the child, as a first step, understands that, words can communicate / that, words can convey sense.

"Then, the child sufficiently grown up, uses *anvaya vyathirekha* method, unknowingly / instinctively, by seeing the varied and unvaried words in the commandments and understands the nouns and verbs gradually.

"How does the child understand the nouns and verbs?

"Let us assume that four commandments are given by a husband, the *utthama vruddha*, to his wife: '(1) Bring the cow (2) wash the cow (3) feed the cow and (4) tie the cow'. In these four commandments, the verbs are varied. But, the noun, the 'cow', is unvaried. Assume, that, the wife, the *madhyama vruddha* implements the commandments. Different types of actions - *bringing* the cow, *washing* the cow, *feeding* the cow and *tying* the cow - are performed by her. In all these four actions, what is common? 'Cow' is common. Therefore, in the actions also, as in the commandments, there is one 'unvaried', namely, the cow.

"In the verbal expressions there is one 'unvaried' - the word 'cow'. In the actions, the object 'cow' also is unvaried. The others are varied in both the commandments and the actions. From that, the child gradually understands that the word / sound 'cow' and the animal 'cow' have a connection. By seeing the common sound and the common object, the relationship between the inherent word and the inherent object is learnt by the child. Of course, in a

single commandment, the relationship cannot be learnt by the child. In a series of commandments one 'word' / one 'sound' is common and in the following actions one 'object' is common. From that, the relationship between the sound symbol 'cow' and the animal 'cow' is made. This is how the nouns are gradually picked up.

"Consider another instance: Suppose the *utthama vruddha* says '(1) bring the desk (2) bring the book (3) bring the pen and (4) bring the spectacles'. Here also four commandments are given. What is the difference between the earlier set of commandments and the present? In the previous set, the noun was unvaried – *anvaya*. In the present set of commandments, the verb 'bring' is unvaried. In all the four commandments, one sound symbol is unvaried, even though the 'objects' are changing. In response to the commandments, the *madhyama vruddha* brings the desk, brings the book, brings the pen and brings the spectacles. The child is watching the actions. From that, the relationship between the verb used and the relevant action is understood by the child.

"This method of understanding is *anvaya vyathirekha* and this *vyavahaaraa* between the *utthama* and *madhyama vruddha* is called '*aavaapa udhvaapa vyavahaaraa*'. This term '*aavaapa udhvaapa vyavahaaraa*' means "different words are introduced and removed, but, keeping one word as unvaried/ common". To repeat: "Keeping one word as unvaried and bringing in other words and removing them" is called '*aavaapa udhvaapa vyavahaaraa*'. When the commandment 'bring the desk' is given, the word desk is brought in, termed '*aavaapa*'; when the next commandment 'bring the book' is given, 'book' '*aavaapa*' takes place and the word 'desk' is now '*udhvaapa*' and so on."

Thus, "aavaapa udhvaapa roopa utthama madhyama vruddha vyavahaaraath anvaya vyathirkha nyaayena padha padhartha sambhandha: jnaayathe" – "By watching the interaction between two adults, the elder adult giving verbal instructions and the younger adult carrying out the instructions, the interaction being of the nature of what is known as '*aavaapa udhvaapa vyavahaaraa*', and by applying instinctively the *anvaya vyathirkha* logic, the relationship between a word and its meaning is understood".

This is how children learn their mother-tongue. They may learn other languages later, in schools. But, they pick up their first *sabda pramaana* called mother tongue, in the manner explained above, as analyzed and detailed by *Saasthraas*.

Reverting to the text, verse 31:

- वाक्येभ्यः पदानि उद्धृत्य - Picking up the words from sentences,
- लोक्तः - used in worldly transactions,

As explained, a child picks up the unvaried words occurring in several commandments given by *utthama vruddha* to *madhyama vruddha*. '*Utthama madhyama vruddha vyavahaara*' is a typical example of 'worldly transactions'
'*Vaakyebhya:*' means 'from the sentences'.

What does the child do? The term '*padhaani uddhruthya*' answers this. The child 'picks up' the unvaried noun or the unvaried verb. The child, of course, does not use the words noun or verb. But it understands nouns also and understands verbs also.

- अन्वय व्यतिरेकतः - and by applying the method of *anvaya vyathirekhaa*,

What does the child do further? The unvaried 'sound' is picked up; the unvaried 'action' also is picked up and they are connected. In the example given, 'cow' word is common to the four commandment sentences; 'cow' animal is common to the four actions. The common 'cow word' and the common 'cow animal/ object' are picked up and matched. This methodology is '*anvaya vyathirakha*', though, of course a child would not know this technical term, but, nevertheless use the method instinctively, especially with regard to its mother tongue.

- पदार्थान् बुद्ध्वा - learning the meanings also of the words,

'*Padhaartham buddhvaad*' means 'learning the connection between a *padhaa* and its *arthaa* / a word and its meaning'.

Learning the connection between *padha* and its *arthaa* is called *sabda sakthi*: | In another advanced *Vedhaanthic* text, *Vichaara Saagaraa* , all these topic are more elaborately discussed. There are different theories also on this topic– *Vedhaanthin'* s theory, *naiyyaikaas* theory, *meemaasakaas* theory etc. In the treatise, *Vichaara Saagaraa*, its author establishes the *Vedhaanthic* theory of how we understand 'sound', refuting all other theories on the topic, by valid arguments.

Reverting to the text, ultimately what does the child do? Not only does the child understand the language from the mother, later, with that *sabda pramaana* the child is able to employ it everywhere else also. This is similar to an youngster learning cycling on a vacant football field and acquiring the capacity to ride the cycle later on crowded roads also. Similarly *sabda pramaanaa* is available not only at home, but everywhere else also. So, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- वाक्यार्थम् वेत्ति - understands sentences used by others in different contexts,
- अञ्जसा - directly / immediately.

143. Chapter III, Verse 31 to 33 (04-07-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about the mahaa vaakyam functioning as a pramaanam and revealing the jeevaathma-paramaathma-eikyam. The mahaa vaakyam happens to be a sabda pramaanam, the term 'sabda pramaanam' meaning 'language used to communicate an idea'. Sabda pramaanam, unlike prathyaksha pramaanam, does not come into the life of a human being at the time of birth itself. The prathyaksha pramaanam, in the form of sense organs, comes into the life of a human being, even at the time of birth. But, sabda pramaanam enters into the life of an individual, only during the growth of the individual. Pramaana saasthraas have made a study of as to how sabda pramaanam enters into the life of a human being.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is briefly referring to the functioning of *sabda pramaanam*, based on the *pramaana saasthraas*. He points out that *sabda pramaanam* comes into the life of a child, by association with *vruddha vyavahaaraa*, meaning, 'by observation of the interaction taking place between two elderly people, who have got knowledge of the language'. The child hears the commandments given by one elder to another elder and also sees that every commandment is followed by a corresponding action by the second elder. The child observes that there is a verbal commandment, followed by a physical action and learns to co-relate the commandment and the action. And, the child indirectly understands that the commandment is able to convey a message and that is why, it is followed by the action. The fact, that the commandment can give a message, makes it a *sabda pramaanam*. Even though, obviously, the child cannot and does not use technical words like *pramaanam* etc., the child understands the commandment and its message, by the following action and thus the co-relation between the commandment and the action.

Afterwards, the child sees the unvaried part of the various commandments and the unvaried part of the actions. Suppose, there are several commandments, as in the example given during the earlier session: "Bring the cow, wash the cow, feed the cow and tie the cow". These are four different commandments, in which the child listens to one non-varied word cow. The child also sees four different actions. Even though the actions are varied, in all of them there is a non-varied object, namely, the cow. By observing this, the child sufficiently grown up, understands the relationship between the 'word' cow and the 'object' cow.

What is this knowledge, gained by the child? Ans: It is termed '*Padha artha sambhandha grahanam*'. '*Padha arthayo: grahana sambhandham*' takes place. 'Cow *padha* (word)' and 'cow *artha* (object)' *sambhandhaa* is grasped. This method is called *anvaya vyathirekaa* method or *aavaapa udhvaapa* method. Thus, *vruddha vyavahaaraa*, through *anvaya vyathirekaa* method and *aavaapa udhvaapa* method, educates the child on the functioning of *sabda pramaanaa*.

In every household, special words are used for different objects. The child initially picks up these special words and gradually builds up a vocabulary of words or various *padhaas*. Later, after *padha jnaanam*, *vaakya jnaanam* also takes place; because, *vaakyam* is nothing but a group of words, arranged in syntactical order. *Padha jnaanam* takes place first; then, *vaakya jnaanam* takes place.

Thus, having initially gathered the *jnaanam* of a few *padhaas* and the *jnaanam* of a few *vaakyaas*, later, when the child is exposed to new sentences, the child is able to gradually derive 'knowledge' from even the new sentences, based on its already acquired *padha jnaanam*. Extending the same principle, it stands to reason, that, the *mahaa vaakyam* also, will be able to convey its meaning, because *mahaa vaakyam* also consists of words only. Thus, a person is able to grasp the message of *mahaa vaakyam*, in which *sabda pramaanam* functions. This was the idea given in the 31st *sloka*, completed in the previous session.

Now, Sureswaraachaarya wants to tackle a new problem that can crop up in the functioning of *sabda pramaana*. He presents the new problem as a *poorva pakshaa* and then gives the answer. What is that problem?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 32:

कुतः पुनः सामान्यमात्रवृत्तेः पदस्य वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तिहेतुत्वमिति । बाढम् ।

How do terms standing for generalities produce the understanding of the specific meaning of propositions? It happens this way:

These are all technical topics; technical *poorva pakshaa* and technical *siddhaanthaa*. Also, this discussion is not commonly found in *Vedhaanthic* texts. In fact, it is almost unique to Naishkarmya Siddhi.

What is that discussion?

It is explained as below: In the earlier verse, the student learnt, that, by observing *vruddha vyavahaaraa* and later by directly listening to the elders, the child learns about words and the objects denoted by words. Imagine that the child later goes to school and the teacher teaches the child, the language of English; at home, the child has picked up only its mother tongue, assuming English is not its mother tongue. The child goes to school and the teacher points out to a tree and says in English, "this is a tree". The child learns to connect the 'sound / word tree' and the 'object tree'. Later, the teacher shows another tree and says "this is a tree". Imagine, that the child thus sees four different trees and understands the meaning of the word 'tree', connected with the object 'tree'.

Now, the analyzers of language ask the question: "When the child understands the word 'tree', referring to a 'tree' as an 'object', does the child understand a particular tree as a meaning of the word 'tree' or does the child understand the general 'tree'ness, as the meaning of the word 'tree'?" This is the analysis. To repeat: "By the word 'tree', does the child understand a particular tree or does the child understand certain common characteristics belonging to all the four trees seen by the child?" More explicitly: " Does the child understand a particular, say, a mango tree as the meaning or does the child understand a common characteristic, belonging to a number of trees, say, a mango tree, a tamarind tree, a coconut tree and a neem tree? What does the child understand as the meaning of 'tree'? Does the word tree refer to a particular characteristic belonging to a particular tree or does it refer to a common characteristic belonging to all the trees?"

In technical language, they frame the question as: "Is the meaning of a word 'a particular' or is the meaning of the word, 'the universal' "?

In *tharka saasthraa* language, they present it as '*jaathl*' and '*vyakthl*'. '*Vyakthl*' means 'particular'; '*jaathl*' means 'universal'. Long debates have been undertaken by philosophers of all *dharsanaa-s* – the *saamkhya* philosopher, the *yoga* philosopher, the *nyaaya* and *vaiseshikaa* philosophers, the *poorva meemaamsaa* and *utthara meemaamsaa* philosophers and, of course, the grammarians, on whether the word conveys a 'particular' or the 'universal'.

After the long debates, both *poorva meemaasakaas* and *advaitins* come to the conclusion that a word can never refer only to a 'particular', because, if a word, say, 'tree' refers only to a particular tree, then that word can never be used for any other tree. And, if it cannot be used for any other tree, when one comes across a new tree, one can never communicate that new tree, by using the word 'tree', because the listener has already associated the word 'tree' only with a particular tree. In the same manner, the word 'boy' can never refer only to a particular boy, since, in that case, one will never be able to use the word 'boy' to reveal other boys, playing or sitting.

Therefore, no word can refer to a particular object.

The contention of *Advaitam* is "After observing a few trees and hearing the word 'tree', the intellect connects the word 'tree' not with a particular tree; but, associates the word tree with the 'tree'ness', which is common to all the observed trees, and, in fact, of all the unobserved trees also. One might have observed only a few trees; but, one understands the 'tree'ness', not only belonging to the observed trees, but belonging to the unobserved trees also. For instance, if an individual goes to America and comes across a redwood tree, which

he / she has never seen earlier even in pictures or movies and somebody says "this is a redwood tree", the individual understands the word 'tree'.

Therefore, the conclusion is: "sabdaa: jaathi vaachakaa: na thu vyakthi vaachakaa:; Padham jaathi vaachakam, na vyakthi vaachakam". This can also be expressed as "padham saamaanya vaachakam na visesha vaachakam"; and, in yet another manner, as "padham aakruthi vaachakam". 'Aakruthi' means 'common features', belonging to all the trees, when the word 'tree' is mentioned; 'common features' belonging to all the boys when the word 'boy' is mentioned; 'common features' belonging to all the animals, when the word 'animal' is mentioned. The words 'tree', 'boy', 'animal' etc., refer to saamaanya gunaas.

This gives rise to a question. What is that?

The question is explained by an example, as follows: "Imagine there is a teacher and there is a student. The student has got the vocabulary; he knows what is a 'table', what is a 'chair', what is a 'pen', what is a 'book' etc. By the above theory of the *Advaitin*, the student should understand a 'table', to mean 'table^{ness}' common to all the tables; similarly, he should understand 'chair' to mean 'chair^{ness}' belonging to all the chairs.

"Suppose the teacher wants the student to get a particular chair closer. To communicate this message, he has to use language / words. He says: "Bring the chair closer". What does he want to communicate? He wants the student to bring a particular chair closer. When the teacher uses the language – the words – what will the student understand? *Jaathi* or *vyakthi*? As per the above theory, by the word 'chair', the student will understand the 'chair^{ness}', i.e. the *jaathi*; but the teacher does not want the student to bring the *jaathi* (all the chairs) closer but the *vyakthi* (a particular chair alone) closer. How can a 'chair^{ness}' *vaachaga sabda:* be used to specify a particular chair? Similarly, considering another example, how can a 'boy^{ness}' *vaachaka sabdha:*, namely 'boy', be used to specify a particular boy? How can anybody, say, the teacher, just command 'call the boy'? 'Boy' will mean 'universal boy^{ness}'. But, the teacher wants to call one particular boy.

"To express this problem in general terms: For communicating any instruction, the instructor has to use a sentence which contains words, which words can communicate only *jaathi*, as per the above theory. But the instructor may want to refer to a *vyakthi* alone.

"Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* raises this question: 'How can the teacher use a *jaathi vaachaka sabdha:* to specify a *vyakthi*?'"

'Universals' are not available for physical transaction. 'Particulars' alone are available for physical transactions. To quote another example, when someone says 'eat the mangoes',

the word 'mangoes' (according to the theory enunciated by both the *Meemaamsakaas* and the *Advaitins*) convey 'mango**ness**'. But 'mango**ness**' cannot be eaten; i.e. *jaathi* cannot be eaten; only *vyakthi* (a particular mango) can be eaten. Therefore, when someone wants another person to eat a particular mango, how will he / she communicate?

This is the *poorva pakshin's* question: "How can *jaathi vaachaka sabdhaas* reveal *vyakthi* for transaction? How can words revealing 'the universal', talk about or reveal a 'particular' for the sake of transaction? And, if they cannot reveal the 'particulars', how can we use the language for communication?"

This is the *purva pakshaa. Siddhaanthaa* will be discussed later.

Referring to the text: (*sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 32;)

- पदस्य सामान्यमात्रवृत्तेः - Since words deals with only 'universals',

The word 'boy' deals with 'boy**ness**', 'table' deals with 'table**ness**', 'mango' deals with 'mango**ness**' and so on.

'*Saamanyam*', in this context, means '*jaath*' or (in English) 'the universal'. '*Padhasya*' means 'of the words'.

- कुतः पुनः - how can
- वाक्यार्थप्रतिपत्तिहेतुत्वम् - they (words) be means of understanding 'particulars'?"

How can words dealing with 'the universal' be used to communicate 'a particular'? How can words referring to 'the universal', lead to the understanding of *vaakyarthaa-s*, which deal with 'particulars'?

"Bring a chair" means "Bring a particular chair"; but, the word 'chair' refers to 'universal chair**ness**'. How can a sentence communicate 'particular's, when the words can reveal only 'universal's? How does the transition take place from 'universal' to 'particular', at the time of communication?

These and similar doubts are raised with regard to both *loukika* and *vaidhika sabdhaa:*, including the *mahaa vaakyam*.

- इति - If such a question is asked,

- बाढम् - I (the *Aachaaryaa* admits) do accept such a problem existing.

First, Sureswaraachaarya appreciates the *poorva pakshin*, as if to tell the *poorva pakshin*: "You are a very good thinker ; you have understood the functions of words very well. Your *poorva pakshaa* is genuine. But, I have an answer to that, thought of, by me, long before. I will give you the answer".

The term '*bhaadam*' conveys '*artha angheekaara*.'| The *Aachaarya* tells the *poorva pakshin*: "I partially accept your *poorva pakshaa*; but I do not totally accept it, because the problem has been solved already".

Verse 31 – Chapter III:

सामान्यं हि पदं ब्रूते विशेषो वाक्यकर्तृकः ।

श्रुत्यादिप्रतिबद्धं सद्विशेषार्थं भवेत्पदम् ॥३२॥

A term, of course, stands for a universal. But, what is specific is conveyed by sentences. The term itself, determined by its particular context, acquires a determinate significance.

What is the answer?

A simple explanation, before entering the text is in order and is as follows:

"When a person tells another 'eat the mango', the listener who hears the word 'mango', initially understands the universal 'mango *ness*' only, because any word will only reveal the generality. In fact, the word, by itself, could include all the 132 known varieties of mangoes. That alone strikes the mind of the listener first, as the meaning of the word 'mango', since the *vaachyaartha* or primary meaning of a word is 'the universal' or '*saamaanyam*'. The listener had heard the speaker say 'eat the mango'. Now, the listener first tries to apply the primary meaning / '*vaachyaartha*' to the word 'mango'. But, he finds that the *vaachyaartha* cannot be applied here. Why not? Obviously because, the 'universal', the 'mango *ness*' or all the 132 varieties of mangoes, cannot be eaten. Since the commandment 'eat the mango' will not be sensible when one takes the *vaachyaartham*, what should one do? To make the command sensible, the listener has to drop the *vaachyaartha* and look for the *lakshyaartha*. The general rule is: 'When a listener wants to understand the meaning of a sentence, and finds that the *vaachyaartham* of a word in the sentence is not 'fitting' the situation, he should drop the *vaachyaartham* and look for the *lakshyaartham* or secondary meaning of the word.'

"In his treatise 'Vaakyavrutthi:', Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa eloquently gives expression to this general principle: 'Maanaantharavirodhe thu mukhyaarathasya parigrahe mukhyaarthena avinaabhootho lakshanaartha parikeerthithaa' – 'In case there is an inconsistency with other evidences in accepting the directly expressed meaning of a word, the meaning connected with what is denoted directly, and clearly intelligible by itself, is called the meaning indirectly expressed' (Verse 47).

"The essence of this *Vaakyavrutthi* verse is: ' When the *vaachyaartha* or primary meaning of a word in a sentence does not make the sentence sensible, drop the *vaachyaartha* of the word and look for the *lakshyaartha* or secondary meaning of the word, which, of course, should be closely associated with the *vaachyaartha*'.

"The secondary meaning of a word should be connected to the primary meaning of the word. In the example given above, a 'particular mango' is associated with the 'universal mango *ness*'. The 'particular mango' in front of the listener's eyes, is connected to the 'universal mango *ness*'. Therefore, what does the listener of the commandment do? He drops the *vaachyaartham* of the word 'mango' and understands the 'particular' mango in front of him, as the *lakshyaartham* of the word 'mango' and taking this *visesham*, enjoys the 'particular mango'.

"This happens to everyone all the time, under similar circumstances. The *saamaanyam* is unknowingly / instinctively dropped and the *visesham* taken.

"It can, therefore, be concluded from this, that *padham* conveys *saamaanyam* **independently**; but, **in a sentence**, conveys *visesham*. To repeat in English: Words **outside** a sentence convey 'the universal'; words **occurring in a sentence** convey 'the particular'.

Therefore (i.e., on the basis explained), the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- सामान्यं हि पदं ब्रूते - The word, of course, conveys 'the universal';
'*Bruthe*' means 'conveys / reveals'; '*saamaanyam*' means 'the universal'.

Every word in the dictionary, when it exists in our mind as a part of vocabulary, conveys only 'the universal' as its *vaachyaartha*. This is the conclusion of both the *Advaitin* and the *Poorva Meemaamsakaa*. Whereas:

- विशेषः वाक्यकर्तृकः - the 'particular' / specific meaning (of the word) is conveyed by sentences.

A word, which conveys only 'the universal' when mentioned independently, can reveal 'visesha.', the 'particular', when used in a sentence. What is the reason? Because *vaachyaarthaas* may not 'fit in', in a given context. For instance, in the examples earlier quoted, nobody can bring 'chairness' closer; only a particular chair can be brought closer. Therefore, the listener brings a particular chair closer. Nobody can call 'boyness' ; only a particular boy can be called. Therefore, the listener calls the particular boy. This is a general rule applied in *loukika vyavahaaraa*.

But in *vaidhika vyavahaaraa*, what do we do? When the very same words occur in the *Vedas*, to arrive at the meaning of the words, not only should one use the *lakshyaartha*, one has to use other methods of enquiry also. Six '*lingaas*' are mentioned in the *meemaasaa saasthram*. Those six *lingaas* must also be used to arrive at the meaning of the word *thath*, the meaning of the word *thvam* etc.

The six *lingaas* used in Vedhaantha Saasthraa are given in the sloka: " upakramo-upasamhaarau abhyaaso poorvathaa palam arthavaadho upapaththi cha lingam thaathparya nirnaye" meaning "In determining the essence of any word / statement (i) upakrama-upasamhaarau (ii) abhyaasa: (iii) poorvathaa (iv) palam (v) arthavaadha: and (vi) upapaththi: are the six *lingaas* used". While these six are the *lingaas* used in Vedhaantha vichaaraa, in the karma kaandaa , the ritualistic portion of the Vedaas, a different set of six *lingaas* are given for proper understanding of the meanings of the words given in karma kaandaa. Those six *lingaas*, according to the poorva meemaamsa saasthraas are: (i) sruthi (ii) lingam (iii) vaakyam (iv) prakaranam (v) sthaanam and (vi) samaakyaa. Using these six clues, every word used in the Karma Kaandaa of the Vedaas, can / must be understood i.e. as to what particular object is revealed by what particular word etc.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, having been a staunch *Poorva Meemaamsakaa*, known by the name Mandana Misraa, before he took to *sanyaasaa* and having been extremely eloquent in debates supporting *Poorva Meemaamsaa* philosophy, is naturally well versed in *karma kaandaa*. Therefore, when he wants to refer to *lingaas*, he uses the names of the *lingaas*, used in the *karma kaandaa*. He says:

- श्रुत्यादि सत् प्रतिबद्धम् - Being associated with the six clues like *sruthi* etc.,
- पदं - the *vaidhika padham* (words in the Vedaas)
- विशेषार्थ भवेत् - will be capable of giving the meaning of 'a particular', dropping the meaning of 'the universal'.

'*Jahalalakshanayaa*' (by the application of *jahath lakshanaa*), it can reveal the *viseshaartha*. Thus, *mahaa vaakyam* can finally reveal *ekaathmaa*, which is the essence of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathma*. There is no problem at all, if the student / seeker properly listens to the *mahaa vaakyam*.

'*Sruthyaadhi sath prathi badham*' is adjective to '*padham*'. The word '*Sath*' (in the compound term *sadhviseshaartham*) means 'being' and should be read after '*sruthyaadh*'. Being associated with various clues, every *Vedic* word will reveal 'the particular', dropping 'the universal'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 33:

अन्वयव्यतिरेकपुरस्सरं वाक्यमेव सामानाधिकरण्यादिनाविध्यापटलप्रध्वंसद्वारेण मुमुक्षुं स्वाराज्येऽभिषेचयति न त्वन्वयव्यतिरेकामात्रसाध्योऽयमर्थ इत्याह ।

Now, it is pointed out that coming after the discrimination between the Self and non-Self, the proposition itself, through relations like co-ordination, destroys the veil of nescience and by that establishes the aspirant after liberation, in the supreme kingdom of self- sovereignty. This goal is not to be secured by mere discrimination through reason:

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about the relative importance of '*anvaya vyathirekaa*' and '*vaakya vicharaa*'. '*Anvaya vyathirekaa*' is an extremely important exercise, to separate the *saakshi* and the *pancha kossaa*; i.e., to separate the *saakshi* and *sareerathrayam*; i.e. to separate the *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. For this purpose, *anvaya vyathirekaa* is essential.

In the same manner, '*mahaa vaakya vicharaa*' is extremely important to understand the '*eykyam*' between '*saakshi*' and '*Brahmar*'. For *saakshi's* 'separation' / 'distinction' from *pancha kosaa* / *sareerathrayam* / *anaathmaa*, '*anvaya vyathirekaa*' is essential. For *saakshi's* 'union' / '*eykyam*' with *Brahman*, '*mahaa vaakya vicharaa*' is essential. Thus, both stages are equally important.

First stage is *anvaya vyathirekaa*, during which stage, the 'separation' of *saakshi* from *sareerathrayam* is done. In the language of *Bhagavadh Githaa* (chapter XIII), '*kshethragnya*' should be first separated from '*kshethram*'. Verse 2 of Chapter XIII, of the *Bhagavadh Githa* runs: "*Idham sareeram kauntheya kshethram ithi abhidheeyathe / ethadh yo vetthi tham praahu: kshethragnya: ithi tadhvidha:*" - "Oh Arjuna! This body is known as '*Kshethram*'. There is a Conscious principle which knows this body. Wise men declare that 'knower' principle to be '*Kshethragnya*.'" | This is the '*anvaya vyathirekaa*' stage, as presented by Lord Krishna.

Immediately afterwards, in verse 3 of chapter XIII, Lord Krishna declares: "ksethragnyam chaapi maam viddhi sarvakshethreshu Bhaaratha | Kshethra kshethragnyor jnaanam yath thath jnaanam matham mama" – "Oh? Arjuna ! May you understand kshethragnyaa to be Myself also, obtaining in **all** bodies. This knowledge, dealing with kshathram .and kshethragnyaa, is true knowledge. This is my teaching". This verse in the Githa is the mahaa vaakya vichaaraa step. Lord Krishna has thus included both steps of Vedhaantha Vichaaraa, extremely intelligently, in a concise manner, in Bhagavadh Githaa.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say: "Without '*anvaya vyathirekaa*', '*vaakya vichaaraa*' is impossible. '*Vaakyam*' cannot 'communicate' to the seeker, the '*eikyam*' between *saakshi* and *Brahman*, without the seeker successfully completing the *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise. At the same time, without '*mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*', the *saadhanaa* of '*anvaya vyathirekaa*' is incomplete."

Therefore, both must be given equal importance; both must be followed; and, sequentially, not simultaneously. The sequence is: *anvaya vyathirekaa* is the first step and the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, is the second. In the first stage, the seeker should have successfully separated himself / herself from the *pancha anaathmaa* and remaining as *saakshi*, should move to the second stage of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. When he / she does that, *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* will be instantaneously successful. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- वाक्यं एव - Only the mahaa vaakya sravanam or vichaaraa,
- अन्वयव्यतिरेकपुरस्सरं - which has already been preceded by *anvaya vyathirekaa* / which comes after efficient *anvaya vyathirekaa*,

The *pancha anaathmaa* renunciation, which is the result of efficient *anvaya vyathirekaa saadhanaa* alone is called by Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, as *sanyaasaa*. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa insists on external *sanyaasaa*. But, even if the aspirant does not take to the external *sanyaasaa aasrama*, the minimum requirement for successful *mahaa vaakya vichaaram* is *aanthara sanyaasam*, signified by mental renunciation of the *pancha anaathmaa* and 'CLASP' rejection.

After *pancha anaathma sanyaasaa* / separation from *pancha anaathmaa*, what does the mahaa vaakyam do? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

- अभिषेचयति - does the *Pattabhishikham*,

Mahaa vaakyam is the grand priest who does the *Pattabhishikam*.

Of whom?

- मुमुक्षुं - of the wonderful aspirant (who has succeeded in achieving internal *Sanyaasaa* and 'CLASP' rejection),

To what *saamrajyam*? Obviously, any *Pattabhishekam* requires a *saamraajyam*.

- स्वाराज्ये - to moksha *saamraajyam*,

Just as in a democracy, every citizen is king, in *vedhantha saasthraa*, every seeker is an emperor.

How does the *mahaa vaakyam* do that?

- अविद्या पटल प्रध्वंसद्वारेण - by tearing away the veil of ignorance,

'*Patalam*' means 'cover' / 'lid' / 'membrane'. '*pradhvamsam*' means 'elimination' / 'destruction'.

It must be understood that the separation between the seeker and the seeker's *moksha saamraajyam* is not a physical separation. Nor is there a long distance separating the two, requiring a long travelling time to achieve *eiikyam*. *Mokshaa* is 'my' very nature. The distance is only 'ignorance'. To emphasize this fact, the *Aachaaryaa* points out '*avidhyaa patala pradhvamsa dvaarena*' meaning 'by eliminating / destroying *ajnaana thimiram*'.

How does the *mahaa vaakyaam* do that particular job of eliminating *avidhyaa*? By functioning at three levels, *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha:*, *viseshana viseshya sambhandha:* and *lakhsya lakshana sambhandha:*, (already discussed earlier, in this same chapter). / Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- सामानाधिकरण्यादिना - by functioning through three levels, starting with *saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandha:* |

Mahaavaakyam 'tears off' the *avidhya patalam* and as even as the *patalam* is removed, the *mumukshu* feels the cool waters of the *abhisheka jalam* falling on him / her. What is that *abhisheka jalam*? Ans: *Moksha saamrajya* 'claiming'.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* exhorts: "Do not stop with *anvaya vyathirekaa*. You have to do *vaakya vichaaraa* also efficiently".

- न तु अन्वयव्यतिरेकमात्रसाध्य अयं :- This (viz., moksha saamraajya *pattabhishekam*) is not possible by mere *aathma anaathma vivekaa*.

'*Maathra*' conveys 'merely'; '*saadhya:*' conveys 'attainable'.

After the seeker has attained the maturity to claim "'I' am the *aathmaa*, the *saakshi* and the entire *dhrusya prapanchaa*, is *anaathmaa*, the *saakshyam*", if the seeker chooses to stop at this stage, what will be his / her approach ?

The seeker will tend to think: "I am here; the entire overwhelming *anaathmaa* is in front of me. I am the 'observer'; the world is the 'observed'. The world is too big and threatening for me and I am too small and powerless in front of this world". What is *mokshaa* for an individual with this concept? Ans: His / her prayer would be: "Oh, Lord! I want to escape this world. This must be my last *janmaa*".

This would be the problem when a student stops with *aathma anaathma vivekaa* and does not receive the message of *mahaa vaakyam*. *Mokshaa* for such an individual will be only 'escapist' *mokshaa*. *Anaathmaa* will be still 'threatening', because the student, at this stage, has not falsified *anaathmaa*. By *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise, *anaathmaa* has been 'separated' from *saakshi*, but not falsified. *Anaathmaa* which has not been falsified, will continue to be a 'threat'.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya warns: "Falsification of *anaathmaa* alone will stop you from seeking to 'run away' from the world / the *pancha anaathmaa*; and, the 'falsification' can take place only when *vaakya vichaaraa* is thoroughly done and you get the conviction '*aham sathyam anaathmaa mithyaad*'. Mere *aathma anaathma vivekaa* alone will not do".

-)अयं अर्थं (इति आह - This fact is to be pointed out (in the following verse).

Verse 33 – Chapter III:

बुद्धियादीनामनात्मत्वं लिङ्गादपि च सिध्यति ।

निवृत्तिस्तावता नेतीत्यतो वाक्यं समाश्रयेत् ॥ ३३ ॥

This very important message, viz. "'separation' of *anaathmaa* is not enough; 'falsification' of *anaathmaa* is crucial" is being conveyed by this verse; this is a very, very important message. As long as *anaathmaa* is not falsified, the philosophy / concept of *mokshaa* as

'running away' or 'escaping' from this world, will be always in the mind. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- बुद्धियादीनाम् अनात्मत्वं - The realization of the *anaathmathva* nature of the mind etc.

The *pancha anaathmaa* had already been listed; they are possessions, profession, family, body and mind. The term '*buddyaadh'* refers to this group of *pancha anaathmaa*. These are the five factors which are constantly creating the feeling "I am bound; not liberated".

- सिध्यति - can be easily be accomplished
- लिङ्गादपि - by using 'reasoning'.

'*Lingam*' represents '*anumaanam*'. By simply using 'reasoning', the aspirant can separate *anaathmaa* from *aathmaa*.

Different types of reasoning have been discussed in different contexts. One of them (covered in detail, in the summary of the 2nd chapter) was that "*Anaathmaa* has *dhrusyathvam*, *boudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*, while *aathmaa* is totally free of these five attributes". With the help of such reasoning, *anaathmaa* can be 'separated' / 'identified as distinct' from *aathmaa*.

But, by mere reasoning, *anaathmaa* can never be falsified.

- तावता - But, by that much study or reasoning,
- निवृत्तिः (न) सिध्यति(- *anaathma nivurtthi:* / elimination of *anaathmaa* does not take place

'*Nivurtthi:*' means 'falsification' or '*mithyaathva nischaya:*' / '*Nivrutthi:*' does not mean physical disappearance.

The 'falsification' of *anaathmaa* can never be accomplished by *anvaya vyathirekaa*. For that purpose *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* must be properly done.

- अतः - Therefore,
- वाक्यं समाश्रयेत् - may you dwell upon *mahaa vaakya vichaaram*, in the form of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, *mahaa vaakya mananam* and *mahaa vaakya nidhidhyaasanam*, until 'falsification' takes place.

144. Chapter III, Verse 33 to 35 (11-07-2009)

In these verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about the importance of both anvaya vyathirekaa and vaakya vichaaraa. In the beginning stages, anvaya vyathirekaa will help the aspirant in thvam padha vichaaraa; and, anvaya vyathirekaa should be followed by vaakya vichaaraa. Only then, the whole journey of the aspirant is complete. Without anvaya vyathirekaa, vaakya vichaaraa will not be fruitful and without vaakya vichaaraa, anvaya vyathirekaa will remain incomplete. Therefore, both must be given equal importance by a serious mumukshu.

But, their implementation should be sequential and not simultaneous. And, what is the sequence? *Anvaya vyathirekaa* must be first and *vaakya vichaaraa* must follow.

If a person stops with *anvaya vyathirekaa*, what will be the problem? Sureswaraachaaryaa says here: "With *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise, *anaathmaa* can, of course, be separated from *aathmaa*. The *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind, will be separated / distinguished from *aathmaa*. In fact, this separation of *anaathmaa* can be done even with the help of simple logic, viz., that *anaathmaa* has got five attributes, *dhrusyathvam*, *baudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*, while *aathmaa* is totally free of these attributes and therefore, is distinct from *anaathmaa*. With the help of such logic, *anaathmaa* will be and can be 'separated'. But, mere 'separating' of *anaathmaa* will never solve the problem. This is because, even after 'separating' *anaathmaa*, the seeker will remain only in 'triangular' format; and, as long as the seeker remains in triangular format, his / her sense of *samsaaraa* will not go away. The seeker will continue to look forward to *mokshaa*, only as a **future** event. If the 'triangular' format should go away and 'binary' format is to be achieved, 'falsification' of *anaathmaa* / *anaathma mithyaathva nischayam* is extremely important. Only then the seeker will arrive at the 'binary' format, with the conviction, '*aham sathyam; dhrusyam sarvam mithyaa*'. Only with that falsification, the seeker can realize that he / she is free **here and now**, in spite of several problems and issues which the seeker may be facing. If the seeker has to claim "I am free here and now", it is possible only when *anaathma mithyaathvam* is established and *aathma sathyathvam* is claimed".

And, therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*thavaathaa nivrutthi: na yethl*".

(With regard to part of the second line of the verse, there are two different readings. '*Na yethl*' is a better reading than '*na ithl*', printed in the book that is being followed. The letter '*ne*' in the book, may be corrected as '*na*'. This change is suggested, since, if the reading is done as '*nethl*', it will be followed by another '*ithl*' and the sentence will run as '*na ithi ithl*'.

The suggested change will make it read '*na yethi ithf*, which, indisputably, is a better way of presentation.)

What is the meaning of "thavaathaa nivrutthi: na yethi"?

- तावता - By merely separating *anaathmaa* from *aathmaa*,
- निवृत्ति :न येति - 'falsification' of *anaathmaa* will never take place.

'*Baadha:*' is the technical term used in *Advaita*, for this 'falsification'

And, therefore, what is required?

'Falsification' of *anaathmaa* is crucial to move to binary format and that 'falsification' requires *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- अतः - Therefore,
- वाक्यं समाश्रयेत् - the aspirant should resort to / enter into *vaakya vichaaraa* / *eiyya vichaaraa*.

This statement may give rise to a question. How will *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* help in falsifying *anaathmaa*? This is a very important doubt, to be given thought and understood. What is the question / doubt? It is: "*Mahaavaakyam* does not directly talk about *anaathmaa*. *Mahaavaakyam* talks only about *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiyyam*. Therefore, *Mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* may help in claiming 'I', the *aathmaa*, am *Brahmarf*. But, how will it help in falsifying *anaathmaa*?"

The direct answer to this query, is, that, "a conclusion about *anaathmaa* has to be derived through a corollary"; and that direct answer is followed by an explanation of the corollary, which is as follows: "During *thadh padha vichaaraa*, it was established that *Brahman* is *kaaranam* and therefore, *sathyam*; it was also established that, '*jagathf*, the *anaathmaa*, is *kaaryam*, and therefore, *mithyaa*. The student should recollect that earlier information, in this context. Now, through *mahaa vaakyam*, the student gets the additional information, 'I', the *aathmaa*, is identical with *Brahman*. Combining the two, the conclusion is: '*aham sathyam anaathmaa mithyaa*'".

In spite of the above explanation that "*Brahman* is *kaaranam* and therefore, *sathyam* and also that, '*jagathf*, the *anaathmaa*, is *kaaryam*, and therefore, *mithyaa*', the question "How do you say *Brahman* is *sathyam* and *anaathmaa*, the *jagath*, is *mithyaa*?" may still persist in

the mind of the student. To counter this, in addition to the above answer, the *Thaithreeya Upanishad's* "anaathmathva nischaya:, kaaryathva nischaya:, naamaroopathva nischaya:, mithyaathva nischaya: pravilaapanam" should also be recollected. *Pancha kosa viveka* of the *Upanishads* should be recollected, because, all the *siddhi granthaas* only tie up the teachings of *Upanishads*. The treatises, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, *Advaitha Siddhi* etc., do not exist independently; but are based on *Upanishads* only. Therefore, if the aspirant remembers the essential teachings of the *Upanishads*, these statements will naturally fall into place.

The conclusion: Only through 'jeeva-Brahma-eikyam', 'anaathma mithyaathvam' is established. And, therefore, the exhortation "vaakyam samaasrayeth".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 34:

न केवलमनुमनमात्रशरणोऽभिलषितमर्थं न प्राप्नोतीत्यनर्थं चाप्नोतीत्याह ।

One who subsists on mere reason, does not only fail to achieve the desired goal but also lands in evil. This is brought out now:

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that *mahaa vaakyam alone* is capable of *jagan mithyaathva nischaya:* | *Mahaavaakyam alone* will lead to 'falsification' of *anaathmaa*. If a person ignores *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* in particular or *sruthi pramaanam* itself in general, and, instead, attempts to use *prathyaksha pramaanam* or *tharkaa*, any amount of *prathyaksha pramaanaa* or *tharka pramaanaa* that is used, will not help him / her to arrive at *jagan mithyaathvam*. *Prathyaksha pramaanaa* can never prove *jagan mithyaathvam*. On the other hand, *prathyaksha pramaanam* will give more and more credence to the mistaken concept, that, *jagath* is *mahaa sathyam*. *Anumaanaa* or *tharka pramaanaa* will also never prove *jagan mithyaathvam*, because *tharka pramaanaa* is based only on the data received from *prathyaksha pramaanaam*. Therefore, *tharka pramaanaam* also can never prove *jagan mithyaathvam*. All the modern sciences also cannot establish *jagan mithyaathvam*, since all the modern sciences are based on experiments and collection of data, which means, that they are also indirectly based on *prathyaksha pramaanam* only. This is a very important doctrine of *Advaitham*, that **only** *sruthi pramaanam* can establish *anaathma mithyaathva nischayam*. Another vehement argument of *Advaitham* is, that, without *jagan mithyaathva nischayathvam*, one will never attain *mokshaa*.

Even if the aspirant achieves the maturity of perceiving *anaathmaa* as *visvaroopaa*, that will not help in *mithyaathva nischaya:* | 'Looking at *anaathmaa* as *viswaroopa Isvara*.' will, of course, be temporarily useful at *Karma Yoga* level. It will be useful for reducing *raagha dveshaa*; but, it will not permanently solve the problem. Coming to the final *jnaana yoga* level only, *anaathma mithyaathva nischayaa* alone will give liberation. This is the *Advaithin's* conclusion. The reasons have been discussed earlier and are briefly indicated, as follows: "If

anaathma mithyaathvam is not established, the seeker's *sanchitha*, *praarabhdam* and *aagaami karmaas* will also be *sathyam*. If *anaathmaa* is not falsified, *karmaas* will not be falsified. If *karmaas* are not falsified, *sanchitham*, is also not falsified. If *sanchitham* is not falsified, *punar janmaa* will not be falsified. A seeker may exhaust *praarabhdam* by experiencing the *praarabhdam palaani*; but, *sanchitham*, since not 'falsified', will be waiting, ready to push the seeker into another birth. How can a seeker escape re-birth, as long as *sanchitham* is *sathyam* and cannot be got rid of?"

An interesting fact to note, is that, even *Isvara's* liberation is also only because He is fully aware of *jagan mithyaathvam*. For argument's sake, let it be imagined that *Isvara* does not know *jagan mithyaathvam*. In that case, *Isvara* will be the most miserable in the universe, because His job will turn very, very unpleasant and very, very uncomfortable. What is *Isvara's* job? He has to create (or cause to manifest) the *jeevaas* regularly, because he is the Creator. Then, He has to give the *jeevaas* their *karma palam* regularly, because He is the *karma paladhaataa*; more often, the *palam* will have to be in the form of *dhu:kham*, old age, degenerative disorders etc. And, then, *Isvara* has to watch all of the suffering of all the *jeevaas*, who are His own creations, because He is *sarvasaakshi*. And most importantly, He will undergo this ordeal without an end, since He is eternal and does not even go to sleep. Who can remain comfortable and happy, seeing other people screaming? Therefore, *Isvara* also will never be liberated if He does not know *jagan mithyaathvam*. The *Advaitin's* stand is that, whether it is a *jeeva* or a *Devatha* or even *Isvara*, anybody's liberation is only because of *jagan mithyaathva nischaya*: and that *jagan mithyaathva nischaya*: is possible only through *mahaa vaakya vicharaa* /

In line with this, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- अनुमान मात्र शरणः - One who takes refuge only in tharka pramaanaa

'*Sarana*:' literally means 'one who takes refuge'. This is a figurative expression; it only means 'one who uses' or 'one who resorts to'.

There may be such individuals, who say: "I do not want *Vedas*; I want to use only logic and modern sciences; using them, I want to arrive at *jagan mithyaathvam*". In fact, this is what *Buddhism* is trying to do. These topics have been discussed by *Goudapaadhaachaaryaa*, in detail, in his *Maandookya Kaarika*. In *Buddhism*, there are two main divisions *Heena Yaanaa* and *Mahaa Yaanaa*. *Mahaa yaanaa* itself talks of two doctrines, *kshanika vigjnaana vaadhaa* or *yogaachchaara vaadha* and *maadhayamika vaadhaa*. But, both *Yogaachchaara mahaa yaana* and *maadhyaamika mahaa yaana* try to establish *jagan mithyaathvam* through pure *tharkaa*. The *Advaita* philosophers vehemently refute their approach and say "without accepting *Veda Pramaanam*, *jagan mithyaathvam* cannot be arrived at".

'*Anumaana maathra sarana:*' refers to 'a philosopher who believes only in *anumaanaa*' or expressed in a different language to 'a *naasthikaa* / one who does not accept *sabdha pramaanam*'.

- अभिलषितं अर्थं न प्राप्नोति - does not achieve the desired goal.

'*Abhilashitham artham*' means 'desired conclusion / goal'. In this context, the desired conclusion is '*mithyaathva nischayam* of the universe' / 'falsifying the universe' ; '*na prapnoothi*' means 'does not achieve / attain' or 'does not arrive at'.

- इति न केवलं - Not only is this the problem.

The word '*ithi*' after '*na prapnoothi*' should be read with '*na kevalam*', in the beginning of the sentence in the text.

The problem mentioned is that, such a person will not be able to arrive at *jagan mithyaathvam*. But, that is not the only problem; there are other problems also.

- अनर्थं च आप्नोति - He also lands in evil.

Such a philosopher, who rejects *sabda pramaanam* and is dependent only on *tharka pramaanam* or 'reasoning', will get into several problems, because of his / her not achieving *jagan mithyaathva nischayam*. One of the problems was already presented, namely, 'continuation in triangular format'. He / she will tend to complain: "I am a helpless *jeevaa*; I am always persecuted by the world and by the *nava grahaas* and their positions" and so on. As long as an individual is in 'triangular' format, he/she has to constantly placate one *devathaa* or another; resort to one *praayaschitthaa* or another. Even if *praarabhdha karma* is exhausted by him / her, *sanchitha karma*, which is looked upon as *sathyam* by such an individual, will give botherations in the form of *punar janmaa*. If *praarabhdhaa* is 'frightening *sathyam*', by the same token, *sanchithaa* also will be 'frightening *sathyam*' only.

On the other hand, if the aspirant is able to claim "By 'knowledge', I have falsified *praarabhdhaa*", then there is no possibility of 'frightening *sanchithaa*' also; conversely, if *sanchithaa* is falsified, why should anybody worry about *praarabhdhaa*, which also stands falsified?

The word '*anartham*', may be interpreted to include '*navagraha bhayam*' also, based on the observation of the current tendency of a vast number of 'religious' people resorting to

grahapreethi, praayaschitthani etc., though, Sureswaraachaarya might or might not have meant it.

इति आह - This is being said here (in the verse that follows).

Chapter III: Verse 34 –

अनादृत्य श्रुतिं मोहादतो बौद्धाः तमस्विनः ।

आपोदिरे निरात्मत्वमनुमानैकचक्षुषः ॥ ३४ ॥

The Buddhists disregarded the *sruthi* in delusion and were given to darkness as a consequence. They, being guided solely by reasoning, landed in the unreality of the Self.

This blunder was committed by the Buddhist philosophers, especially the *mahaa yaanaa* Buddhists, known as *soonya vaadhaa* Buddhists or as 'nihilist' Buddhists. They committed the blunder. Sureswaraachaaryaa is wild with them and therefore, uses a very strong term in describing them:

- तमस्विनः बौद्धाः - The Buddhists, overpowered by *thamo gunaa*,

Why does the *Aachaaryaa* consider Buddhists as 'overpowered by *thamo gunaa*?

Ans: They had sufficient intelligence to use *tharka pramaanam*. They were all great *thaarkikaas*. In fact, there is a general assumption in philosophical circles, that the greatest philosopher among all types of philosophers, is a *Maha yaanaa* Buddhist, Nagaarjuna, who is believed to have lived even before Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa. This assumption that he is the greatest philosopher is due to the fact that Nagaarjuna was undoubtedly one of the greatest logicians and used *tharkaa* / arguments wonderfully well in support of his doctrines. One of his arguments is known as '*chathushkoti tharkhaa*' and Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, who came later, was so impressed by that argument, that, he also adapts and adopts that argument.

Great Buddhists like Nagaarjuna had sufficient intelligence to handle *tharkaa* ; but, did not have sufficient intelligence to understand the limitation of *tharkaa*. The greatest limitation of *tharkaa* is, that, it can function only in empirical field and can never enter the Absolute. Goudapaadhaachaaryaa, in his *Maandookya Kaarika* says of such philosophers "*parasparam viruddhyanthe*" - "The dualists contradict one another". (Verse 17 – *Advaitaprakaranam-Maandookya Kaarika*). They are arguing on and on, each one contradicting the other. Nobody is able to arrive at the Absolute, because they do not know that "*Naishaa tharkena*

mathir aapaneyaa – “This knowledge cannot be attained by reasoning”, as declared by the *Katopanishad* (1. 2. 9). *Tharkaa* can / should never be used to ‘arrive’ at the Truth. It must be used to ‘extract’ the Truth from *saasthraas*. That is why it is said “**srothavya: manthavya:**”, stressing the need to study *saasthraas*, under a *guru*. The Buddhists are not aware of this important fact and therefore, Sureswaraacharya calls them ‘*thamasvina:*’ meaning ‘dull witted people’, though they are intellectually brilliant.

What is the result of the *thamo gunaa*?

- अनुमान एक चक्षुषः - (and) with ‘reasoning’ as their only eye,

They have only one eye, in the form of ‘*tharkhaa*’; they do not have the second eye called ‘*saasthra chakshu:*’| To arrive at the truth, the aspirant requires both *saasthra chakshu:* and *tharka chakshu:*| How do *saasthra chakshu:* and *tharka chakshu:* complement each other? *Tharka chakshu:* will help in extracting the meaning of *saasthra chakshu:* / But, the Buddhist philosophers refuse to use the *saasthra chakshu:*| Therefore, they are partially blind people. The term ‘*anumaanam eka chakshusha:*’; is *bahuvreehi samaasam*, arrived at, as ‘*anumaanam eva ekam chakshu: yesham the*’.

Because of that, what blunder have they committed?

- अतः - (and) consequently,
- मोहात् - because of their delusion (and partial blindness),
- श्रुतिं अनादृत्य - ignoring the *sruthi pramaanaa*,

In fact, in modern times, even some *advaitins* do not want to accept that, *sraddhaa* in the *saasthram* is required. These *advaitins* have got a dislike for the word *sraddhaa*; because, they translate *sraddhaa* as faith; and, faith is associated with religion ; and religion is ‘red rag’ for science. Therefore, for modern people, ‘to be scientific ’ is ‘to negate religion’. To negate religion is to negate faith; to negate faith is to negate the word *sraddha* ; To negate the word *sraddha* is to negate *saasthram*. Thus, a few modern *advaitins* want to negate religion, *saasthram* and *sraddhaa* and want to present *advaitam* as a scientific philosophy. In their opinion, *advaitam* can be demonstrated purely with the help of science.

Sureswaraacharya warns: “Never join that group, who have no *sraddhaa* in *saasthra pramaanam*; you will have problems establishing *advaitam* logically”.

What happened because the Buddhist philosophers ignored *sruthi pramaanam*?

- निरात्मत्वं आपेदिरे - landed in the unreality of the Self.

What was the culmination of Buddhists reasoning / of the *tharkhaa* of Nagarjuna? Ans: Like *Advaithins*, they also arrived at *jagan mithyaathvam / anaathma mithyaathvam*, which, no doubt, was a very great accomplishment. But, Not only did they arrive at *anaathma mithyaathvam*, they arrived at *aathma mithyaathvam* also. Their conclusion was that "the 'Observed' is all *mithyaa*; the 'Observer' is also *mithyaa ; sarvam mithyaa*". And, what is the *adhishtaanam* for everything, according to them? Ans: *Soonyam*. They arrived at '*soonyam*' or 'nothingness'. This is the misguided consequence of *anumaana eka chakshuthvam*.

'*Niraathmathvam*' means 'negation of *aathmaad*'. They first negated *anaathmaa*, on which *Advaithins* agree with them; but, unfortunately, they extended that *mithyaathvam* to *aathmaa* also. Therefore, according to them, "*jadam* is *mithyaa*; *chaithanyam* is also *mithyaa ; sarvam mithyaa*. The Truth is *Soonyam*".

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his 'Sri Dakshinamuorthy Sthothra' refers to these soonya vaadhins. The first half of the 5th verse of the Sthothraa runs: "Deham praanam api indriyaani api chalaam buddhim cha **soonyam** vidhu: sthree baala andha jadopamaa: thu ahamithi bhraanthaa bhrusam vaadhina:" – "Those, who, intellectually innocent like women, children, the blind and idiots, because of their delusion, firmly consider the Reality, as the physical body or as the praanaa or as the senses or as the ever-changing intellect or even as mere **void**". The reference in the first portion, viz., 'deham praanam api indriyaani api chalaam buddhim cha (vidhu:)' is to the charvaakaa and similar philosophers, who consider only the physical body, or the praanaa or the senses or the intellect as the ultimate Reality. The second portion '**soonyam** vidhu:' refers to the soonya vaadha Buddhists, who think that Reality is soonyam, similar to the experience of 'nothingness' in sushupthi.

Having talked about soonya vaadhaa in the 5th sloka, Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa refutes the soonya vaadha in the very next sloka (verse 6) by saying: "raahu grastha divaakarendhu sadurso maayaa samaachchaadhanaath sanmaathra: karanopasamharanatho yobhoothsushuptha: pumaan" – "On entering the deep sleep state, the individual folds up all the functions of the senses, and becomes '**Existence**' alone, like the sun or the moon during eclipse", implying his refutation: "Oh! Buddhist mahaayaani ! how can you say there is soonyam in sleep? To talk about soonyam, you require some chaithanyam. A Soonya saakshi is required to talk about soonyam. And, once you accept soonya saakshi, there is no soonyam. That soonya saakshi is sath Brahman, which 'I' am".

The Buddhists negated that *sath Brahman*, because of their *mohaa* – delusion. '*Niraathmathvam*' means 'negation of *aathmaa*'. '*Aapedhire*' means 'arrived at'. '*Aapaadhanam*' means 'concluding' or 'arriving at the conclusion'.

Therefore, what is Sureswaraachaaryaa's instruction? Ans: "Use *tharkhaa* alright; but, may you note that *sruthi* is the primary *pramaanam* to arrive at *Advaitam*. Therefore, may you have *sraddhaa* in *Veda Pramaanam*."

(Swamiji had earlier given a separate talk, in a different context, on *sraddhaa* ; when, he had given the definition of *sraddhaa* **not** as faith but as '*upajeevya pramaana svatha: praamaanya jnaanam*'. For details, that talk can be referred to). That *sraddha* is crucial for *Vedhaanthic* study. This fact is being highlighted by Sureswaraachaaryaa in the following portions.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 35:

न चानादरे कारणमस्ति । यस्मात्सर्वत्रैवानादरनिमित्तं प्रमाणस्य प्रमाणान्तरप्रतिपन्नप्रतिपादनं वा विपरीतप्रतिपादनं वा संशयितप्रतिपादनं वा न वा प्रतिपादनमिति न चैतेषामन्यतमदपि कारणमस्ति । यत आह ।

In fact, there is no ground for such a disregard. In all cases where such a procedure is legitimate, the knowledge in question must be simply re-affirming what is ascertained through another source of knowledge or it must be affirming what is contradicted by another source or it must be indeterminate in itself or it must fail to convey any knowledge whatever. In the present case, none of these reasons holds good. Therefore, it is said:

This is the topic of *sraddhaa* in any *pramaanam* in general, *sraddhaa* in *saasthra pramaanam* in particular and *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*, to be still more particular.

Without *sraddhaa*, *maaha vaakyam* will not produce *jnaanam*; *Mahaa vaakyam* will produce a hypothesis only. The listener will take the *maaha vaakya* message as only a hypothesis; and, once he / she takes it as a hypothesis, he / she will always require a proof through some other *pramaanam*. A hypothesis can be converted into a theory or a fact, only when it is proved through some other *pramaanam*. Once the student takes *mahaa vaakyam* teaching only as a hypothesis, he / she will always look for proving that 'hypothesis' through some other *pramaanam*, and will say : "I still have only theoretical knowledge; I am waiting for 'proving' my knowledge".

'Proving the knowledge' is what is termed by people as 'converting knowledge into realization'. A student without *sraddhaa* in the *saasthraas*, will always be looking for a new 'realization' **other than** the knowledge derived from the *saasthraas*. He / she will conclude

that an extraordinary mystic experience is that other *pramaanam*, which will have to 'prove' this knowledge.

Such a seeker will believe: "Until that mystic experience comes, I have only got knowledge; I do not have '*anubhavaa*' " and will struggle to prove his / her knowledge through that some other experience.

Sureswaraacharya says: "Other than *saasthram*, there is no *pramaanam* to prove the *saasthram*".

Tharka pramaanam, *prathyaksha pramaanam* etc. cannot prove or disprove *saasthra pramaanam*. As for 'meditation', which, some misguided people consider as capable of 'proving' the 'knowledge' derived from *saasthraas*, it should be realized, that *dhyaanam* is not even accepted as a *pramaanaa*, by *Advaita* philosophy. 'Meditation' or '*dhyaanam*' does not find a place in the *shadpramaana* list of *Advaita*.

People who lack *sraddhaa* will always look and wait for a separate *anubhavaa* to validate 'knowledge'. But, they have to wait forever, since there is absolutely no possibility of such a separate *anubhavaa* happening.

Therefore, to avoid this blunder, what should the seeker know and do? Ans: The seeker should have *sraddhaa* in *saasthraas*. Once he / she has *sraddhaa*, *mahaa vaakyam* gives final and complete knowledge in the form of 'understanding' and other than this 'understanding', there is no other separate 'realization' required. That 'knowledge' or 'understanding' itself is called *anubhavaa*; and, that 'knowledge' or 'understanding' itself is also 'realization'. All this will become clear, if the student has *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya asks the question "Why do you lack *sraddhaa* in *saasthram*? Why do you not have *sraddhaa* in *saasthram*? There is no reason for not having *sraddhaa* in the *saasthra pramaanam*, in the same manner, as we have *sraddhaa* in *prathyaksha pramaanam*".

The entire humanity has *sraddhaa* in *prathyaksha pramaanaam*. Nobody questions *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Nobody wants to validate *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Even a scientist wants to collect data from *prathyaksha pramaanam*; that means, even a scientist does not question *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

Just as, we, thus, naturally have *sraddhaa* in *prathyaksha pramaanam*, why should we not have *sraddhaa* in *saasthra chakshu* also, which is also an *upajeevya pramaanam* / a primary *pramaanam* like *prathyaksha pramaanam*? Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- अनादरे च कारणं नास्ति - There is no reason for non-acceptance of saasthra pramaanam.

If an individual does not have *sraddha* in *saasthra pramaanam*, it may be due to one of four obstacles, because of which *sraddha* is obstructed.

Sureswaraacharya is entering another territory. He says: "If you do not have *sraddha* in *saasthram*, that lack of *sraddha* can only be due to any one of four types of obstacles / *Chaturvidha prathibhaandhaa*: | '*Sradhha* in *saasthram* ' means 'acceptance of *saasthra pramaanam*'.

In this context, Sureswaraacharya, in fact, talks not only of '*Sradhha* in *saasthra pramaanam*', but in *pramaanam*-s in general. If *sraddha* even in *prathyaksha pramaanam*, should go away, it can be due to four types of obstacles. Sureswaraacharya himself introduces those four obstacles.

He says: "These may be the obstacles, because of which you do not accept *saasthraas*. I will remove those four obstacles and show that there is no reason for you in not having *saasthra sraddha*."

Now, Sureswaraacharya introduces the four obstacles, which obstruct *sraddha* in any *pramaanam*. This is a highly technical, but, important topic – important because if a seeker does not understand this technical topic, he / she will wait forever, for a future *Brahma anubhavaa* ; he / she will be eternally practicing meditation or some other *saadhanaa* for *Brahma anubhavaa*; conversely, if this is understood he /she will never 'wait' for '*anubhavaa*'. The seeker will understand that 'understanding' itself is '*anubhavaa*'. After this 'understanding' also, he / she may go in for meditation ; but, the meditation will be a different type of meditation (details of which were given by *Swamiji* in an earlier talk on 'Meditation' during a *Guru Poornima*.) The meditation will not be for *Brahma Anubhavaa*.

What are the obstacles? Reverting to the text:

- यस्मात् - Because
- सर्वत्र एव - always,
- प्रमाणस्य अनादरनिमित्तं - the reason for disregarding any *pramaanam* may be, that,

'*Pramaanam*' means 'source of knowledge' and in this context, includes all six *pramaanaas* – *prathyaksham*, *anumaanam*, *upamaanam*, *arthaa patthi*, *anupalabhdhi* and *sabdham*.

'*Nimittham*' means 'reason'. 'Disregard' refers to 'Lack of *sraddha*'. The 'disregard' or 'lack of *sraddha*' is because of the following four obstacles.

- (प्रमाणस्य) प्रमाणान्तर प्रतिपन्न प्रतिपादनं वा- either the *pramaanam* is revealing an object which can be revealed by another *pramaanam*;

Explanation: "Suppose *pramaanam* no. 1 reveals an object which can be revealed by *pramaanam* no. 2; then, naturally, my interest in *pramaanam* no. 1 will be relatively less only. Why? Because, I know I can manage through *pramaanam* no. 2. On the other hand, suppose I know that a particular *pramaanam*, say, the same *pramaanam* no. 1 again, reveals an object, which can never be revealed by any other *pramaanam*, then, for knowledge of that object, I know I have to depend on that *pramaanam* no. 1 **alone** and I will therefore have more regard for *pramaanam* no. 1.

"An example: The eye and the 'colour of an object'. It is my eye that reveals the colour of any object. If my ears also are capable of revealing colours, the interest I attach to my eye will come down. In such a hypothetical situation, even if there is a probability of a 'retinal detachment' for me, which may result in total blindness, I will remain relaxed, thinking that if my eyes are not there, I can always depend on my ears. But, it is not so. 'Eye' is the only *pramaanam* capable of revealing the 'colour of an object'. '*Chakshu*' is a unique *pramaanam* not an *anuvaadakha pramaanam*. One who does not understand this uniqueness of the eye will be careless with regard to the protection of the eye and one who understands the uniqueness of the eye will be very careful about protecting the eye.

'In the same manner, one who understands the uniqueness of *mahaa vaakyam* will have 'regard' for the *mahaa vaakyam* and one who does not understand the uniqueness of the *mahaa vaakyam* will have lesser regard".

This is obstacle no. 1 for having '*sraddha*' in a '*pramaanam*', viz., 'the particular *pramaanam* revealing an object which is revealed by some other *pramaanam*'.

'*prathipaadhanam*' means 'the revealing / ascertainment'; '*prathipannam*' means 'object which can be revealed'; '*pramaanaanthara*' means 'by a different '*pramaanam*'.

What is the second obstacle?

- (प्रमाणस्य प्रमाणान्तरविपरीत प्रतिपादनं वा (- alternately, the *pramaanam* is revealing an object or an idea which is contradicted by another *pramaanam*;

Explanation: "Suppose a *pramaanam* reveals an idea which is contradicted by another *pramaanam*, then my *sraddha* or regard in the first *pramaanam* will go away".

145. Chapter III, Verse 35 (18-07-2009)

In the context of *mahaavaakya vichaaraa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to take a small diversion, as it were.

He wants to deal with the topic of the role of *sraddhaa* in *maaha vaakya vichaaram*, because, *mahaa vaakyam* can give knowledge only when it is enquired into, with *sraddhaa*. That is the reason why '*sraddhaa*' is included as an important qualification, in *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* also. In the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, in the sixth chapter, there is a *vaakyam*, addressed by Sage *Uddhaalaka Aaruni* to his son *Svethakethu*: "*sraddhathsva soumya*" – "Have faith, O! Good-looking one" (VI.12.2), highlighting the importance of *sraddhaa*. In the *Bhagavadh Githa* also, Lord Krishna declares: "*Sraddhaavaan labhathe jnaanam*" - "One who has faith attains knowledge" (IV-39). A diligent aspirant should, therefore, realize, that, *Sraddhaa* plays a very crucial role in *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* and conversely, *asraddhaa* is a very big obstacle in *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

In this particular portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to discuss *sraddhaa* ; but, he uses a different name '*aadhara*'. Instead of using the word *sraddhaa*, he uses the word *aadhara*: and instead of the word *asraddhaa*, he uses the word *anaadhara*: |

What is this *sraddhaa*? (Swamiji had discussed this topic in one of his *Guru Poornima* talks, titled 'what is *sraddhaa*?'. And, according to Swamiji, he had 'borrowed' almost that entire talk, only from this portion of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.)

Sraddhaa, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*, denotes two healthy attitudes: one is the student's attitude towards the *mahaa vaakyam* itself and the second is the student's attitude towards the 'understanding' that is derived from *mahaa vaakyam*.

What are the two attitudes?

The first, on the *mahaa vaakyam*, should be: "*Mahaa vaakyam* is the **only** source of '*aham Brahma asmi*' knowledge and also that *mahaa vaakyam* is a **valid** source of '*aham Brahma asmi*' knowledge". This must become crystal clear. *Mahaa vaakyam* is the **only** source and **the** valid source of '*aham Brahma asmi*' *jnaanam*.

Then, on the 'understanding' of *mahaa vaakyam*, the student's healthy attitude should be: "This 'understanding' of *mahaa vaakyam* is the final and direct knowledge of '*aham Brahma asmi*'. Since *mahaa vaakyam* is the **only** source and since *mahaa vaakyam* is **the** valid source, understanding *mahaa vaakyam* clearly, is, itself, the final and direct knowledge of

'*aham Brahma asmi*' ". The student should have the conviction: "Other than this 'understanding', which is final and valid, I need not work for any other separate final liberating knowledge, in the name of 'realization' or in the name of 'enlightenment' or in the name of '*Brahma anubhavaa*'. I do not have to work for any separate knowledge through a mystic or any other experience. This 'understanding' of *mahaa vaakyam* is 'direct knowledge'; this 'understanding' is 'final knowledge'; this 'understanding' is 'direct experience'; this 'understanding' is 'enlightenment' ; this 'understanding' is 'realization' ; this 'understanding' is '*Brahma anubhavaa*'. Other than this 'understanding', I do not have to work for anything else. *Mahaa vaakyam* is capable of giving me this *jnaanam* which **is** *aparoksha jnaanam* and final".

This fact is stressed repeatedly, because, some other statements occur in the *Upanishads*, other than the *mahaa vaakyam*, known as '*avaanthara vaakyaani*', which *avaanthra vaakyaani* may give only indirect knowledge; they may give only incomplete knowledge; they may give only book-knowledge. But, this limitation of the *avaanthara vaakyaani* should never be extended to the *mahaa vaakyam*. The statement, viz., that 'this *vaakyam* gives indirect or incomplete or book knowledge' can be made about an *avaanthara vaakyam*. But, one should never commit the blunder of making that statement with regard to *mahaa vaakyam*.

To consolidate: The first part of *sraddhaa* is the conviction "*mahaa vaakyam* is **the** valid and **only** source of *aparoksha jnaanam*". The second part of *sraddhaa* is the conviction "the 'understanding' that I derive from the *mahaa vaakyam* is **the final**. I do not have to work for any other distinct / separate 'experience' ".

This gives rise to a common question / doubt: "If a separate mystic experiences is not required, why is *nidhidhyaasanam* prescribed at all? If *mahaa vaakya sravanam* itself completes the process, why should the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* say '*srothavya*, *manthavya*, ***niddhidhyaasithavya***' (II.iv.5) ? Why is *Vedhaantic* meditation prescribed?"

This doubt is answered as below:

Many people mistake *nidhidhyaasanam* as a means of mystic experience. This is an unfortunate conclusion / a misconception.

Tradition defines *nidhidhyaasanam* as '*vipareetha bhaavanaa nivrutthi saadhanam*'. It is never a *saadhanam* presented as a means for 'final' knowledge or mystic experience. *Nidhidhyaasanam* is prescribed for the purpose of 'changing one's habitual thinking'; not for the purpose of producing any mystic experience.

What is that 'habitual thinking' to be changed? Ans: "The 'triangular' format of *jeeva, jagath* and *Isvara*".

Changing / shifting from this 'triangular' format to the 'binary' format is a must, if the 'understanding' from the *mahaa vaakyam* should have an impact. In other words, the impact of the 'understanding' from the *mahaa vaakyam* will become evident and palpable, only when it goes along with 'throwing away' the habit of the 'triangular' format. Also, this shifting from the old habit of 'triangular' format and moving to the new habit of 'binary' format is not during *nidhidhyaasanam* alone, but, throughout the rest of the aspirant's life.

The 'triangular' format mind-set is the '*vipareetha bhaavanaa*'. The aspirant should 'break' that '*vipareetha bhaavanaa*' and move to 'binary' format. That is the purpose of *nidhidhyaasanam*.

In this treatise, Sureswaraacharya also is anxious to remove the misconception that *nidhidhyaasanam* is intended to produce a mystic experience.

Reverting back to the main topic of '*sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*', the attitude/ *bhaavaa* that "*Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can and does give me '*jnaanam*' or 'understanding'; that 'understanding' **alone** is 'realization'; that **alone** is 'enlightenment'; there is no other mystic experience or any other *anubhavaa*' is called '*sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*' .

Sureswaraacharya further points out: "*Sraddhaa* towards *prathyaksha pramaana* is very natural / in-born to every human being. It is so natural that we do not even realize that we are applying *sraddhaa* to *prathyaksha pramaanam*. We never call the 'knowledge' / information, which *prathyaksha pramaanam* gives, as second-hand information; we take it as factual knowledge. This is because we have got *sraddhaa* in *prathyaksha pramaanam*, without anybody educating us and without anybody specifically instructing / requesting us to have *sraddhaa* on the *prathyaksha pramaanam*".

Even scientists do not have any doubt with regard to *prathyaksha pramaanam*, even though sense organs do create 'illusions' at times, as for instance, the eye admittedly creating 'optical illusions' at times. Even when, thus, the eyes give optical illusions, the tendency is only to 'explain away' the illusions, without the *sraddhaa* in the sense organ ever getting 'shaken'. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "*sraaddhaa* in *prathyaksha pramaanam* is natural".

Then, he argues "If *sraaddhaa* is natural in *prathyaksha pramaanam*, why do we not have the same *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*, which is *apourusheyam, nirdhushtam* and *Isvara krutham* or in the Lord's declaration '*vedaischa sarvai: aham eva vedhya: |*

vedhaanthkruth veda vidh eva aham cha? We should have natural *sraddhaa* in mahaavaakya pramaanaa also. But, why is it not so?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa himself answers: "It is not 'absence of *sraddhaa*', because *sraddhaa* **is** in-born. But, that *sraddhaa* is obstructed by certain factors. What we require is not 'generation of *sraddhaa*'; but, what we do require is 'removal of the obstacles' ".

In some other texts, 'five' obstacles are enumerated. Sureswaraachaaryaa lists four obstacles here and says: "If those four are removed, we 'discover' *sraddhaa*. When the obstacle / cover is removed, we will develop the same keen type of *sraddhaa* that we have in *prathyaksham*, in the *mahaa vaakyam* also. As a consequence of that *sraddhaa*, the 'understanding' derived from the *mahaa vaakyam* will become 'final' and we will be 'relaxed'".

What are the four obstacles enumerated by the *Aachaaryaa*? The first two obstacles were discussed in the previous session. But, in view of their significance / importance, they are being repeated now.

The first obstacle is : '*pramaanaanthara prathipanna prathipaadhanam*'. To explain: "If a so-called *pramaanam* reveals an already known object or fact, then, that so-called *pramaanam* does not deserve to be called a '*pramaanam*' or 'source of knowledge', because, the object or fact is already known. The so-called *pramaanam* is not 'producing' knowledge; it only 'restates' something which is already known. Such a statement cannot be called *pramaana vaakyam* . It will have to be called *anuvadhaka vaakyam*".

The first obstacle is, thus, '*anuvadhakathvam*'. '*Anuvadhakathvam*' means 'restatement of a known fact', and, obviously, cannot be considered as 'production of new knowledge'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the term '*pramaanaanthara prathipanna prathipaadhanam*', to denote *anuvadhakathvam*. Another term '*athigathathvam*' also is commonly used for this. The first obstacle or *prathibhandha*: is therefore, '*anuvadhakathva prathibhandha*.' or '*athigathathva prathibhandha*.' or '*pramaanaanthara prathipanna prathipaadhana prathibhandha*.'"

The commentators give examples for '*anuvadhakathvam*' - both *loukikaa* examples and *vaidhikaa* examples.

A common *loukikaa* example is as follows: "Two persons are seated on the bank of a river. There are many trees around them, with large numbers of fruits. Both the individuals are looking at the river, the trees and the fruits. Both are fully aware of their surroundings. If,

under such circumstances, one of them makes a statement '*naddhyastheere palaani santhi*' – 'there are many fruits on the bank of the river', can that statement be called *pramaana vaakyam*? Obviously not, since the other person is also equally aware of what was stated. You cannot call it *pramaana vaakyam*, because the statement is about something well known and evident. It is only an *anuvadhaka vaakyam*'.

A *saasthric* example, which is given, is the statement '*Agni: himasya beshajam*'. This is a *vaakyam* occurring in some part of the *Vedaas*, meaning 'fire is a remedy, when there is lot of snow around'. In severely cold climates with snowfalls, bonfires are kindled and used as remedy or relief for the cold surroundings. Even though it is the *Veda* that had made this statement, it is again not a *pramaana vaakyam*, because the content of the *vaakyam* is a well known fact. It is only an *arthavaadhaka* or *anuvadhaka vaakyam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "Do you think that *mahaa vaakyam* is an *anuvadhaka vaakyam* (similar to the examples given)?" and says "If *mahaa vaakyam* is revealing something that we already know, *mahaa vaakyam* also cannot be a *pramaanam*, and, there is justification for your not having *sraddhaa* in it. But, it is not so. *Mahaa vaakyam* reveals a fact that cannot be known from any other *pramaanam*".

What is the second obstacle? It is this. If one so-called *pramaanam* / 'source of knowledge' is revealing something, which is contradicted by another so-called *pramaanam*, then at least one of the so-called *pramaanam*-s becomes invalid. The observer loses regard for one or both *pramaanam*-s. Thus, 'contradiction' is the second obstacle to *sraddhaa* or acceptance.

An example given by Swamiji: "If I point out to the desk in front of me and say 'this object is an elephant, black in colour and weighing five tons', my statement, which may be considered *sabda pramaanam*, is contradicting the already operational *pramaanam* called *prathyaksha anubhavaa*, which very clearly has established the object to you, as a lightweight, brown desk. My statement is *anubhava viruddham* – contradictory to what you experience. The *sabda pramaanam*, in this case, is *viruddhaartha prathipaadhakam* or *vipareethaartha prathipaadhakam*. Such 'contradictory revelation' is also an obstacle in 'acceptance', i.e. to '*sraddhaa*'. This is the second type of obstacle, in the *Aachaaryaa's* list.

For '*Vipareethaarthaprathipaadhanam*' also, the commentators give examples - both *loukika* and *vaidhika*. The *loukika* example is the statement "*graavaana: plavanthe*", meaning "rocks are floating (in the water)". Obviously, this cannot be a *pramaana vaakyam*, since it contradicts *prathyaksha pramaanam*, this reason stated in Sanskrit as, "*vipareethaarthaprathipaadhakathvaath*".

The *Vedic* example for this type of obstacle is a statement in *Chaandoghya Upanishad*. In the *Panchaagni Vidhya* of the *Upanishad*, there is a statement "*purusho vaava Gouthama agni:*" (V.7.1) meaning "O Gauthama! Man is indeed the fire". Obviously, this statement 'man is fire', is not acceptable on its face value. Again, "*vipareetharthaprathipaadhakathvaath*" i.e. because it contradicts *prathyaksha pramaanam*, even this *Vedic* statement "*purusho vaava Gouthama agni:*" cannot be taken as a *pramaana vaakyam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "*Vipareetharthaprathipaadhanam Vaa?*" - "Is it because the *sabda pramaanam* is revealing something contradictory?", making it clear, that *Vipareetharthaprathipaadhanam* is the second possible obstacle to *sraddhaa*.

What is the third obstruction? And: It is termed '*samsayithaprathipaadhanam*'.

To explain: If a so-called *pramaanam* gives doubtful or vague knowledge, (a doubtful knowledge is no knowledge), then it cannot be accepted as *pramaanam*.

An example from mundane life: "Imagine that a person wants to board a particular train, but, does not know the exact time of departure of the train. Another person had recently travelled by the same train. Therefore, the first person asks the second person as to what time the train starts from the Railway Station. The second person replies 'at 10 PM' and then adds 'I think so; I am not 100 % sure; but, I am 99% sure'. Then can the first person use this statement as *pramaanam* for going to the Station? Obviously not, since the second person has given only a doubtful or vague answer". A *pramaanam* is not a *pramaanam*, if it gives doubtful knowledge / information, as in this instance.

The commentators give examples for '*samsayithaprathipaadhanam*' also - both *loukika* and *saasthreeya* examples. A *loukika* example is the purported statement, i.e. someone remarking, "*sthaanu: vaa purusha: vaa*" meaning "There is something there; I do not know whether it is pillar or a human being ". Such a vague statement cannot be *pramaana vaakyam*, '*samsayitharthaprathipaadhakathvaath*', meaning 'because its import is vague or of doubtful nature'.

As for the *saasthreeya* example, there is a *Vedic* statement "*ko hi thath vedhaa yadhi amushmin loke asthi vaa na vaa*" - "Who knows whether there is life or not in *Paraloka* ?". This is a statement found somewhere in the *Vedas*, almost atheist in nature, expressing the doubts "Is there a *Paraloka* at all? Will we go to *Paraloka*, after death? Are our forefathers now in *Paraloka*?" If one considers this statement '*ko hi thath vedhaa yadhi amushmin loke asthi vaa na vaa*', the statement is '*samsayitharthaprathipaadhakham*'; i.e. it expresses only doubts on a subject. Such '*samsayithaprathipaadhanam*' - 'conveying an information in a

very vague manner' also is considered an obstacle, in accepting something as a valid 'source of knowledge'.

What is the fourth obstacle? Ans: If a so-called 'source of knowledge' does not produce any knowledge at all, such a defect is termed '*aprathipaadhanam*' or '*jnaana adhanakathvam*', meaning, 'non-generation of knowledge' and obviously, that so-called 'source of knowledge' cannot be considered a *pramaanam* at all.

A *loukika* example is the 'talk' of a person during sleep. Invariably, such talks do not convey any sense; very often, they cannot even be de-ciphered. These meaningless sentences coming from a sleeping person cannot be considered *pramaanam*, because they do not produce any knowledge.

Saasthreeya example for this fourth obstacle: In the *Vedas*, at times, along with several *manthraa*-s, certain sounds, which do not have any meaning are used. In *Saama Veda*, such letters are termed '*thobha akshaarani*'. In the well known *Praana pradhista manthraas* before commencing any *Puja*, there are some terms such as *voushat* (*nethrathraaya vaushat*), *hoom* (*kavachaaya hoom*), *patu* (*asthraaya patu*) etc., which are all only basic letters. They do not have any independent existence, nor do they have any particular meaning. They all come under *apramaana vaakyaani*.

Sureswaraacharya concedes: "If any of these four defects viz., (1) anuvaadhakathvam (2) vipareethaatha prathipaadhakathvam (3) samsayithaatha prathipaadhakathvam and (4) aprathipaadhakathvam is there in mahaa vaakyam, then the mahaa vaakyam will not govern any respect"; and, wonders : "But, when none of these four defects is there, how could anyone refuse to accept mahaa vaakyam as a valid and final source of knowledge, exactly like prathyaksha pramaanam ?"

When an individual sees some object as *prathyakshaa*, he / she does not follow it up by 'meditation' for 'realizing' the object. He straightaway considers the object as 'evident'.

Mahaa vaakyam is talking about the **ever** experienced Consciousness, which is experienced, in fact, more permanently, than any other object seen as *prathyaksham*. Any object experienced as *prathyaksham*, is experienced only when it is in front of the 'viewer'. On the other hand, Consciousness is experienced **all the time**.

The *Aachaaryaa* asks: "When *mahaa vaakyam* is talking about such an ever available Consciousness, what obstructs you from receiving that knowledge and accepting that knowledge as final? And, what obstacle is there for your *sraddhaa* in that *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*?"

Sradhaavaan receives immediate knowledge; *asraadhaavaan* resorts to meditation, which can produce no result at all, even if pursued for a length of time.

Reverting to the text:

- (प्रमाणस्य) संशयितप्रतिपादनं वा - alternately, the pramaanam must be making a vague or doubtful statement;
- (प्रमाणस्य) न प्रतिपादनं वा - alternately, the pramaanam should not be producing any knowledge at all ;
- इति - these four are the defects / obstacles for lack of *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*.

Since none of these four defects is there in *mahaa vaakyam*, there should be no obstacle to *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*; and, if *sraddhaa* is there, the aspirant will be convinced that his / her 'understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam* **is** 'enlightenment', apart from which there is no other enlightenment for which he / she need work. If at all the aspirant should work for something, he/she should work only for eliminating 'triangular' format from his / her life and nourishing 'binary' format, especially when *praarabhdhaa* is not favourable. Other than this, nothing else is required. This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa, the foremost amongst the *sishtyaas* of Adi Sankara, is trying to convey. He says:

- एतेषां - Among these four,
- अन्यतमत् अपि कारणं नास्ति - none of the reasons is there (in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*).

'anyathamath' is aarsha prayogam; actually, it should be 'anyathamam'.

There may be defects / obstacles, in the sentences given earlier as examples, viz., "naddhyastheree palaani santhi" (example of anuvaadhakathvam), "purusho vaava Gouthama agni:" (example of vipareethaatha prathipaadhakathvam) and "ko hi thath vedhaa yadhi amushmin loke asthi vaa na vaa" (example of samsayithaatha prathipaadhakathvam) etc. "But" warns the Aachaaryaa, "Do not bring those obstacles in the case of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Kindly do not apply those defects". And, if a seeker says that he / she has *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*, what can prevent him / her from claiming that the 'understanding' derived from the *mahaa vaakyam* **is** final and **is** 'enlightenment'?

- यतः आह - This particular point, viz., that *mahaa vaakyam* does not have any of these four obstacles / defects. is elaborated (in the following verses).

In the following *slokaas*, Sureswaraachaaryaa proceeds to eliminate each one of them, in the case of *mahaa vaakyam*. These are very technical and significant *slokaas*.

Chapter III: Verse 35 –

मानान्तरानवष्टब्धं निर्दुःख्यात्मानमञ्जसा ।

बोधयन्ती श्रुतिः केन न प्रमाणमितीर्यते ॥ ३५ ॥

On what grounds, can *sruthi*, which truly reveals the real Self, free from misery and inaccessible to other sources of knowledge, be judged as not being a source of valid knowledge?

Sureswaraachaaryaa negates the first and second obstacles in this *sloka*.

- श्रुतिः मानान्तरानवष्टब्धं बोधयन्ती - *Sruthi* is revealing a fact, which is not revealed by any other *pramaanam*,

What do the *Upanishads* reveal?

- निर्दुःखी आत्मानं - the *aathmaa* or Self, which is free from misery.

Through *mahaa vaakyam*, *Sruthi* is revealing a fact about Consciousness, which fact about Consciousness, is never revealed by any other *pramaanam*. If any other *pramaanam* had already revealed the fact, then the *mahaa vaakyam* will become *anuvadhaka vaakyam* / a re-statement only. It will become a secondary source.

In this context, reference has to be made to a blunder committed by many non-traditional people. They have a wrong concept of *Vedhaanthaa* or *mahaa vaakyam*. They think that the *rishis*, who are authors of the *Veda*, gained *Brahma jnaanam* through their mystic experiences. This is the first part of the blunder.

The non-traditional people further assume that the *rishis*, who have already gained their knowledge' through their meditation and mystic experiences, are only recording that 'knowledge' in the *Vedhaanthic* text book. In short, *Vedhaanthaa* is looked upon as the recording of a knowledge gained by *rishis*, through their meditation and mystic experience.

This is the presentation of *Vedhaanthaa* by all the non-traditional people, an unfortunate presentation.

What is the consequence of this 'presentation'? Ans: It leads to the misconception, that, *Vedhaanthaa* does not produce knowledge; it only talks about a knowledge gained through meditation. Therefore, instead of looking upon *Vedhaanthaa* / *mahaa vaakyam*, as the primary source of knowledge, they look upon 'meditation' as the primary source of knowledge. .

In other words, because of the misconception, 'meditation' becomes *pramaanam* and *Vedhaanthaa* becomes *anuvadakham*, i.e. only a 'restatement' of knowledge gained through meditation. Once an aspirant, thus, mistakenly looks upon *Vedhaanthaa* as only a restatement, he is no more satisfied with what he considers as 'book-knowledge'. He aims to experience whatever direct experience the *rishis* are supposed to have had. He tends to think : "This '*aham brahma asmi*' statement of the *mahaa vaakyam* is not the original knowledge; I have to get the original knowledge which the *rishis* themselves got, either through meditation or some mystic experience".

Meditation is wrongly considered as the 'source of knowledge', because of this wrong presentation / concept. Sureswaraacharya warns: "Kindly do not commit this blunder. *Vedhaantha vaakyam* is **not** *anuvadahakam* of the experience gained during meditation. *Vedhaantha vaakyam* itself **is** the primary source of knowledge for you also, for me also and for the *rishis* also. *Rishis* also gained the knowledge **not** through meditation, but through *mahaa vaakyam* only".

In the *Kenopanishad*, the *guru* declares : "*ithi susrooma poorveshaam ye na: thath vyaachachakshire*" (Chapter I- Verse 4), – "We have heard the following teaching of the ancient teachers who revealed that to us" implying "We did not get the knowledge in meditation; we are not recording our mystic experiences; we are only sharing the same words which our *guru* taught to us".

Therefore, for the entire *advaita parampara*, *mahaa vaakyam* is the final, valid and only source of knowledge. Therefore, understanding of *mahaa vaakyam* is the final knowledge. The seeker does not have to meditate or attempt to have any mystic experience.

Reverting to the text, Sureswaraacharya says "*Sruthi: maanaanthara anavashtabhdham bodhayanthee*" – "*Upanishads* are revealing 'knowledge' not revealed by any other *pramaanam*"}

The term "*Maanaanthara*" means "any other *pramaanam*". But, in this context, the term should be understood to include meditation or any other mystic experiences also, though neither 'meditation' nor 'mystic experiences' is included in the list of the six *pramaanams*, accepted by *Advaithaa*. Unfortunately, many people wrongly think that the final knowledge should come in meditation. In his treatise, *Panchadasee*, Swami Vidhyaaranya also repeatedly says: "Final knowledge should come in *mahaa vaaka vichaaraa* only and not in meditation".

With this statement "sruthi: maanaanthara anavashtabhdham bodhayanthee", the Aachaaraa has removed the first obstacle, viz., 'anuvaadhakthvam'.

Now, on the second obstacle:

- अञ्जसा) श्रुति :आत्मानं बोधयन्ती(- (Sruthi reveals the Self) without contradicting any other *pramaanam*.

'*anjasaad* means 'without contradiction' / '*avaipareethyena*'|

Vedhaanthaa never contradicts any other *pramaanam*; conversely, no other *pramaanam* can contradict *Vedhaanthaa*.

For instance, *Vedhaanthaa* never says " You, the mind, is *nithya suddhaa*"; it says "You, the Consciousness , is *nithya suddhaa*"| In this statement, there is no contradiction at all; *prathyakasha virodha* is not there; *anumaana virodhaa* is not there; *virodhaa* to modern science is also not there.

In fact, there can be no *virodhaa* between *sruthi / sabdha / mahaa vaakyam* and any of the other five *pramaanams*, because all *pramaanams* other than *sruthi* or *sabdha pramaanam* are dealing only with 'matter', while *sruthi / mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with the non-material entity, Consciousness.

When one says "I am fat", using *prathyakshaa*, one is talking about the material body. And, when one says "I am agitated / depressed", which experience is also based on *prathyakshaa*, then, one is talking about the material mind. Whether it is *indriya prathyaksham* or *saakshi prathyaksham*, *prathyaksham* deals with 'matter' only. Other *Pramaanams* (except *mahaa vaakyam*), like *anumaanam*, *upamaanam* etc. are based only on *prathyaksham*; therefore, all other *pramaanams* also deal with 'matter' only. On the other hand, *Mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with the non-material entity 'Consciousness'. Therefore, how can the other *pramaanam*-s contradict *sruthi*?

Unfortunately, at times, there is a seeming contradiction. This is because, the word 'I' is used very, very loosely. To explain: "When I say 'I have a body', then I realize that I am different from my body, because I claim to be the possessor of the body. But at other times when I say 'I am fat'/'I am lean' etc., then, by the word 'I', I mean my body. Thus, we have got a vagueness regarding the term 'I', as to whether we are referring to the 'Consciousness' part or to the 'matter' part". The term 'I' can be used for Consciousness part or for the 'material' part. Therefore, there is a seeming contradiction.

'*Nirdhu:khee*' is adjective to '*aathmaa*', meaning that *aathmaa* is 'ever free' from *dhu:kham*. The *Aachaaryaa* does not say that mind is free from misery. Mind will always have ups and downs. As declared by Lord Krishna in the Bhagavadh Githa (Chapter XIV), the three *gunaas* will be fluctuating all the time, causing different emotions in the mind. *Saasthraas* never say that mind is ever free from *dhu:kham*. They only say: "**You** are not the mind; and, **you**, who is other than the mind is eternally *aanandasvaroopa*; and, '**your**' *aanandhaa*, sometimes get reflected in your mind; that *aanandhaa* is called experiential or *prathibhimbhaa aanandhaa*". The *Aachaaryaa* asks: "What is your problem in accepting this *nirdhu:khee aathmaa*, not contradicted by any other *pramaanam*?"

146. Chapter III, Verse 35 to 38 (25-07-2009)

In these important and technical verses, Sureswaraacharya is taking a small diversion, dealing with the topic of *sraddha* and the crucial role played by *sraddha* in *mahaa vaakyavichaara*: | When a person does not have *sraddha* in *mahaa vaakyam*, he will receive the understanding of *mahaa vaakyam*, but, will treat it as only 'theoretical knowledge', and think that there is some 'enlightenment', which has to follow later. To express it in a marginally different manner, a person without *sraddha*, makes (attributes) a difference between knowledge and 'enlightenment', between knowledge and 'realization', between knowledge and '*anubhava jnaanam*' and between knowledge and '*saakshaathkaara*'. The difference is 'made' (attributed), when *sraddha* is lacking.

On the other hand, when *mahaa vaakyavichaara* is done with *sraddha* in the *mahaa vaakyam*, for such a *sraadhavaan*, the knowledge received from *mahaa vaakyam* is itself 'enlightenment', is itself 'realization', is itself '*aparoksha jnaanam*', is itself '*anubhava jnaanam*' and is itself '*saakshaathkaara*.' | The *sraadhavaan* sees no difference at all between 'knowledge' and 'understanding' or between 'knowledge' and 'realization'. In other words, the seeming difference between 'knowledge' and 'enlightenment' is caused only by lack of *sraddha*. It is *sraddha*, whose presence makes knowledge and enlightenment identical and whose absence makes knowledge and enlightenment different. It has nothing to do with any mystic experience.

The conviction that knowledge born out of *mahaa vaakyavichaara* and 'enlightenment' are identical, is the result of taking the message of *mahaa vaakyam* as final. In fact, 'enlightenment' is itself nothing but looking upon the message of *mahaa vaakyam* as final and factual; that, the message does not require any further validation, any further confirmation or any further corroboration.

Once, thus, the message of *mahaa vaakyam* is understood firmly as final and factual, the aspirant will change his mindset from the 'triangular' to the 'binary' format.

Therefore, whether one can come to binary format or not, is dependent on the presence or absence of *sraddha*, and, ultimately, 'liberation' depends upon 'binary' format.

Thus, the route is: (i) *sraddha* in *mahaa vaakyam* (ii) *sraddha* 'makes' knowledge itself into 'enlightenment' (iii) 'enlightenment' makes message of *mahaa vaakyam* final and factual (iv) the 'factuality' of the *mahaa vaakyam*, makes 'binary' format possible and (v) the 'binary' format leads to liberation.

It follows, therefore, that, *sraddhaa* takes the *mumukshu* / the aspirant right up to 'liberation'. That is the reason Lord Krishna makes the seemingly simple, but, actually a very significant declaration, '*sraddhaavaan labhathe jnaanam*'. And, Swami *Vidyaaaranaya*, in his treatise, *Panchadasee*, declares: "*sarvathra eva mahaa vaakya vichaaraa aprokshath*" meaning "when *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is done with *sraddhaa*, what knowledge the student gains **is** *aparoksha jnaanam*".

That knowledge **is** enlightenment; that knowledge **is** *saakshaathkaara*: / The aspirant need not work for any separate 'realization' or '*anubhava*.' | And, therefore, *sraddhaa* is crucial.

Sureswaraacharya defines *sraddhaa* as "appreciation of the *pramaanam* status of *mahaa vaakyam*". And, for this appreciation, there can be different obstacles. The *Aaacharya* lists four, all four in the forms of different types of misconception. Any one of the four types of misconception is an obstacle to the appreciation of the *pramaanam* status of the *mahaa vaakyam*. When any one of these four obstacles / four types of misconception is there in the mind of the seeker, he / she does not see *mahaa vaakyam* as a *pramaanam* ; that means, that he / she has no *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*; that means, that he / she will treat the knowledge only as 'theoretical knowledge' and look for some other 'enlightenment'.

Sureswaraacharya enumerated those four misconceptions, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 35. Now, in the 35th verse, he is negating the first two misconceptions.

What is the first misconception? Ans: "Thinking that there are two *pramaanams* for achieving *eikya jnaanam*; that, one *pramaanam* gives 'knowledge' and another *pramaanam* gives 'enlightenment'. This misconception is a very big obstacle. *Mahaa vaakyaa* is taken as the *pramaanam*, giving only 'theoretical knowledge' and meditation is taken as the second *pramaanam*, giving 'actual enlightenment'"

This is a very big obstacle / misconception, which, unfortunately, most seekers tend to have. They assume that there are two *pramaanams*, that 'study' is one *pramaanam* which gives 'knowledge' and 'meditation' is the second *pramaanam* which gives 'enlightenment'. This assumption of two *pramaanams* is the first type of blunder.

Sureswaraacharya 'blasts' that misconception and strongly asserts "there is no separate 'meditation *pramaanam*'; there is only one *pramaanam*, viz., the *mahaa vaakyam*, which gives 'knowledge', which 'knowledge' **is** 'enlightenment'".

It should not even be said that *mahaa vaakyam* gives 'knowledge' and 'enlightenment', since such a statement will lead to another misconception in the seeker, that he /she has received

knowledge from the *mahaa vaakyam* as a first step and will get 'enlightenment' *later*, as a second step, from the same *mahaa vaakyam*.

It is not so. It is one *pramaanam*, *mahaa vaakyam*, which **alone and by itself**, gives 'knowledge' which **is** 'enlightenment'. The seeker should / need not 'wait' for a *later* or *subsequent* 'enlightenment', even from that one *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*. If he / she waits, the 'wait' will only be eternal.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "*sruthi: maanaantra anavashtabdam aathmaanam bodhyanthee*" - "*sruthi* is revealing an *aathmaa*, which cannot be revealed by any other *pramaanam*".

Thus, the *Aacharya* makes it very, very clear to the student that (i) the 'revelation'/ 'knowledge' given by the *mahaa vaakyam* **is** 'enlightenment'(ii) the 'enlightenment' has to help the seeker see the message given by *mahaa vaakyam* as factual and (iii) that 'factuality' has to take the seeker to the 'binary' format and liberation. If it does not, nothing else can do that.

Then, what is the second misconception? Ans: "That, *Vedhaantha* reveals a fact, which is contradicted by other *pramaanam*-s."

The 'other *pramaanam*-s' mainly means '*prathyaksham*'.

This is the second misconception. This misconception results essentially because of two reasons: (1) because, *Vedhaantha* reveals *advaitam* and other *pramaanam*-s reveal *dvaitam* and (2) because, while *Vedhaantha* asserts "'I' am *aanandha svaropa*:", 'experience' or '*prathyaksha*' reveals "I am not *aanandha svaropa*: / In fact, more often, I am miserable or *dhu:khee*". Mainly because of these reasons, the seeker concludes that "*Vedhaantha* is '*vipareetharthaprathipaadhanam*'" – "*Vedhaantha* affirms what is contradicted by other sources of knowledge".

The further result of this conclusion, is that, the seeker is not able to accept *Vedhaantha* as factual and tends to resort to other *saadhana*s, like meditation, for achieving a new *aanandha*.

Even if, for the sake of argument, it is accepted that such an *aanandha* 'arrives' during meditation, it cannot be called 'enlightenment' or 'liberation'. The reason is obvious. The extraordinary *aanandha* that came because of meditation, will go away, when the seeker stops meditation. The *aanandha* will be temporary; the 'enlightenment' and the '*moksha*'

will be temporary. When the 'experience' that gave the *aanandhaa* goes away, *samsaaraa* will come back.

Swami Dayananda Saraswathy jocularly calls this misconceived philosophy (viz. of achieving *aanandhaa* through meditation) 'see-saw' philosophy, because "In meditation, 'I' am 'up' and *samsaaraa* is 'down'; once, out of meditation, 'I' am 'down' and *samsaaraa* is 'up'; all the problems come back".

Then, how is this seeming contradiction between what is revealed by *mahaa vaakyam* and what is revealed by *prathyakshaa* is to be resolved? Sureswaraachaarya answers. He says: "In reality, there is no contradiction between the fact that 'I' am *aanandha svaroopaa*: and my 'experience' of sorrow. How do I say that? I will answer. Whenever you talk about any experience, that experience deals with only *anaathmaa*. All your experiences are dealing with *anaathmaa*, either external *anaathmaa* or internal *anaathmaa*. Internal *anaathmaa* means body / mind/ intellect / *annamaya / mano mayal praana mayaa* etc. All experiences deal only with *anaathmaa*. But, 'I', the *saakshi*, is never an object of experience. *Mahaa vaakyam* deals with 'I', the Consciousness, which is not subject to any form of objectification, through any *pramaanam*. In short, *mahaa vaakyam* deals with *aathmaa* ; other *pramaanam*-s deal with *anaathmaa*. Thus, when the very subjects they deal with, are different, where is the question of any mutual contradiction between *mahaa vaakyam* and *anubhavaa* or *prathyakshaa*?" (*Anubhavaa* means objective experience).

The *Aachaaryaa* conveys this fact, by saying "*sruthi: nirdhu:khee aathmaanam bodhayanthee anjasaa*" – "*sruthi* reveals the *aanandha svaroopaa aathmaa* very clearly, without any contradiction". And, *aathmaa* is not the mind.

Mind has got two conditions, which nobody can stop. What are the two conditions? At times, mind gets into a particular type of state, in which 'my' *aanandhaa* (the *svaroopaa aanandhaa*) can be reflected by the mind; at other times, it gets into another particular type of state, when 'my' *aanandhaa* cannot be reflected by the mind. The mind cannot avoid either the 'reflecting state' or the 'non-reflecting state'. 'Reflecting state' gives 'temporary happiness'; 'non-reflecting state' gives 'temporary sorrow'. Mind can never, never avoid either.

In other words, mind can never avoid the arrival of *prathibhimbha aanandhaa* or the departure of *prathibhimbha aanandhaa*. Depending on *praarabdham*, the proportions may vary. In higher *lokas*, *prathi bhimbha aanandhaa* is more ; in lower *lokas*, *prathi bhimbha aanandhaa* is less; in *manushya loka*, *prathi bhimbha aanandhaa* will be going 'up and down'. Nobody can stop that, including *Bhagavaan*. "Understanding this, as it is and claiming 'my' *bhimbha aananadaa status*" is what *mahaa vaakyam* is helping the seeker to achieve. "Therefore" asks the *Aachaaryaa* "Where is the contradiction, between *sruthi* and

prathyaksham? Why are you thinking of the ephemeral *prathi bhimbha aanandaa* in the mind, when *mahaa vaakaym* is talking about the permanent *bhimbha aanandhaa* of *aathmaa?*"

The term '*Nirdhu:khee*' in this verse, refers to '*bhimbha aanandhaa*'.

When the real Self revealed by *sruthi* is not accessible to other *pramaanam*-s and (i) therefore, cannot be revealed by other *pramaanam*-s and (ii) therefore, cannot be contradicted also by other *pramaanam*-s,

- केन श्रुति :न प्रमाणं इति ईर्यते - How can it (*sruthi*) be judged as not being a 'source of knowledge'

The first misconception that "*eykya jnaanam* can be / has to be achieved by *pramaanam*-s other than *sruthi (mahaa vaakyam)*" and the second misconception, that "*Vedhaanthaa* contradicts 'Experience'", have both been, thus, resolved by Sureswaraachaaryaa. Now, he proceeds to talk about the third misconception.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 36:

न च संशयित्वमवगम्यति । यतः ।

Nor does it convey what is open to doubt; for:

What is the third misconception? It is: "*sruthi* gives a vague or doubtful message".

If *sruthi* gives *samsaya jnaanam*, then, there may be justification for the student's lack of *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*. But, *sruthi* **does not** reveal *samsaya jnaanam*, though, at times, there is a 'perceived' vagueness about its message. This 'perception' is a result of the fact, that, there are *advaitins* extracting one message from the *Upanishads*, there are *visishtha advaitins* extracting another message and there are *dvaitins* extracting yet another message. Since the messages extracted by the different philosophers do have contradictions, the student concludes that the *Upanishads* are vague. It is to counter this problem that '*mananam*' has been included in the *Advaita* philosophy as a crucial part in the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.| '*Mananam*' is to firmly establish that there is only one message which comes from the *Upanishads* and that message is '*thath thvam asI* |

Mahaa vaakyam or *sruthi* is not giving any vague message at all. This has to be clearly understood. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- संशयित्वं च - A doubtful message also

- न अवगम्यति - is not given (by the *Upanishads*).
- यत : - I will give you the reason why I say this.

What is that reason? The *Aachaaryaa* gives two *slokaas* (36 and 37) to remove the third misconception / obstacle. Verse 35 removed the first two misconceptions; verses 36 and 37 remove the third misconception.

Chapter III: Verse 36 –

सर्वसंशयहेतौ हि निरस्ते कथमात्मनि ।

जायेत संशयो वाक्यादनुमानेन युष्मदि ॥ ३६ ॥

When the non-Self, which is the root cause of all possible doubts, is removed through reasoning, how can the meaning of the *sruthi* in relation to the Self be open to doubt?

Sureswaraachaaryaa has averred: "No doubt can come at all, if *sruthi* is understood properly".

The *Upanishad* reveals "I am *aanandha svaroopaa*.", but, only after negating the *pancha kosaas* from the 'I'. Without understanding this crucial fact, if the student mistakenly retains the *pancha kosaas* in 'I', the doubt is bound to arise. The following example of an imaginary situation when a student finds it difficult to negate or dismiss the *annamaya kosa* (the physical body) will make this statement clearer. *Sruthi* is telling the student "you' are free from *jaraa* and *maranam*". *Sruthi* also says "you' are free from degenerative diseases". When *sruthi* makes this declaration, *sruthi* is not talking about the *annamaya kosaa* / the physical body, which it has already negated. But, imagine that the student is suffering from a knee-joint pain and refuses to sit on a chair, thinking that, as a mark of respect for the *Aachaaryaa*, he should sit only on the floor; and having done so, continues to suffer from the pain more intensely, during the course of the class. At this stage, when he is strongly in *annamaya kosaa*, he listens to the *Aachaaryaa* giving this message from the *sruthi* "You are immortal. You are free from old age. You are free from **degenerative disorders**". Since the student is preoccupied with his intense pain, he will naturally get the doubt as to whether the *Sruthi* is right at all.

It is obvious, therefore, that 'doubts' arise because there are two 'I'- s. One is the *annamaya kosaa* 'I' (with which the student has continued to identify in the example given). The second 'I', is the *aathmaa* 'I', which *saasthra* is talking about. The doubt will persist as long as both the *kosaa* 'I' and *aathmaa* 'I' are together. Therefore, the *Upanishad* is taking pains to move the seeker's mind out of the *pancha kosaas* and make him receive the message,

that, in reality, there is only one *saakshi*, which is *aanandha svaroopam*: or *poorna svaroopam*: and that everything else is *mithyaa* / If and when the listener negates the *pancha kosaas* intellectually and listens to the *mahaa vaakyam* remaining as *saakshi*, he can directly lap up the message of the *mahaa vaakyam* as 'knowledge-cum-enlightenment'.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- अनुमानेन - By *anumaanam* or *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic,
- युष्मदि निरस्ते - when the *pancha kosaas* are negated,

'*Yushmadh*' literally means 'you' or any object that can be addressed as 'you'. It is a peculiar/ rare usage, the word declined as '*yushmadh – yushamadau – yushmadha:*'. In this context, it means the '*pancha kosaa 'aham'* † '*Nirasthe*' means 'negated'.

Sruthi is 'revealing' facts about 'me' and *sruthi alone* can reveal. No other *pramaanam* can. Scientists can never study Consciousness and declare whether it is *aanandha svaroopam* or *dhu:kha svaroopam*. Even 'I', the Consciousness, cannot objectify the Consciousness, just as eyes cannot see the eyes themselves. Just as the eyes require a mirror to see them, similarly *sruthi alone*, like the mirror, has to reveal whether Consciousness is *aanandha svaroopam* or *dhu:khaa svaroopam*. *Sruthi pramaanaa* alone has to reveal 'I' or *aatmaa* and it is revealing "'I' am *pancha kosa adheetha:* / 'I' am *aanandha svaroopam:*'"

The 'I', which *mahaa vaakyam* reveals, am not *anna maya kosaa*. Therefore, *annamayaa*-centric mortality cannot be talked about. That 'I', which *mahaa vaakyam* reveals, am not *praana mayaa kosaa*; therefore, *praana mayaa*-centric 'hunger', 'thirst' etc. cannot be talked about. That 'I', which *mahaa vaakyam* reveals, am not *mano mayaa kosaa*. Therefore, *mano-mayaa*-centric *raaghaa, dveshaa, kaamaa, khrodaa* etc. cannot be talked about. That 'I', which *mahaa vaakyam* reveals, am not *vijnaana mayaa kosaa*; therefore, *vijnaana-mayaa*-centric 'ignorance' of worldly matters cannot be talked about. That 'I', which *mahaa vaakyam* reveals, am not even *aanandha maya kosaa*. Therefore, *aathma ajnaanam* also cannot be talked about. Then, what is that 'I' that *mahaa vaakyam* reveals? It is that 'I', the *aathmaa*, **devoid of all *upaadhi-s*** / attributes and limiting adjuncts. The *Aachaaryaa* asks : " When such is the case, if you have *sraddhaa*, what is the difficulty in accepting the fact, that *sruthi / mahaa vaakyam* is a non- contradictory *pramaanam*?"

Highlighting the need for the 'negation of the *pancha kosaas*', while understanding the import of 'aham' in the *mahaa vaakyam* 'aham brahma asmi' or of 'thvam' in the *mahaa vaakyam* 'thath thvam asi', the *Aachaaryaa* says "anumaanena yushmadhi nirasthe (sathi) " - "when the *pancha kosaas* are removed from 'I', by *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic ":

- सर्वसंशयहेतौ हि (निरस्ते) - all the reasons for the doubts are also gone.

What are the reasons? These had already been discussed. When *annamaya kosa* is retained in 'aham', the student will have doubts about the *mahaa vaakyam*, because *anna maya*, the body, **is** mortal, whereas *mahaa vaakyam* talks of the immortality of 'aathma' or 'aham'. When *mano maya kosa* is retained in 'aham', the student will have doubts about the *mahaa vaakyam*, because *mano mayaa*, the mind **is** loaded with sorrow, whereas *mahaa vaakyam* declares 'aathmaa is *aananda svaroopam*'.

But, when *anna mayaa* is negated, what can be the basis for the doubt about 'my' immortality?

In a similar manner, when *mano maya* is negated, where is the question of the doubt whether 'I' am *aanandhaa* or *dhu:kham*. That is the reason, why in *sushupthi avasthaa* or deep sleep state when *mano maya* is resolved, it becomes *aanandhaa* for everyone. "Thatha aathmaa sadhaanandho naasya dhu:kam kadhaachana / Yath sushupthau nirvishaya aathmaanandha: anubhooyathe sruthi: prathyaksham eithiyam anumaanam cha jaagrath" – "The aathman is ever blissful; it never suffers misery. In dreamless deep sleep, there are no sense-objects; the bliss of aathman is experienced then. This is attested by sruthi, sense perception, tradition and inference, in the waking state" declares *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in his *Veveka Choodaamani* (verse 107).

In *sushupthi*, we are enjoying *aathma aanandhaa* alone, though, of course, we are not aware of this fact **during** *sushupthi*. If we want to know this fact, we have to 'wake up' and return to the *jaagrath* state, to claim that we experienced *aathma aanandhaa* during the deep sleep state. For 'claiming' this fact, *mano maya* and *vijnaana maya kosaas* are, of course, required.

'Sarva samsaya hethau' is saphthami vibhakthi and is an adjective to 'yushmadhi'. It should be read as: 'sarva samsaya hethau yushmadhi nirasthe (sathi)'. Sruthi has first rejected all the pancha kosaas by avaya vyathirekhaa logic. Therefore:

- कथं आत्मनि संशयः जायेत - Where is the scope for any doubt with regard to 'my' nature ?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 37 and Verse 37 (Chapter III):

अपि च ।

यत्र स्यात्संशयो नासौ ज्ञेय आत्मेति पण्डितैः \

न यतः संशयप्राप्तिरात्मनोऽवगतित्वतः ॥ ३७ ॥

Further: That about which doubts may arise it not to be considered the Self, by the wise. With regard to the Self, there could be no doubt, for it is of the nature of awareness itself.

- अपि च – Further:

This verse is also dealing with the same topic, viz., that, *sruthi* is not revealing anything doubtful or vague. It gives another reason to establish that *sruthi* is not talking about anything that is doubtful or vague. The reason is this: What *sruthi* talks about is something whose existence can never be doubted by anyone. In fact, the very doubt is possible, because of that 'doubtless one' only. What is that 'doubtless one'? It is the Consciousness principle. Nobody can have any doubt as to whether he / she has Consciousness or not, because, even to doubt the existence of Consciousness, he / she **has** to be a Conscious being. If *sruthi* is talking about a 'mysterious' *Brahman*, the listener / the student can have a doubt as to whether that *Brahman* really exists or not. But, when *Sruthi* is talking about the Consciousness itself as *Brahman*, since Consciousness cannot be doubted, *Brahman* also cannot be doubted. That is the reason why *Thaithreeya Upanishad* says: "asanneva sa: bhavathi asadh brahmethi veda cheth| asthi brahmethi cheth veda| santhamenam thatho vidhurithi" – " If one considers that *Brahman* is non-existent, then, he himself becomes non-existent. If one considers that *Brahman* is existent, then, the wise consider him to be existent" (*Brahmavalli* – Paragraph 6).

Referring to the *sloka*:

- यत्र संशयः स्यात् - "Wherever there is doubt,
- असौ न आत्मा - that which is doubted, is within the field of *anaathmaa* only"

All the doubts in the world are *anaathmaa* -centric.

- इति पण्डितैः ज्ञेयः - This fact has to be understood by discerning people.

Intelligent students should understand that wherever there is doubt, it can be only in the field of *anaathmaa*, whereas *mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with something other than *anaathmaa*.

- यतः आत्मनः संशयप्राप्तिः न - This is because, with regard to *aathmaa*, there can be no doubt at all,

Why? Ans: The very presence of doubt with regard to *anaathmaa* is because of the doubtless presence of *aathmaa*, which is of the very nature of awareness. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* also says:

- अवगतित्वतः - since *aathmaa* is of the very nature of *chaithanyam* / awareness.
'*avagathi:*' means *chaithanyam* / awareness.

Suppose a *sishtyaa* concedes this, but, says: "I have no doubt that there is *chaithanyam*; but, I have the doubt as to whether that *chaithanyam* is *aanandha:* |"

The *guru* asks him "Why do you have that doubt, when *sruthi*, the *pramaanam*, is revealing that *chaithanyam* as *aanandha:?*"

Suppose the *sishtyaa* replies "I understand that *sruthi* says that *chaithanyam* is *aanandha:* | But, I can accept it as a fact, only after verification,".

Then the *guru* asks: "How do you want to verify?"

The *sishtyaa* answers: "By some other *pramaanam*".

The *guru*: "But, I have already said there is no other *pramaanam* for verification and proof of *sruthi's* teachings. Therefore, do not waste your time on verification. Either accept or do not accept. Eyes tell me that the colour of a piece of cloth as 'orange'. Eyes have revealed the colour. Do you accept this or not?"

The adamant *sishtyaa* responds: "No. Why should I accept it? I want to verify it with some other *pramaanam*, say, my ears".

The *guru*: "But, You cannot; because, with regard to colour, eyes are the only 'source of knowledge'. Therefore you have no other option except to accept what the eyes have revealed. You cannot make attempts for verification. Similarly, when *sruthi* reveals that *chaithanyam* is *aanandha:*, one can never verify it. There is only one option: have *sraddhaa* and accept it. Attempts to verify will not be fruitful, since other *pramaanam-s* are not capable of either confirming or contradicting the *sruthi*, exactly like the incapacity of the ears or any other sense organ to confirm or contradict the 'colour' that the eyes have revealed".

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* exhorts: "Treat *mahaa vaakyam*, just as you treat your eyes – viz. a valid 'source of knowledge'. With regard to *aathmaa*, *sruthi* is the *chakshu:*, the only valid source of knowledge. Accept it".

Thus, the third misconception has been removed by Sureswaraachaaryaa. The fourth misconception is clarified in the next verse.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 38:

अननबोधकत्वं तु दूरोत्सारितमेव । यत आह ।

That the *sruthi* does not reveal anything at all is not even remotely possible. Therefore, it is said:

Suppose a person says: "Since I cannot verify the *sruthi*'s messages by any other *pramaanam*, I do not want to accept *mahaa vaakyam* itself as a *pramaanam*. I want to reject it". Sureswaraachaaryaa objects and says that, that 'rejection' is also not possible, since what gives you knowledge cannot be rejected.

Going back to the example of the eyes being a *pramaanam*, what the eyes reveal cannot be verified by any other sense organs or even by science. But, would anyone consider this fact as a reason for rejecting eyes as a 'source of knowledge'? Certainly not. Eyes are accepted as *pramaanam*, since they are able to reveal colours and forms, even though what they reveal cannot be verified by any other *pramaanam*. Similarly, *mahaa vaakyam* gives new knowledge about the Self, which new knowledge should be accepted as facts, even though it cannot be verified or confirmed by any other *pramaanam*, or by other means, such as meditation. Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- अननबोधकत्वं तु दूर उत्सारितं एव - "That the *mahaa vaakyam* does not reveal anything at all" is not even remotely possible.

"*Anavabodhagathvam*" means "not revealing a knowledge". "*Dhoora uthsaaritham*" means "is removed far away", implying the meaning "not even remotely possible".

"The idea that '*sruthi* does not teach anything and is, therefore, not a *pramaanam*' is very strongly negated" is the import of the sentence "*anavabodhkathvam thu dhoora uthsaaritham eva*".

Like what? Similar to 'eyes', which are considered *pramaanam*, even though whatever they reveal, cannot be verified with the help of any other sense organ. Exactly like the eyes, *mahaa vaakyam* is also revealing new and unique knowledge, viz., about *chaithanyam*,

which knowledge cannot be verified or contradicted by other *pramaanams*. Then why cannot *sruthi's* teachings be accepted as facts, exactly as the 'colours' and forms' revealed by the eyes are accepted as facts?

Therefore, it can never be said that *sruthi* is *apramaanam*.

Yatha: aaha – Therefore, it is said:

Chapter III: Verse 38 –

बोधेऽप्यनुभवो यस्य न कथंचन जायते ।

तं कथं बोधयेच्चास्त्रं लोष्टं नरसमाकृतिम् ॥ ३८ ॥

How can he in whom no experience arises concerning the matter on hand, be instructed by the scripture? Instead he is a figure of clay in the likeness of man.

Sureswaraacharya says: "When *sruthi* is talking about the ever-available Consciousness and giving information about that Consciousness, which is new knowledge about a new subject, which knowledge can never be questioned or contradicted by anyone, including modern science, and which subject is available all the time as *chaithanya svaroopam*, if a person is missing this, he must be a human being made up of solid clay. Not only his head is clay (as is commonly said of an unintelligent person), his whole person must be clay, because he is refusing to claim a new fact / a liberating fact".

- यस्य कथंचन :अनुभव :न जायते - If a person does not have enlightenment, which is nothing but clearly grasping the *mahaa vaakyam*,

'*anubhava:*', in this context, means 'knowledge, which is enlightenment'.

If a person does not have this '*anubhava:*',

- बोधे - with regard to Consciousness,

The term '*bodhye*', as printed in the book, means 'in the teaching'. Use of the term '*bodhe*', in the place '*bodhye*' gives a better reading. '*Bodha:*' means '*chaithanyam*'.

When the *sruthi* is talking about the **ever-experienced** Consciousness, how can a person work for **separate** experience?

Therefore, "*bodhe api yasya anubhava: na jayathe*" – "one who does not grasp the meaning instantaneously", must be the dullest student.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is not able to see any problem at all, in a discerning student understanding the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, he says:

- शास्त्रं कथं बोधयेत् - how can saasthraa teach
- तं - such a dull student,
- लोष्टं - who is nothing but an embodiment of clay,

'*Loshta:*' means 'clay'.

- नर सम आकृतिम् - which has got a human shape?

Saasthra cannot help such a student at all. Therefore, the problem is with the student and not the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Mahaa vaakya sravanam is one moment's job; the student will have to listen and forthwith negate the *pancha kosaas*, when, 'I', the Consciousness alone, will be left behind. The student still does not know the nature of that Consciousness. *Upanishad* tells him; it declares: "'I' am *aanandha:*". The student has to claim that *aanandha:*, which gets reflected, now and then, in empirical experience. But, the student should claim: "'**I**' am original *aanandhaa*" and walk off as "*sath-chith-aanandham Brahmar*". "Where is the problem in this?" wonders Sureswaraachaaryaa.

147. Chapter III, Verse 38 and 39(01-08-2009)

In this verse (no. 38) Sureswaraacharya is presenting *mahaa vaakyam*, which serves as a *sabdha pramaanam*, as 'introducing words'.

To explain: Sabdha pramaanam can be considered to be of two types. One type of sabdha pramaanam is in the form of 'introducing words', introducing something which is already experienced by the listener. The second type of sabdha pramaanam is in the form of 'describing words', where the words are describing something which is not already experienced.

Swamiji gives an example in detail, to make the above distinction clear. He says:

"For example, when I go to a student's house for *bhikshaa*, the student introduces several members in the family as wife, son / daughter, brother / sister etc. When he is introducing these people, his words are not really 'revealing' the people to me, because the people have already been revealed to me, by my sense organs, viz. my eyes. The words do not have to do the job of revealing the people, because even before the student employing his words, my eyes have revealed the people, all very well dressed and neatly presenting themselves. They are already people 'experienced' by me. Therefore, when the student makes the 'introduction', 'this is my brother / sister' etc., his words are not 'revealing' the individuals; but, are revealing a new status about the already experienced individuals. To repeat for emphasis and clarity:

The words are not revealing the **people**, which 'revealing' has already been done by my eyes; the words are revealing only the **status or relationship of the people**.

"Conversely, my sense organs can only reveal the people, i.e. they can reveal only their presence; they cannot reveal their status or relationship. I see a man standing in front of me; my eyes 'reveal' the man. But they do not say 'this person is the brother / son / son-in-law of the student'; the sense organs do not reveal the brother-hood etc. But they 'reveal' the person.

"In short, *prathyaksha pramaanam* has revealed the people; the *sabdha pramaanam* does not reveal the people, but, reveals the status or relationship of the people, which relationship I come to know through the words.

"And, when, thus, the words reveal brother-hood, sister-hood etc., is the knowledge that I get 'direct' knowledge or 'indirect' knowledge? The answer is: 'The knowledge is a direct knowledge, because it is talking about the status of the directly experienced people'.

"Now, if, on the other hand, the student talks of an absent brother and says 'I have a brother in America', I do not 'experience' the brother in America with my sense organs, but, I only come to know of him through my student's words.. That 'knowledge' is, therefore, 'indirect knowledge'. In this situation, the student's words are to be termed 'describing words' and not 'introducing words'.

"When the student points out to his brother standing before me and says 'this is my brother', the knowledge of the brother is 'direct'. The 'experience' of the brother is given through sense organ and the status is revealed through the words. Thus, in this example, 'introducing words' give 'direct' knowledge, as they talk about an already 'experienced' person. In contrast, the student talking of a brother in America are 'describing words', which give 'indirect' knowledge of a brother, who is in America and therefore not 'experienced' by me. 'Describing words' give only indirect knowledge and 'introducing words' give 'direct' knowledge".

Having understood the distinction between the terms 'introducing words' and 'describing words', what about the *mahaa vaakyam*?

Sureswaraachaarya says "*mahaa vaakyam* is **not** 'describing words'; *mahaa vaakyam* is 'introducing words'. *Mahaa vaakyam* is not describing some *Brahman* somewhere; if *mahaa vaakyam* is describing some *Brahman* somewhere, the *mahaa vaakyam* would have been 'describing words' and those 'describing words' would have given only 'indirect' knowledge. But, *mahaa vaakyam* is 'introducing words', giving 'direct' knowledge' ".

This gives rise to the questions: "How do you say that? Whom or what is *mahaa vaakyam* 'introducing' or 'giving direct knowledge' about"?

They are answered by Swamiji, as follows: "Just as the student, in the example given above, is introducing people who are already experienced by me, *mahaa vaakyam* is talking about the Consciousness, which is already experienced by me. I **am** a Conscious being and not an inert being. Even as I say 'I', I know I am a Conscious being; when I know this, the Consciousness is already experienced by me. It is this already experienced Consciousness, which is being 'introduced' by *mahaa vaakyam* ; and, while 'introducing' it, the *mahaa vaakyam* is revealing a new status of an already experienced Consciousness.

"Going back to the example, as explained already, when my student is introducing his brother, the person has already been 'experienced' by me; my student's words are revealing not the person, but, a new status. And, what is the new status? The 'brother-hood' is the

new status. The sense organs did not reveal the 'brother-hood'; the sense organs only revealed a person standing in front of me.

"Similarly, in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam* also, Consciousness is already experienced directly (*aparokshathayaa*) by me, similar to the person standing in front of me being experienced by me directly. The 'introducing words' of my student revealed, **not** the person standing in front of me, but, only a new status of the person; and, exactly in a similar manner, the *mahaa vaakyam* is revealing only a new status of a known entity, viz. Consciousness and **not a new entity**. This aspect should be carefully understood and noted. **The *mahaa vaakyam* reveals only the status of the already experienced Consciousness.**

"And, what is that status? The answer: *Brahmathvam* is the new status of the ever-experienced Consciousness.

"*Brahman* is **not** a new entity. It is nothing but a new status of an already experienced Consciousness. By the word *Brahman*, *Sruthi* means: 'the Consciousness which is experienced in the body, is not part of the body nor a property of the body nor a product of the body; this ever experienced Consciousness is free from all types of limitations'; i.e., the word *Brahman* is revealing the limitless status of the already experienced Consciousness.

"When this revelation is made by a reliable *mahaa vaakyam*, what stops me from 'understanding' it? When (in the example) my student says 'this is my brother', I straightaway receive it as a 'knowledge'; the person is already experienced; the 'experienced' person's status is revealed by the reliable student. Therefore, I get the 'direct knowledge' of the brother, derived from the 'introducing words', coming from a reliable source of knowledge, viz., my student. Similarly, *mahaa vaakyam* does not reveal a new entity called *Brahman*; it is revealing a new status about *bodha*., the already experienced Consciousness.

"To repeat: *Sruthi* is **not** revealing the Consciousness, because Consciousness is already 'revealed' / 'experienced'; it is something with which I am already 'familiar'. Then, what is *sruthi* revealing? *Sruthi* is revealing only a status **about** that Consciousness, which status is not known to me. What is that status? The answer: *Brahman* status. '*Brahman*' means 'not limited by time; not limited by space; not limited by property'. It means '*desa parichedhaa* is not there; *kaalaparichedhaa* is not there; attribute- *paricchedhaa* is not there.

"That time-less, space-less, attribute-less **status** of the already available Consciousness is revealed by a reliable *mahaa vaakyam* , which is, in fact, many times more reliable than

ordinary mortals. Even my student may not have been wholly accurate in presenting his 'brother' to me, because, in Tamil Nadu, the word 'brother' is used very loosely. The word is used for a 'direct' brother and, quite often, for a 'cousin' also, showing that words locally used may be vague. But, *mahaa vaakyam* is 'nirdhushta aparoksha saasthra pramaanam', coming from *Bhagavaan* Himself. Therefore, the knowledge generated by the *mahaa vaakyam* should be 'direct' knowledge and not indirect knowledge. Just as the 'introducing words' of my student (in the example) give a 'direct knowledge' of his brother, whom I had perceived already with my sense organs, 'aham Brahma asmi jnaanam', which I get from the *mahaa vaakyam*, has to be 'direct' knowledge only, since I have already experienced Consciousness directly".

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- यस्य कथंचनः अनुभवः न जायते - If a person does not have enlightenment, which is nothing but clearly grasping the *mahaa vaakyam*,
- बोधे - with regard to Consciousness,
- शास्त्रं कथं बोधयेत् - how can saasthraa teach
- तं - such a dull student,
- लोष्टं - who is nothing but an embodiment of clay,
- नर सम आकृतिम् - which has got a human shape?

If the introducing words called *mahaa vaakyam* does not give *aproksha jnaanam* of the *Brahman* status of the ever experienced Consciousness to a student, that student must be an extraordinary student like a wax or a clay model. He cannot be a sentient person.

With this rather strong remark, Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes his arguments to prove that there is no obstacle at all to *mahaa vaakyam* generating *aparoksha jnaanam*. He established that all the four possible obstacles mentioned in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 35 are absent, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*, which *mahaa vaakyam* (1) does give a message (2) gives a new message (3) gives a clear message and (4) gives an unchallenged message.

Because of these four criteria, *mahaa vaakyam* **is** a *pramaanam*. In Sanskrit, this is popularly known as *anadhigatha*, *abhaadhitha*, *asandhigdha jnaana janakam pramaanam*.

When the student appreciates this *pramaanam* status of the *mahaa vaakyam*, he is said to have *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*. And, when he has got *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*, the knowledge that he derives from *mahaa vaakyam*, i.e. the knowledge that he derives **with *sraddhaa***, is itself called 'realization' or 'enlightenment'. Knowledge + *sraddhaa* is 'enlightenment'.

When *sraddhaa* is present, 'knowledge' and 'enlightenment' are synonymous; 'knowledge' and 'realization' are synonymous; 'knowledge' and '*saakshaathkaaraa*' are synonymous. 'knowledge' and '*aparoksha jnaanam*' are synonymous; 'knowledge' and '*Brahma anubhavaa*' are synonymous.

Conversely, when *sraddhaa* is absent, 'knowledge' and 'enlightenment' become different; 'knowledge' and 'realization' become different; 'knowledge' and '*saakshaathkaaraa*' become different; 'knowledge' and '*aparoksha jnaanam*' become different; 'knowledge' and '*Brahma anubhavaa*' become different.

Thus, one's perception of the 'sameness' or 'difference' between 'knowledge' and 'realization' is caused by *sraddhaa* only. The presence of *sraddhaa* makes them synonymous or identical; absence of *sraddhaa* makes them different. The 'difference' is not caused by the absence of a mystic experience or by the absence of meditation or by the absence of *samaadhi*.

Sraddhaa is thus crucial in *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*.

Sureswaraacharya feels that since he had removed all possible obstacles to *sraddhaa*, there is no reason for anybody to lack *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam* and wonders: "When there is no reason for losing *sraddhaa*, why can't you have that *sraddhaa*?"

He further points out: "When *sraddhaa* is there, you will not make the mistake of complaining 'I have only 'knowledge'; but, no 'realization'; instead, you will confidently say 'I have *aparoksha jnaanam*. I have no hesitation in claiming I am a *jnaan*'. When there is thus no hesitation in accepting the message that 'knowledge' and 'realization' are identical, as a fact, you will move to binary format without any hindrance. There is no snag at all".

After all, *sraddhaa* in '*veda vaakyam* as *pramaanam*' is not a new thing for us; because, even the 'triangular format' that we are currently following, is based only on *sraddhaa* in '*veda vaakyam* as *pramaanam*'. The most crucial component/ powerful entity in the triangular format of '*jeeva-jagath-Iswara*', is *Iswara*. Based on what *pramaanam*, do we accept *Iswara* as a fact? Obviously not on *prathyaksha pramaanam*, because we do not see *Iswara* in physical form, anywhere around. *Prathyaksha pramaana* does not reveal *Iswara*;

anumaanam does not; logic does not; science has never revealed *Iswara*. (The consolation is that science or any other *pramaanam* has not disproved and cannot also disprove *Iswara*.) *Iswara* is never proved by any *pramaanam*, other than *saasthraas*.

When *Iswara* is not thus 'proved' by any *pramaanam* other than *Veda*, how do we adhere to the triangular format, accepting *Iswara* as a fact? Are we not taking an 'un-proved' *Iswara* as a fact, based on only *Veda Pramaanam*, though such acceptance may be considered unscientific or non-rational? We are rooted firmly in triangular format; we are already implementing the triangular format; we are benefitting also from the triangular format.

If we have thus got sufficient *sraddhaa* in *Veda Pramaanam*, to accept an 'unproved' *Iswara* as a fact, and can implement triangular format, both the 'acceptance' and the 'implementation' based only on *Veda Pramaanam / Veda poorva pramaanam*, what stops us from moving to the 'binary' format, which is also equally based on *Veda pramaanam / Veda antha pramaanam*? If *Veda* is reliable for triangular format, the same *Veda* can be relied upon for the binary format also. Conversely, if *Veda* is not reliable for binary format, the same *Veda* cannot be relied upon for the triangular format also.

In other words, if we do not have *sraddhaa* in *Veda*, neither the triangular format of '*jeeva-jagath-Iswara*' nor the *Vedhaanthic* '*aathma-anaathma*' binary format can be accepted and implemented. We would have to go to the binary format of the rational people. The *naasthika* also has got a binary format. His format is '*jeeva*' and '*jagath*'. By coming to the *Vedas*, we, the *aasthika*-s have added an *Iswara* to the *naasthika*'s binary format. Is not this 'addition' of *Iswara* purely based only on *Veda pramaanam*? Thus, if from *naasthika*'s binary format, we came to *Veda Poorva's* triangular format, why should we not move to *Veda Antha's* binary format of *aathma* and *anaathmaa*?

Sureswaraacharya says: "You already have *sraddhaa* in *Veda*. What is the proof? To solve your problems, you 'run' to God, Who is proved only by *Veda*. If God can be relied on, because of *Veda Poorva sraddhaa*, '*aham brahma asmi*' can also be implemented through *Veda antha sraddhaa / mahaa vaakya sraddhaa*".

This portion of the treatise, from verse 35 to verse 38, talks of the need for *sraddhaa* in binary format, similar to the *sraddhaa* in triangular format. The *Aacharya* avers: "If triangular format can bless, binary format also can bless, in fact, even better than triangular format".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 39:

अन्वयव्यतिरेकपुरस्सरं वाक्यमेवावाक्यार्थरूपमात्मानं प्रतिपादयतीत्यस्य पक्षस्य द्रढिम्ने श्रुत्युदाहरणमुपन्यस्यति

I

In support of the position that the *Vedhaanthic* proposition itself, coming after discrimination between the Self and non-Self, reveals the Self, which transcends the primary import of the proposition, the authority of the *sruthi* is added:

So, we saw that *mahaa vaakyam* is 'introducing words'. It does not reveal a new entity; but, it reveals a new status of an already known/ experienced entity. What status? Answer: '*Brahman* status'. What is the already known/ experienced entity? Answer: 'Consciousness', which is very much there in the physical body itself.

(In a lighter vein): What is the proof for Consciousness being in the body? Answer: The very fact that the body has not been taken for cremation indicates that the body is a sentient, live and Conscious entity.

So, Consciousness is an evident fact. With regard to this evident fact / the available entity, *Brahman* status is revealed.

Therefore, what is the message of *mahaa vaakyam*? Answer: "aparoksha chaithanyam Brahma asthi". '*Aparoksha chaithanyam*' is otherwise called '*Pragnyaanam*'. This "**Pragnyaanam Brahma**" is the Rig veda *mahaa vaakyam*, occurring in Eithreya Upanishad.

The intimately available Consciousness has got *Brahman* status. And, Sureswaraacharya says: "But, this conviction alone viz., '*Pragnyaanam Brahma*' is not sufficient to liberate the seeker; the seeker has to be further convinced that, "that *Pragnyaanam* is 'I' ".

Therefore, what the *Upanishads* do, is, to train the seeker to use the word 'I' for 'Consciousness', by employing '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*' methods, one type of which is the '*avasthaathraya viveka*' method. Using such methods, *Sruthi* trains the seeker to use the word 'I', for Consciousness. '*Anvaya vyathirkha*' is a training ground, by which the seeker practices using the word '*aham*' for the Consciousness.

In the '*avasthaathraya viveka anvaya vyathirekha*' method, the seeker regularly practices saying "'I', the Consciousness, am common to all the three *avasthaas*. 'I' employ the physical body medium / the 'waker's' body medium for *jaagrath anubhavaa*. 'I' use dream body medium for *svapna anubhavaa*. 'I' use *kaarana sareeram* medium for *sushupthi anubhavaa*. The mediums change; the *avasthaas* change. Mediums are variable; *avasthas* are variable. Mediums are *vyathirekha*; *avasthaas* are *vyathirekhaa*. But, 'I' am the changeless / non-variable / *anvaya* Consciousness. 'I' 'push off' the body; 'I' 'push off' the mind; and practice claiming '*Pragnyaanam saakshi* 'I' am".

When does the seeker do this? Answer: Before going to *mahaa vaakyam*, the seeker practices equating Consciousness with 'I' / *pragnyaanam* with *aham*. By *anvaya vyathirekhaa* method, the seeker practices this equation, before going to *mahaa vaakyam*. Thereafter, when the seeker goes to *mahaa vaakyam*, the *mahaa vaakyam* reveals the new status of *Pragnyaanam*, viz., *Brahman*. The seeker has already practiced "*pragnyaanam aham asmi*". Now, when *mahaa vaakyam* reveals the new status of Consciousness and says "*Pragnyaanam Brahma*", instantaneously, the seeker replaces '*Pragnyaanam*' by '*aham*' and claims "*aham Brahma asmi*".

Therefore, training the mind to use the word '*aham*' for Consciousness, using '*anvaya vyathirekha*' is an important preliminary exercise.

And, Sureswaraacharya says "*sruthi* itself gives this basic training of equating *aham* and *pragnyaanam*; *sruthi* itself does the later job of equating *pragnyaanam* and *Brahman* also".

Reverting to the text:

- अन्वयव्यतिरेकपुरस्सरं - "After initially discriminating between the Self and non-Self, by *anvaya vyathirekha* logic,

'*Purassaram*' means 'initially'.

Initially, the *sruthi* itself does the *anvaya vyathirekha* or *avasthaathraya viveka*, to equate *aham* and *pragnyaanam*, otherwise called *saakshi*. *Sruthi* first equates 'I' and the Consciousness, which is already experienced.

And, thereafter:

- वाक्यं एव - the *mahaa vaakyam* itself,

What does the *mahaa vaakyam* do in the second stage?

- आत्मानं प्रतिपादयति - reveals that '*pragnyaanam-aham*' / reveals the new status of that '*pragnyaanam-aham*',

As what?

- अवाक्यार्थरूपं - as the absolute Brahman"

'*Avaakyartharoopam*' is a technical word, which has been discussed and explained in detail earlier. '*Avaakyartham*' means 'absolute *Brahman* status'.

- इति अस्य पक्षस्य द्रढिम्ने - To reinforce this statement / position / viewpoint,

The approach of the *sruthi* is to first equate 'I' and '*saakshI*' and then to equate '*saakshI*' and '*BrahmarI*'. First equation is accomplished through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* and the second step is accomplished through *mahaa vaakyam*.

To reinforce / confirm / consolidate / corroborate / substantiate this view:

- श्रुत्युदाहरणं उपन्यस्यति - the author gives various *Upanishadic* quotations .

'*Udhaaharanam*' means 'quotations'; '*Sruthyudaaharanam*' means '*sruthi vaakyaanI*'. '*upansyathI*' mean 'the author is presenting'.

Why does Sureswaraacharya present *sruthi vaakyaani* to reinforce the statement made above? Answer: He wants to emphasize: "This is not my message".

If Sureswaraacharya says "This is my view", his opponents will ask for *prathyaksha pramaanam* or *anumaana pramaanam* in support of his view. Sureswaraacharya will be in trouble, because *prathyaksham* / *anumaanam* / modern science etc. cannot prove his statement. They cannot even prove that Consciousness is an independent entity. If Sureswaraacharya stands alone, modern science will challenge him; therefore, the *Aacharya* points out that his teaching is based on *sruthi pramaanam*. "*Naishaa tharkena mathiraapaneya*" – "This knowledge cannot be attained by reasoning" declares *Katopanishad* (I .ii.9).

At this juncture, Swamiji gives an example of an experience he had.

He says:

"I had a visitor who told me 'Swamiji! I have no problem in accepting God. But, I have difficulty in accepting existence of other *lokaas*, such as *svarga*, *narakaa* etc. I have difficulty in accepting the *karma* theory of *punyam* and *paapam*. I have difficulty in accepting rebirth etc. I am a rationalist / a scientist. And, by what is known as 'random theory' in scientific circles, I can explain all these phenomena satisfactorily. I am not able to see any scientific proof in support of any of these religious theories. I am told that you teach *Vedhaanthaa*

'scientifically'. Is there any scientific evidence for *karma* theory, *punar janma*, *paraloka* etc.? I have not seen any proof so far. Can I have any satisfactory proof from you?'

"I replied: 'You say that you have belief in God. Can you give me a scientific proof for God? If you do, I can disprove your 'proof' of God also, by another scientific theory. Even creation can be explained by random theory, without requiring the need for a God.'

"My visitor was perplexed with my reply. He least expected me, a Swamiji, to talk about a scientific theory *disproving* the existence of God. In confusion, he said 'Swamiji! Let me think about it and come back'; and he never did".

Swamiji continues:

"A large number of people are partly rational like this visitor of mine. They accept God; but reject rituals. But, 'negating rituals and accepting God' **is** partial rationalism. It is not very different from the so-called rationalism of certain current organizations in Tamil Nadu, who criticize temples and idols ; but, unabashedly, garland the statues of their deceased leaders and even wave camphor in front of the 'inert matter' that the statues are.

"Therefore, let it be clear that every religious theory, right from 'existence of God' / the triangular format, is based on *saasthraa* only. Acceptance of God is based only on *saasthra pramaanam*. Similarly all the other beliefs like *karma* theory, *punar janma* etc., also have to be accepted based on *saasthra pramanaam* only. Any logic that is used is not 'proving' logic but 'supporting' logic."

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "*sruthi udaaharanam upansyathi*" – "the author presents *sruthi vaakyaani*, as authority".

For what purpose? "*Dhradimne*" – "for reinforcing / endorsement /validation".

'*Dhradam*' means 'firm'. '*Dhradima*' is the abstract noun meaning 'firmness'.

Hereafter, the *Aachaaryaa* gives several *sruthi* quotations, to show the first stage, viz., 'equating *aham* and *Pragnyaanam* (Consciousness) '; and, the second stage, viz., 'equating '*Pragnyaanam* and *Brahmar*'.

aham = Pragnyaanam; Pragnyaanam = Brahman ; therefore, 'aham Brahma asmi'.

Verse 39 – Chapter III:

जिघ्राणीममहं गन्धमिति यो वेत्त्यविक्रियः ।

य आत्मा तत्परं ज्योतिः शिरसीदं वचः श्रुतेः ॥ ३९ ॥

The head of the *sruthi* has this statement: 'He who cognizes the ego experiencing "I smell this smell" and is unchanging, is the Self, and he is the supreme light.

Now, in this portion. we get several references to the *Upanishads*. Most of the references are taken from *Chaandoghya Upanishad* and *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, which, unfortunately, are the least familiar *Upanishads*. The other *Upanishads* are smaller in size and content and easier to remember also. *Chaandoghya Upanishad* *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* are large/ voluminous. But, Sureswaraachaaryaa quotes mostly from them.

Therefore, if the student desires to get the full impact, he will have to go back to the *Upanishadic* portions and repeatedly read those *manthraas*. And, that is the reason why *Nithya Upanishad Paaraayanam* is recommended for a serious *Vedhaanthic* student.

Traditional Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaas advise a Vedhaanthic student to gradually replace Saguna Isvara Sthothra Paaraayanam like Vishnu Sahasranaama Paaraayanam, by Geetha Paaraayanam, Upanishadic Paaraayanam and even (Brahma Soothra) Bhaashya Paaraayanam. If Saguna Isvara Sthothra Paaraayanam-s are reduced, a seeker need not feel guilty or disturbed by fear of 'punishments' by Isvara. Geetha and Upanishads are also saasthraa-s only, talking about Bhagavaan only – the 'Paraa Prakruthi Bhagavaan', while Sahasranaamam-s talk about 'Aparaa Prakruthi Bhagavaan'.

Therefore, without any sense of guilt, *Vedhaanthic* students can and should take to *Upanishad Paaraayanam*. And, when they do so, they will find *anvaya vyathirekhaa* being talked about in different contexts.

Prajapathi Vidhya (Chapter VIII of *Chaandoghya Upanishad*) talks about akshi purusha:, svapana purusha:, suptha purusha: and utthama purusha: | Consciousness in jaagrath avasthaa is called akshi purusha: | Consciousness in dream is called svapna purusha: | Consciousness in sleep is called suptha purusha: | And, the Consciousness separated from all the three is called utthama purusha: | Utthama Purushaa is non-variable; the avasthaas are variable. Thus, 'Indira prajaapathi samvaadha roopena' – 'through a discussion between Indira and Prajaapathi, 'avasthaathraya saakshi' is beautifully brought out.

Similarly, in 'Svayamjothi Brahmanam' of *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* 'Janaka Yagnyavalkyq samvaadha roopena' – 'through a discussion between King Janakaa and Sage Yaagnyavalkyaa', 'avasthaathraya saakshi' is talked about.

Sureswaraacharya advises the seeker: "Read and re-read such portions. The teaching will become more and more alive".

148. Chapter III, Verse 39 and 40 (08-08-2009)

In the introduction to this sloka (no. 39), Sureswaraachaaryaa said "asya pakshasya dhradimne sruthyudaaharanam upanyasyathi" |

The word 'dhradimne' means 'for confirmation'. 'Udaaharanam' means 'citations' or 'quotations'.

The statement "asya pakshasya dhradimne sruthyudaaharanam upanyasyathi", therefore, means : "For confirmation of the teaching that he has given till now, the author gives citations from *sruthi*", indicating that the *Aachaaryaa* wants to draw support for his teaching, from the *Upanishads*.

In keeping with this statement, Sureswaraachaaryaa presents a number of *Upanishadic* quotations in the following verses. As was mentioned in the earlier session, Sureswaraachaaryaa is drawing the quotations mainly from the *Chaandoghya* and *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishads*. Naturally, if the student is familiar with those two *Upanishads*, the student can get the full impact of the quotations. One of the methods to familiarize oneself with *Upanishads* is to resort to regular *Paaraayanam* of the *Upanishads*. The *Vedhaanthic* student can do more of *Githa* and *Upanishad Paaraayanam*-s, even if, in the process, *Saguna Isvara paaraayanam*-s have to be reduced, since *Githa* and *Upanishads* also talk of *Bhagavaan's* glory alone.

If and when a *Vedhaanthic* student wants to follow this advice and desires to do *Paaraayanam* of *Chaandoghya* or *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, since the two *Upanishads* are voluminous, the student might wonder how he could do the *Paaraayanam* of the entire texts. The answer is that the entire texts need not be done , but, *paaraayanam* of selected portions would be sufficient.

In the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, the portions to be chanted, can be limited to the last three chapters (6, 7 and 8), which are the *Vedhaanthic* chapters. Chapter 6 is the famous 'thathvamas' chapter called '*Sadh Vidhyaa*'. The seventh chapter is called *Bhooma Vidhya* and the eighth chapter is called *Prajapaathi Vidhyaa*. As for the *Brahadhaaranyak Upanishad*, three whole chapters are extremely important for a *Vedhaanthic* student – the 2nd, 3rd and 4th. And, in addition, in the 1st Chapter, the fourth section called '*Purusha Vidha Brahmanam*' is also important.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is heavily borrowing from the '*Prajaapathi Vidhya*', the 8th chapter of *Chaandoghya Upanishad* and from the '*Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam*' of the fourth chapter of *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*. And, in both these *Chaandoghya* and *Brahadhaaranyaka*

portions, the *Aachaaryaa* is taking the '*avasthaathraya vivekaad*' topic, which consists of 'the analysis of the three states of experience', in order to identify the non-variable part in the individual.

'*Avasthaathraya vivekaad*' is one type of '*anvaya vyathirekhaad*'. '*Avasthaathraya vivekaad*' is the analysis of the three states of experience, with the intention to find out the 'non-variable' in 'me' and the variables in 'me'. The non-variable is called '*anvayaad*' and the variable part is called '*vyathirekhaad*'. Through this analysis, done diligently, the seeker will arrive at the only non-variable, which is "'I' am".

This "'I' am" portion alone is the non-variable part of 'me' in all the three *avasthaas*. Everything else is variable. The physical body is variable. During *jaagarth avasthaa* I use one body and in *svapna avasthaa* I use another body. Even the mind is variable. The student finds that bodies are variable, minds are variable and attributes are variable.

And, in the only non-variable part "'I' am", 'I' means 'Consciousness' and 'am' means 'Existence'. "'I' am" = *chith sath*; in other words, '*sath-chith*' is 'my' non variable essence. Everything else is variable – bodies, minds, attributes, and of course, relationships such as father, mother, wife, husband etc.

After thus arriving at the non-variable 'I', through *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, the student analyses as to what 'relationship' all these variable attributes have got with 'me'. Expressed conversely, he analyses what relationship 'I' have with all the variable attributes like father-hood, mother-hood, husband-hood etc., *raagha dveshaa*, *kaaama krodhaa* etc., *punya paapam* etc.

When I claim that they are my 'own' attributes i.e. when I look upon them as my 'own' attributes, I am called *ahamkaaraa*. But, when I realize, through diligent enquiry, that they are **not** my 'own' attributes; but, are only attributes of my body or mind / i.e. once I shift the perception of attributes, from 'own' attributes to 'known' attributes, they do not belong to me anymore and, 'I' am called the *saakshi* non-variable.

Thus, the three stages of *avasthaathraya vivekaa* are :

Stage no. 1: "'I' am" is the non-variable component; attributes are variable .

Stage no. 2: The variable attributes are my 'own' attributes; at this stage, I am called *ahamkaaraa* and

Stage no. 3: The variable attributes are not my 'own' but are only 'known' attributes; at this stage, I have arrived at non-variable *saakshi*.

Non-variable "I am" is the first step; non-variable *ahamkaaraa* is the second step; non-variable *saakshi* is the third step. In these three steps, the student has come to "I am the non-variable *Saakshi*". With this, the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* part of the study is over. After the successful completion of the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* part, the student is ready for the *mahaa vaakyam* part, whose essence is "the *saakshi* 'I', **am** the *Brahman*, the all-pervading Existence-Consciousness principle".

Sureswaraacharya says that this is the route map that a student finds in all the *Upanishads*, namely, "With the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic, arrive at the *saakshi* ; then, through *mahaa vaakyaa* 'merge' into *Brahman*". (The word 'merge' is not used in the literal sense, but only denotes the need for realization or recognition of the fact that 'I' am already *Brahman*). These steps of teaching are found in all the *Upanishads*, including *Chaandoghyaa*.

And, in the *Chaandhoghyaa*, Sureswaraacharya takes up for study and support, the 7th to 12th sections, of the 8th chapter, '*Prajaapathy Vidhyaa*'. The *Aachaaryaa* is taking several references from these sections.

Therefore, as mentioned earlier, to get the full impact of the teaching in this portion, the student will have to study these *Upanishadic* sections repeatedly. The *Aachaaryaa* gives numerous *Upanishadic* quotations, in this portion.

In the first line of the verse 39, the *Aachaaryaa* talks of *manthraa* 8.12.4 of *Chandoghyaa*. What does the *Upanishad* say in this *manthraa*? The *Upanishad* says "the *saakshi* Consciousness 'changelessly' (i.e. without itself undergoing any change) reveals the *thriputi* in every experience". And, the *Upanishad* refers to a particular experience, as a sample. And, what is that experience? Ans : "I am smelling this fragrance" - "*Aham imam gandham jigraan*".

'*Jighraan*' means 'smeller'; '*imam gandham*' means 'this fragrance'.

In this single experience of 'smelling', there are three factors – the 'knower', the 'known' and the 'knowledge'; or the 'smeller', the 'smelled' and the 'smell- cognition' or 'smell-experience'.

The *Aachaaryaa* starts verse 39 with this statement: "*Jighraani aham imam gandham*" - "I am smelling this particular fragrance".

The 'smeller' is the mind. Mind is the *pramaathaa*, because, the mind alone contacts the smell outside. Therefore, *pramaathaa*, the subject, is the mind ; *prameyam*, the object, is *gandhaa*, the smell. The 'cognition' or 'experience' is the 'smell thought' or '*ghraana vrutthi*.' | Thus, during the 'experience' or 'cognition' in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, these three, viz., the mind, the object and the thought / *pramaathaa*, *prameyam* and *pramithhi*: , come together and stay together.

And, during the deep sleep state, the mind has revolved i.e. the *pramaathaa* is not there; the thought also is resolved; the knowledge is not there; the smell / the world also has resolved for the sleeper.

To repeat briefly: in *jaagrath avasthaa*, mind, thought and object come together giving the experience; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, mind, thought and object resolve together simultaneously, resolving the 'experience' also.

Now, this *Chaandoghya manthraa* further says "all these three, viz., the mind, the thought and the fragrance, are inert in nature". Mind is inert matter; thought is also inert matter and of course the smell or the fragrance is also inert. All these three inert objects are together revealed by the Consciousness principle, which is other than the *pramaathaa*, the *prameyam* and the *pramithhi*: / *ahamkaaraa*, *vishayaa* and *vrutthi*. That is what is said in the *Kaivalya Upanishad* also, in a splendid *manthraa* : "*Thrishu dhaamasu yadboghyam bokthaa boghascha yadh bhaveth thebhyo vilakshana: saakshee chinmaathroham sadhaasiva.*" – "I am distinct from all those which are the subject of experience, object of experience and the instrument of experience, in all the three states. I am the witness, which is pure Consciousness and which is ever auspicious".

In the various *avasthaa*-s, the *thriputi* rises and the *thriputi* falls and 'I' am the changeless revealer of the *thriputi*. That is the idea presented here also.

- यः - He, who
- वेत्ति - reveals
- अविक्रियः - changelessly,

The 'revealing' is not an action done by 'me'; without doing any action, by 'my' mere presence, 'I' reveal. The term '*avikriya*:' conveys this '*saannithya maathrena*'.

- अहं"इमं गन्धं जिघ्राणिइति " - that 'the *pramaathaa ahamkaara*: is the 'smeller' of this particular fragrance',

In the statement "I am smelling this particular fragrance", *thriputi* is there. The *pramaathaa*, the subject, is 'aham', which refers to the 'ahamkaaraa' and not to the 'saakshi', since it is the mind or *ahamkaaraa*, which is the 'smeller' or the 'jighraani'.

The mind is smelling. How does it do that? By having a thought, which is associated with an object. How does the thought get associated? By travelling through the nose, 'as it were'.

Part of the 4th verse of Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram runs : "Naanaachchidhra ghatodharasthitha mahaadeepaprabhaa bhaasvaram chakshuraadhikaranadvaaraa bahi: spandhathe" – "The bright light of a great lamp placed in a jar having many holes, flashes outside through eyes and other sense organs".

The thought from the mind, travelling through the nose, 'as it were', contacts the smell. Thus, 'mind' is the subject; 'thought' is the knowledge; 'smell' or 'fragrance' is the object.

When it is said "I smell this fragrance", the *thriputi* consisting of (i) *ahamkaaraa*, the subject, (ii) the 'fragrance, the object and (iii) experience or cognition viz., 'smelling', gets 'revealed' .

Ahamkaaraa, the mind does not have a sentiency of its own. Then, who lends it the sentiency? Ans: 'I', the *saakshi*, bless the mind with Consciousness ; and, through the mind, 'I' bless the thought with Consciousness and through the thought, 'I' bless the fragrance with Consciousness. To repeat: The *saakshi* blesses the mind directly ; through the mind, it blesses the thought; and through the thought, it blesses the object. Thus the mind , the thought and the fragrance are all simultaneously blessed with sentiency, by 'I', the *saakshi* or, in other words, revealed by the *saakshi*.

- स :आत्मा - he is the real Self.
- तत्परं ज्योतिः - This *aathmaa*, the real Self, is nothing but *Param Brahman*.

This statement of the *Aachaaryaa* is akin to *mahaa vaakyam*.

The term 'param jyothi:', is borrowed from the Chaandoghya Manthraa 8.12.3 - "Evamevaisha samprasaadha: asmaachchareeraath samutthaaya **param jyothi:** upasampadhya svena roopena abhinishpadhyathe sa utthama: purusha:" – "In this very

way, this tranquil one (the individual soul) becomes established in his own nature after rising up from this body and reaching the supreme Light. He is the supreme Person”.

Incidentally, Lord Krishna also borrows the term '*utthama: purusha:*', appearing in this *manthraa*, in the 15th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa*.

In this Chaandoghya *manthraa*, '*utthama: purusha:*' is equated to '*param jyothi:*'| This Chaandoghya *manthraa* is a fantastic *manthraa*, which is analyzed in the Brahmasoothraas, by Vyaasaachaaryaa, in several soothraas.

Reverting to the text, '*thath param jyothi:*' means 'That 'I', the *chith*, **am** the *sath*'. This *sath-chith* equation is always important, because, even if advanced enough to look upon oneself as *saakshi*, one might tend to think "'I' am a localized entity; the whole world is an object 'outside' and 'I' am the *saakshi*'inside'

This 'inside-outside' duality is permissible in the initial stages of looking at oneself as the *saakshi*. In *Ramana Maharishis Sad-dharsanam*, there is a verse (no. 30) running "*koopē yathaa ghaadajale thatha antharnimajya buddhyaa sithayaa nithaantham praanam cha vaacham cha niyamyā chinvan vidhen nija ahamkruthimoolaroopam*" - meaning "just as a person goes inside a deep well and recovers an object that has fallen in, you have to dive 'inside' and claim '*saakshi*'".

These two terms, 'diving in' and 'claiming *saakshi*', might make the aspirant close his eyes to claim his '*saakshi*' status, since he thinks "'I' am inside".

But, it is important to remember, that an aspirant has to, ultimately get out of this orientation. He has to finally reach the conviction: "'I', the *chith*, is none other than *sath*, the Existence principle. Therefore, the *saakshi* is not only within, but is everywhere , in the form of Existence". Verse 3 of *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* declares: "*yasyaiva spuranam sadhaathmakam asath kalpaarthakam bhasathe*" - "He, whose manifestations – which are themselves nothing but the Reality, appear as the objects of the world". Therefore, to appreciate 'Me', one need not close one's eyes . To borrow terms from *Bhagavadh Githa* "*Pasyan srnvan sprusan jigran api*" (Ch. V – Verse 8) – "Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling etc.", "*sarvaboothastham aathmaanam eekshathe*" (Ch. VI – verse 29) - "the *jnaani* perceives, that 'I' am present everywhere- in all the beings".

In the initial stage, 'closing the eyes' (to claim *saakshi* status) is not wrong; but, ultimately the aspirant does not have to close his eyes, because "'I' am the *sath chith ekaathmaa*, which is everywhere". In fact, as the *Kaivalya Upanishad* declares "*Mayyeva sakalam*

jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham" (*manthraa* 19)- "Everything is born in 'me' alone; everything is based in 'me' alone".

A *Vedhaanthin* never closes his eyes to appreciate *aathmaa*. A *yogi* may do it, because, for the *yogi*, *purushaa* and *prakruthi* are different and the *yogi* wants to escape from *prakruthi*. For a *Vedhaanthin*, 'inside' and 'outside', "'I' am *Param jyoyji*:", '*param jyothi*:' meaning '*sadhaathmaa*'.

Reverting to the text,

- **इदं वचः** - This teaching (viz., 'I' am everywhere / 'I' am the whole)
- **श्रुते शिरसि** - (is given) in the head of the *Vedas*.

What is the head of the *Vedas*? '*Vedic head*' means *Vedhaanthaa*. The statement, therefore, means, "In the *Upanishads*, the teaching is "I' am the whole".

Therefore, what is *mokshaa*? It is **not** 'escaping from the world, never to come back again'. *Mokshaa* is 'the understanding that the world is an entertainment, provided free for me'. This is the teaching of the *Sruthis*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 40:

यथा "तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि" इत्यस्य शेषत्वेनान्वयव्यतिरेकश्रुतिः यथा "य एषोऽक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते" इत्याध्या "अथ यो वेदेदं जिघ्राणि" इत्यन्ता तथा "असं ब्रह्मास्मि" इत्यस्य शेषः।

Just as the passage beginning with 'He, the *purushaa* seen in the right eye' (*Chaandhogya Upanishad* VIII.vii.4) and ending with 'I am smelling' (*Chaandhogya Upanishad* VIII.xii.4) is preliminary and subsidiary to the text 'That is real, He is the Self and thou art That' (*Chaandhogya Upanishad* VI.viii.7), even so, the text 'I am *Brahman*' has the following subsidiary passage:

In the *Chaandhogya Upanishad* itself, we find both the *anvayavyathirekha* step of teaching, as well as the *mahaa vaakyam* step of teaching.

What is the *mahaa vaakyam* part of teaching? Sureswaraachaaryaa quotes from VII.viii.7 of the *Chaandhogya Upanishad*:

- तत्सत्यं"स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि" - "That is the Reality, He is the Self and thou art That".

As is well known, this *manthraa* is repeated several times in this Chapter VII, in sections 'vii' to 'xv', as "*thath sathyam sa aathmaa thathvamasi svethaketho*", as the *mahaa vaakyam*, the main teaching of the *Chaandhogya Upanishad*.

- अस्य शेषत्वेन - As a part of this teaching,
- अन्वयव्यतिरेकश्रुति : - anvaya vyathirekhaa teaching (is also given).

Seshathvena means 'as a part of' '*Sruthi*:', in this context, means 'teaching'.

And, why is that required? When the teacher says "you are *Brahmar*", the student, of course, should have sufficient intelligence and also knowledge of grammar, to convert the second person noun to the first person noun and change the verb also and say "'I' am *Brahmar*" and not repeat to the teacher "you are *Brahmar*".

And, when he thus says "'I' am *Brahmar*", that 'I' should be taken as *saakshi* and not *ahamkaaraa*. Otherwise, when the teacher says "You are *aananda*:", the student will not be convinced. He will wonder "I have numerous problems, troubling my mind all the time; how can the teacher say that I am *aanandha*:" Therefore, the student should have already gone through and successfully completed the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise. Only then, the student will use the word 'I', as non-variable *saakshi* and not as non-variable *ahamkaaraa*.

Only on this consideration, that '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*' teaching should go as preliminary to '*thathvamas*' teaching, the *anvaya vyathirekha* method has been in-built in the *Upanishadic* teachings.

An example can be given from a mundane experience, to explain the importance of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise : " Suppose a thirsty person buys a bottle of coco-cola. He has the bottle in hand. But, the bottle alone will not give him the benefits of 'drinking' and 'quenching his thirst'. He would require a 'bottle opener'. He will not get the benefit from the bottle, if a bottle- opener is not readily available. *Mahaavaakyam* can be likened to the bottle of coco-cola and *anvaya vyathirkhaa* to the opener. With *anvaya vyathirekhaa* opener, the seeker can open the bottle of *mahaa vaakyam* and drink *moksha aanandhaa*".

Therefore, the *mahaa vaakyam* and *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise always go together as *sesha - seshi*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is '*seshi*' and *anvaya vyathirekhaa* is '*seshaa*'. Bottle is '*seshi*' and the opener is '*seshaa*'.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "seshathvena anvaya vyathirekha sruthi: "What is that anvaya vyathirekha? It is avasthaathraya viveka: |

And, where do you find that? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers:

"य एष :अक्षिणि पुरुष " दृश्यते :इत्याध्या - Beginning with "He, the purushaa, seen in the right eye" (VIII.vii.4)

अथ"यो वेदेदं जिघ्राणिइत्यन्ता " - and ending with "I am smelling" (VIII.xii. 4)".

The contents of these six sections from 'XIII.vii. 4' to 'XIII.xii. 4' are on *avasthaathraya viveka:* /

Here, 'I' am given four names:

'I' am called '*viswa*', when I am illumining *jaagrath avasthaa*.

'I' am called '*thyjasaa*', when 'I' am revealing *svapna avasthaa*.

'I' am called '*praagnyaa*' when I am revealing *sushupthi avasthaa* .

'I' am called '*saakshI*', the '*thureeyam*', from the standpoint of 'my'self.

Thus, *viswa* is talked about; *thyjasaa* is talked about; *praagnyaa* is talked about. But, these three are only 'my' incidental names, when 'I' am functioning in *jaagrath avasthaa*, in *svapna avasthaa* and in *sushupthi avasthaa* respectively. But, 'I', from 'my' own standpoint, am '*saakshI*' different from all of them. Not only that; 'I' am free from the *punyams* and *paapams*, which come in the *avasthaas*.

'I' do not have any *punyam* or *paapam* ; 'I' am '*punya papa rahitha chaithanyam*'.

Thus, in four stages, *viswa*, *thyjasaa*, *praagnyaa* and *thureeyam* are taught. *Viswa* is called *akshi purusha:* | *Thyjasaa* is called *svapna purusha:* | *Praagnyaa* is called *suptha purusha:* | *Thureeya* is called *utthama purusha:* |

To recollect this episode (*Prajaapathy Vidhyaa*) from *Chaandoghya Upanishad*:

Indira and *Virochana*, kings of the *Devas* and *Asuraas* respectively, come to *Prajaapathy* as students. As customary, they do service (*seva*) to *Prajaapathy* for 32 years. *Guru Prajaapathy* then gives them his first teaching, as "you are the 'waker' individual". *Virochana* is very, very happy with the teaching; he goes away, never to return; and, he teaches this misconception to other *asuraas* also. That is why, all of them have got *deha abhimaanaa*, as 'waker' 'I'.

But, *Indira*, after thinking over this teaching, finds himself dissatisfied with it, and comes back to *Prajaapathy*, and serves him for another 32 years. *Prajaapathy* then teaches him "You are not the 'waker' 'I'; but, you are the 'dreamer' 'I'. *Indira* goes away and contemplates on this teaching; but, dissatisfied with this teaching also, he comes back again to *Prajaapathy*.

He serves the *guru* for another 32 years, at the end of which he is taught "You are the 'sleeper' 'I' ". This appears to be a fantastic teaching, because in sleep, 'I' exist without any limitation. It is *poorna* 'I', closest to *Brahman*. In sleep, 'I' do not have physical limitations; 'I' do not have emotional limitations; 'I' do not have intellectual limitations. Nevertheless, I am existent also. Therefore 'sleeper' 'I' seems to be the real 'I', *Brahman*.

But, after contemplating on this teaching, *Indira* is dissatisfied again ; because, he realizes the problem in the 'sleeper' 'I'; no doubt, the sleeper 'I' is limitless; but, the sleeper 'I' does not know that he is limitless. 'I' am limitless in sleep; but, 'I' cannot claim 'I' am limitless.

Therefore, *Indira* comes back again to *Prajaapathy*. When, he, thus, approaches *Prajaapathy* the fourth time, *Prajaapathy* gives him a concession. He asks *Indira* to serve him only for five more years. Thus, *Indira* serves *Prajaapathy* totally for 101 years.

On completion of the final five years, *Prajaapathy* gives his main teaching as:

"Maghavan, marthyam vaa idhagum sareeramaattham mruthyunaa thadasya amruthasya asareerasya aathmanodhishtaanamaathho vai sasareera: priyaapriyaabhyaam na vai sareerasy satha: priyaapriyayo: apahathirasthi asareeram vaava santham na priyaapriye sprusatha:" (VIII.xii.1) – "O Indra, this body indeed is mortal. This is covered by death. But, the body is only the seat of this Self, which is immortal. Anything embodied is within the range of the desirable and the non-desirable. Surely, for that which remains embodied, there can be no elimination of the desirable and the undesirable. But the desirable and the undesirable cannot surely touch It, which has become embodied"

"evamevaisha samprasaadho asmaachachareeraatthasmutthaaya param jyothi: upasampadhya svena roopena abhinishpadhyathe sa utthama: purusha: sa thathra paryethi jakshathkreedan ramamaana: sthreebhi: vaa yaanairvaa jnyaathibhirvaa nopajanagum smarannidhagum sareeragum sa yathaa prayoghya aacharane yuktha evamevaayam asmin sareere praano yuktha:" (VIII. xii. 3) – "In this very way, this tranquil one becomes established in his own nature after rising up from this body and reaching the supreme Light. He is the supreme Person. There he moves about laughing, sporting and enjoying with women, vehicles or kinsmen, but not remembering this body born from the contact of man

and woman. That is, just as a horse is harnessed to a vehicle, in that very way, this individual soul is joined with this body".

Prajaapathy's teaching, in this portion, goes on further. But, the essence of this fourth level teaching of *Prajaapathy* is: 'I' am 'utthama purusha', free from ignorance also; ignorance belongs to the sleeping mind, *kaarana sareeram*, whereas, 'I' am free from ignorance also. Then, who am 'I'? "I' am the 'saakshi chaithanyam', free from the *sthoola sareeram* and its limitations, free from *sookshma sareeram* and its limitations and free from *kaarana sareeram* and its ignorance. 'I' am the *saakshi* and that *saakshi* is the all-pervading *Brahman*".

Sureswaraacharya says, that, the entire *anvaya vyathirekhaa* teaching culminates with the statement "atha yo vedha idham jigraani ". This is, in fact, the culmination of the main *Chaandoghya* teaching, which started with VI. viii.7, now concluding in the Chapter VIII. The entire range of teaching reveals the fact, "I' am the *chith*, which is none other than *sath*".

Thereafter, Sureswaraacharya says: "You can enjoy the same fantastic teaching in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* also; I will give you the reference".

An incidental and interesting aside: Even now, in an *Aashramaa*, known as *Kailaasa Ashrama* in *Hrishikesh*, with a branch in *Uttharakasi*, when students are admitted for *vedhaantha vicharaa*, several conditions are imposed on them, before giving the teaching. One of the conditions is, that, whatever text the student wants to study, he has to, first, get by heart. That is the basic qualification for commencing the 'study'. If a student wants to study *Chaandhogya Upanishad*, he has to go back, get the *Upanishad* by heart and then report for the class. But, the problem is that, most prospective students, finding it difficult to get entire texts by heart and also not understanding the value of 'getting the text by heart', do not return at all. Even earnest students do not realize that, once one is thoroughly familiar with the text, one's 'understanding' of the text and its intricacies is easier. The tradition of 'getting by heart' is, therefore, disappearing gradually. Unfortunately, modern gadgets like 'I Pods', further contribute to this tendency. But, the indisputable fact is, that, once a text is got by heart, studying the text thereafter, is not only easier, but, highly enjoyable also. A compromise formula will be, to, at least, resort to repeated *paarayanam* of the text, that is being studied.

Now, Sureswaraacharya comes to *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* and says:

- तथा - In the same manner,

- अहं"ब्रह्मास्मि "इत्यस्य - for the mahaa vaakyam 'aham brahma asmi' ,

'Aham Brahma asmi' is the mahaa vaakyam in the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad (I. iv. 10), just as 'thath thvam asi' is the mahaa vaakyam of Chaandhoghya Upanishad.

- शेषः - the subsidiary passage (is as follows).

The following portion is the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* 'opener' for the *mahaa vaakyam 'aham Brahma asmi'*, in the form of *avasthaathraya vivekaa*. What are those *manthraas*? Sureswaraachaaryaa gives in verse 40.

Chapter III: Verse 40 -

अहमः प्रत्यगात्मार्थो निरस्तशेषयुष्मदः ।

बम्भणीति श्रुतिर्न्याय्या योऽयमित्यादिनाऽसकृत् ॥ ४० ॥

The *sruthi* 'He, who is full of consciousness and resides as the inner light among senses' (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* IV .iii. 7) etc., repeatedly refers to the inmost Self divested of all non-Self, in the manner of reason.

In the first chapter, I.iv.10, *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* gives 'aham Brahma asmi' as the teaching and the student learns to say 'aham Brahma asmi'. *Brahma* means the limitless *Brahman*.

One of the meanings of *Brahman* is *aananda*: also. As the popular *manthraa* of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* (*Bhruguvalli- manthraa* 6) goes: "Aanandho Brahmethi vyajaanaath | Aanandhaath eva kalu imaani boothaani jaayanthe | Aanandhena jaathaani jeevanthi | Aanandham prathi abhisamvisanthi ithi" | *Brahman*, therefore, means *aanandha*: |

So, 'aham Brahma asmi' means 'aham *aananda*: asmi' | But, as even as a student says "I am *aanandha*:", he is not convinced. On the other hand, he is disturbed by the teaching. With all his worldly worries, he wonders "How is this possible?" To him, there appears to be a contradiction between the teaching and the facts. The contradiction can be resolved, only when the student understands the true meaning of the term 'I'; when he understands that, " 'I' am not *viswaa* ; 'I' am not *thyjasaa*; 'I' am not *praagnyaa*; 'I' am none of the three, but, 'I' am *thureeya*:".

Therefore, as part of the main teaching 'aham Brahma asmi', 'thureeyam' is revealed in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* also. And, how? In *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* also, there

is an anvaya vyathirekhaa vichaara, again through avasthaathraya viveka, given in the third section of Chapter IV, of the Upanishad.

This is a very famous section, known as '*Svayamjyothi Braahmanam*', a wonderful dialogue between King *Janakaa* and Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa*, wherein *Janakaa* asks *Yaagnyavalkyaa* "What is the light, O, Sage! with which a man does all transactions?"

As is well known, 'light' (either sunlight or moonlight or any artificial light) is important for carrying out any transaction. That's why when one enters a hall or a room, even a bathroom, one makes sure that there is sufficient light in the room, for the transaction to be done. All *vyavahaaraas* require light.

And, when *Janakaa* asks the question "What serves as the light for a man?" *Yaagnyavalkyaa* replies: "The light of the sun, O Emperor. It is through the light of the sun that he sits, goes out, works and returns". *Janakaa* responds "But, when the sun has set, what exactly serves as the light for a man?" *Yaagnyavalkyaa* replies "The moon serves as his light. It is through the light of the moon that he sits, goes out, works and returns". King *Janaka* queries again "When the sun and the moon have both set, what exactly serves as the light for a man?" and so on.

After thus eliminating all the lights one by one, they come to the conclusion "Any light can help you, only when there is the basic light of Consciousness". For a dead body, all lights are useless for transaction.

Thus, through an enquiry and *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, King *Janakaa* and Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* arrive at the light of Consciousness and also at the conclusion "That Consciousness Light, 'I' am".

For *jaagarth vyavahaaraa*, 'I' serve as the basic light. For dream transactions, 'I' serve as the basic light. As for the *sushupthi avasthaa*, there are two transactions that go on in *kaarana sareeram*. One transaction is "'I' do not know anything"; the second transaction is "'I' am comfortable", because sleep is the most comfortable state. Both transactions go on as "'I' do not know! 'I' do not know!" and as "'I' am comfortable! 'I' am comfortable!". But even these minimum transactions, *ajnaanam* and *aanandhaa*, are experienced by 'me' only. Those minimum transactions are also happening in a particular light – the light of 'Consciousness'.

"All these transactions, viz., transactions during waking, transactions during dream and transactions during sleep have got *thriputi*; and 'I', the light of Consciousness, *saakshi*, am revealing all those " *Yaagnyavalkyaa* tells *Janakaa*. How does he tell?

Sureswaraacharya uses an unique verb '*bambaneethi*', derived from the root '*bar*', which root means 'to declare' or 'to proclaim'. '*Bambaneethi*' is a special usage called 'frequentative' usage. This usage indicates 'repeated proclamation'.

'puna: puna: banathy' ithi 'bhambaneethi'.

Sureswaraacharya chooses this onomatopoeic word as the verb. To explain: A word is considered 'onomatopoeic', when the sound of the word itself conveys the idea. Examples are (i) the word 'whisper', which by its very sound, conveys the soft undertone being used and (ii) the word 'humming' in the sentence 'the bee is humming', where again the word 'hum', by its very sound, conveys the noise made by the bee.

To stress the idea, namely, "the *Vedas* are loudly and repeatedly proclaiming" (so that nobody will miss this fantastic teaching "I am the *thureeya aathmaa*, which is none other than *Brahman*"), Sureswaraacharya uses the verb '*bhambaneethi*' and says '*bahambaneethi sruthi*.' |

149. Chapter III, Verse 40 and 41 (15-08-2009)

Many students of Vedhaanthea often have a grievance against Vedhaantic teaching. Their thoughts go on the lines that follow:

"We approach *Vedhaanthea* as *samsaaris*, to solve our problems of *samsaaraa*. And, after listening to our problems, *Vedhaanthea* first acknowledges all the problems; and, *Vedhaanthea* even gives explanations to our problems, pointing out that I am a *karthaa* and *bokthaa* and because of that, I have several *karmas* fructifying regularly; and, because of the fructifying *karmaas*, I am going through ups and downs in life. *Vedhaanthea*, thus, diagnoses the problem.

"Thereafter, *Vedhaanthea* even gives a special *saasthric* name for me, the *samsaari*, suffering the *samsaaraa*, as *ahamkaara*: | The technical word for *ahamkaara*: is '*thvam padha vaachyaartha*.' |

"When, thus, *Vedhaanthea* sees through and presents my condition very clearly, namely, that, I am *samsaari*, I am *kartha-bokthaa*, I have several problems, I am *ahamkaara*:, I am '*thvam padha vaachyaartha*.' etc., as a student, I am excited, listening to all these teachings of *Vedhaanthea*. And, I eagerly wait for the solution, that *Vedhaanthea* will give to my problems.

"But, *Vedhaanthea*, somehow, at this point, surprisingly drops this *ahamkaara* topic and introduces a new topic saying: "You have a higher nature; that higher nature is called *saakshi*; that *saakshi* is called '*thvam padha lakshyaartha*.'; that *saakshi* is wonderful / fantastic, without any *karma*, and therefore, devoid of problems also; *saakshi* is *nithyam*, *suddham*, *buddham* and *muktham*; it is identical with *Brahman*, *jagath kaaranam*" etc. *Vedhaanthea* goes on and on about that *saakshi* on similar lines. Even when *Vedhaanthea* thus goes on describing the *saakshi*, I fondly hope that, after some time i.e. after briefly discussing that *saakshi*, *Vedhaanthea* will come back to me, the *ahamkaaraa*, and give solutions to *my* problems. And, I wait for *Vedhaanthea* to come back to the problem of *ahamkaaraa*, which is myself. I wait and wait and wait and wait; but, even after long years of study and waiting, I find that *Vedhaanthea* is only going on and on about my higher nature, the *saakshi*, which, of course, seems to be fantastic; but, all the time, I am bothered about myself, the *samsaari*, the *ahamkaaraa*; and, *Vedhaanthea* does not seem to give any solution for me.

"How does the knowledge the status of some *saakshi*, which may exist or even not exist at all, matter to me? It is like knowing the higher status of my neighbor, when I am facing

varieties of problems. Imagine a situation, when I call a building expert to solve the problems in my building; and, that, he comes and agrees with me: 'Yes, you have plumbing problems; you have electrical problems'; and, that, he diagnoses the problems correctly; but, then, instead of solving my problems, he says: 'Do you know your neighbor has got a fantastic house? There is no plumbing or electrical problem there'. I have called the expert for solving my problems; but, he keeps talking about my neighbor not having any problems at all. Knowing about the superior status of some *saakshi* is only akin to this hypothetical situation of knowing about the superior status of my neighbor, when I, myself, have numerous problems."

And, therefore, it may appear to a seeker, that, *Vedhaanthaa* has missed the point, viz., his worries and concerns, and is talking about irrelevant things. Instead of sorting out the problems of *ahamkaaraa*, the *samsaari*, *Vedhaanthaa* keeps talking about *saakshi*, 'my' higher nature, something seemingly non-relevant.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is trying to sort out this grievance, of course, of not all students, but, some students, who always feel that *Vedhaanthaa* is talking about something non-relevant.

Addressing such students, he points out: "It is **not** *Vedhaanthaa* that is missing the point; it is **you**, who are missing the point. It may be that you are listening to the *Vedhaanthic* teachings carefully; however, you are missing the punch line of *Vedhaanthaa*. *Vedhaanthaa* has several teachings alright; but, if you miss the punch line, *Vedhaanthaa* will appear non-relevant".

What is that punch line of *Vedhaanthaa*? That is what Sureswaraachaaryaa is trying to point out.

He explains to the student: "What is your complaint? Is it not 'how does the status of my neighbor, **saakshi**, matter to me?' This is your question. Let me correct your question based on *Vedhaanthic* teaching. The entire *Vedhaanthic* teaching is that you should learn to ask the same question, looking at *ahamkaaraa* as your neighbor. Instead of standing as *ahamkaaraa* and looking at *saakshi* as neighbor, you should stand as *saakshi* and look at *ahamkaaraa* as neighbor. Then, you will yourself realize that, whatever be the status of *ahamkaaraa*, whether going through *sanchitha-aagaami-praarabhda karmaas*, or through *jaagrath-svapna-sushupthi avasthaas* etc., all types of statuses of *ahamkaaraa*, will appear like the fluctuating statuses of the neighbor. Then, instead of asking 'How does the status of my neighbor, the **saakshi**, matter to me?', you will ask the question 'How does the status of my neighbor, **ahamkaaraa**, matter to me?' "

It may be even said that the difference between *mokshaa* and *samsaaraa* is only the perspective. If you ask this question "What does it matter to me whatever be the status of my neighbor?", looking at *saakshi* as the neighbor, it is called *samasaara*. When you ask the same question "What does it matter to me, whatever be the status of my neighbor?" with *ahamkaaraa* as your neighbor, that is *moksha*: | Therefore, the *Vedhaanthic* punch line is "'neighbourise' (this is not a regular English word, but conveys the meaning effectively) the *ahamkaaraa*".

This is the *Vedhaanthic* teaching. If a seeker misses this punch line and, therefore, standing as *ahamkaaraa*, looks at *saakshi* as neighbor, even long years of study will not help him; he will feel that the teaching is irrelevant.

It also sometimes happens that, even after understanding this teaching, a seeker does not seek to 'neighbourize' *ahamkaaraa*; and instead, desires to improve *ahamkaaraa*. But, when the seeker's aim is 'improving *ahamkaaraa*', again *Vedhaanthaa* cannot help and will also appear irrelevant. The aim of *Vedhaanthaa* is not 'improving *ahamkaaraa*', but, 'neighbourising' *ahamkaaraa*.

Suppose a person says "I am not interested in making *ahamkaaraa* the neighbor. I want to remain as *ahamkaaraa*; and as *ahamkaaraa*, I want to improve my status. My aim is 'repairing' *ahamkaaraa*. What does *Vedhaanthaa* have to offer to me?"

For such a person, *Vedha anthaa* is not the solution. He has to resort to the *Vedha Poorva* portions of the *Vedas*. *Vedha Poorva* prescribes a number of *karmaas* and *upasanaas*, all aiming at improvements or 'repairs' to *ahamkaaraa*.

But, for such a person also, the *Vedhaanthic guru* has a message. It is: "A number of *karmaas* and *parihaaraas* will be prescribed for you, by the *Veda Poorva*, for your problems. No doubt, you will find them efficacious. But, by the time you 'repair' one part of *ahamkaaraa*, (i.e. when one particular problem is solved for you) there will be another part falling into disrepair and needing attention (another problem will crop up). Thus, *ahamkaaraa* 'repair' works will go on and on; and, a time will come when you will be utterly frustrated and you will feel utterly helpless. At that stage, you will discover that "'repairing' *ahamkaaraa* is exactly like the proverbial 'straightening of a dog's tail' ". And, when you thus tire of 'repairs' to *ahamkaaraa* and the remedies suggested by *Vedha Poorvaa*, your only recourse is *Vedha anthaa*, to which you are always welcome". This is what is conveyed by the well known *manthraa* (I. ii. 12) of *Mundakopanishad* "*pareekshya lokaan karamachitthaan Brahmana: nirvedam aayaath*" – "Having examined the worlds, which are achieved through *Karma*, a *Brahmin* should come to dispassion".

One should know the difference between 'repairing' *ahamkaaraa* and 'neighbourising' *ahamkaaraa*. *Vedha poorvaa* is meant to 'repair' or improve *ahamkaaraa*. The aim of *Vedhaanthaa*, on the other hand, is teaching the aspirant to make the claim "'I' am *saakshi*" and to look at *ahamkaaraa*, not only as a neighbor, but also as a *mithyaa* neighbor.

Vedhaanthic teaching is: "Perceive *ahamkaaraa* as 'neighbor'; perceive *sareerathrayam* also as 'neighbor'; perceive *chidhaabhaasaa* also as 'neighbor'; even one's family is 'neighbor'. All these will have permanent problems. *Karma* will doggedly follow these".

Seeing *ahamkaaraa* as a *mithyaa* neighbor, the aspirant should ask the question "What does it matter to me, whatever be the status of the *mithyaa ahamkaara* neighbor?"

Verses 8 and 9 of the 5th chapter of the Srimad Bhagavadh Githa are relevant here: "Naiva kinchith karomi ithi yuktha: manyetha thathvavith pasyan srunvan sprusan jigran asnan gacchan svapan svasan pralapan visrujan gruhnan unmishan nimishan api indriyaani indriyaartheshu varthanthe ithi dhaarayan" – "Even while engaged in activities such as seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening and closing the eye, the disciplined knower of the Truth understands 'I do not do anything at all' bearing in mind, that senses organs remain in sense-objects".

The aspirant should have the conviction "*mithyaa ahamkaara: mithyaa vishayeshu varthethe; aham saakshi chethaa kevalo nirgunascha*" – "It is the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* that dwells on *mithyaa* sense-objects. But, 'I' am only the Witness, devoid of any attributes". If this punch line is missed, *Vedhaanthaa* will appear indifferent and irrelevant to one's problems. Then, as already explained, the remedy is to go to *Vedha Poorva*, get frustrated and then come back to *Vedhaanthaa*.

That is the reason why *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise becomes very important. *Anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise is the method of 'neighbourising' *ahamkaaraa*.

"In the jaagrath avasthaa, viswa, the neighbor *ahamkaaraa* is there; in svapna avasthaa, the thyjasaa neighbor *ahamkaaraa* comes; in sushupthi, praagnyaa *ahamkaaraa* arrives; the visva-thyjasaa-praagnyaa *ahamkaaraa*-s arrive and depart. Each *ahamkaaraa* has its own problems, in its own relevant state. But, 'I' am the thureeyam, beyond all the three and not conditioned by any one of them and not suffering any problem also". This is the teaching in Chaandoghya Prajapathy Vidhya and in Brahadhaaranyaka Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam also.

"'Neighbourising' *ahamkaaraa* through avasthaathraya vivekaa" is the method advised by both Prajapathy Vidhyaa and Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam.

Reverting to the text, (verse 40 – Chapter III):

अहम् प्रत्यगात्म अर्थ : - "The meaning of the word 'I' is the innermost Self, *Saakshi*, the *thureeyam*,

The meaning of the word 'I', is not *ahamkaaraa*, having *saakshi* as the neighbor; but, the meaning of the word 'I', is the *saakshi*, which has got *ahamkaaraa* as the neighbor, which *ahamkaaraa* 'comes' and 'goes'. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, *viswa* comes; in *svapna avasthaa*, *thyjasaa* comes; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, *praagnyaa* comes. 'I' am the *thureeyam*, beyond all the three. Therefore, the assertion: "*ahama: artha: prathyagaathmaa*" meaning "the *thureeyam* or *saakshi*, is the meaning of the word 'I'"; and, also the exhortation: "Do not make *saakshi* the neighbor; make *ahamkaaraa* the neighbor".

What type of *thureeyam* / *saakshi* is it?

- निरस्त अशेष युष्मदः - totally free from all *anaathmaa*"

"*yushmadha:*", in this context, means "*anaathmaa*". Literally, the word means "you"; in this context, the word "you" means, "other than 'I'", 'I' meaning '*aathmaa*'; therefore. in this context, 'you' means 'anything other than *aathmaa*'.

'*Yushmadh*' is '*anaathmaa*'; and, *anaathmaa* consists of threefold *thriputi*, viz.,

- (1) the 'experiencer'
- (2) the 'experienced' and
- (3) the 'experience':

(1) the '*jaagrath avasthaa thriputi*' consisting of:

- (i) the 'experiencer'
- (ii) the 'experienced' and
- (iii) the 'experience',

belonging to *jaagrath avasthaa*, viz.,

- a) *viswaa*
- b) *sthoola prapanchaa* and
- c) *sthoola sareeram*

(2) the '*svapna avsthaa thriputi*' consisting of:

- (i) thyjasaa
- (ii) sookshma prapanchaa and
- (iii) sookshma sareeram; and

(3) the 'sushupthi avasthaa thriputi' consisting of:

- (i) praagnyaa
- (ii) kaarana prapancha, and
- (iii) kaarana sareeram.

All these three triads are called '*yushmadh*'.

But, who am 'I'? 'I' am the *thureeyam*, free from all the three triads. '*Nirastha*' means 'free from'. '*Asesha*' means 'totally'.

This is what is said in Maandookya Upanishad also, in the well known manthraa 7: "Naantha: pragnyam na bahi: pragnyam nobhayatha: pragnyam na pragnyaanaganam na pragnyam naapragnyam| adhrushtam avyavahaaryam agrahyam alakshanam achinthyam avyapadesyam ekaathmaprathyayasaaram prapanchopasamam saantham sivam advaitham chathurtham manyanthe sa aathmaa sa vignyeya:" – " They consider the thureeyaa to be that which is not the outward consciousness, not the inward consciousness, not the consciousness turned both sides, not a mass of consciousness, not the all-knowing consciousness, not unconscious, beyond perception, beyond transaction, beyond grasp, beyond inference, beyond thoughts, beyond description, traceable through the unbroken self-awareness, free from the world, tranquil, auspicious and non-dual. It is the Self. It is to be known".

Viswa is chidhaabhaasaa reflected in sthoola sareeram; thyjasaa is chidhaabhaasaa reflected in sookshma sareeram; praangnyaa is chidhaabhaasaa reflected in kaarana sareeram. All the three are three types of chidhaabasa / prathibhimbha chaithanyam / 'reflected Consciousness'. 'I' am the 'thureeya saakshi' free from all these three. I dismiss all these and 'I' am the Original Consciousness – chith.

Incidentally, all these have been discussed even during the study of basic texts such as *Thathva Bodhaa*, using notations for easier reference and understanding, such as RC1 , RC 2 and RC 3, OC, and RM 1, RM 2 and RM 3 etc.

'RC' stands for 'Reflected Consciousness' meaning '*chidhaabaasaa*'

RC 1 is 'Reflected Consciousness 1' or *Viswa*, in the RM 1 or 'Reflecting Medium 1' viz. *sthoola sareeram*.

RC 2 is 'Reflected Consciousness 2' or *Thyjasaa*, in the RM 2 or 'Reflecting Medium 2' viz. *sookshama sareeram*.

RC 3 is 'Reflected Consciousness 3' or *Thyjasaa*, in the RM 3 or 'Reflecting Medium 3' viz. *kaarana sareeram*.

OC is 'Original Consciousness' viz., *thureeya saakshl* or *chithl*.

'*Ahama:*' is a special Sanskrit word, meaning 'for the word 'I' '. And, by saying '*ahama: prathyagaathmaartha:*', Sureswaraacharya points out, that, according to *Sruthi*, the meaning of this word '*aham*' is '*prathyagaathmaa saakshl*', which is free from all these three groups of *thriputi-s'*.

- इति - Thus,
- श्रुतिः बम्भणीति असकृत् - the *Sruthi* loudly proclaims repeatedly,

What is the purpose of the *Sruthi* in making the proclamation 'repeatedly'? The intent of *Sruthi* is to stress to the aspirant, that the 'switching' or changing of his perspective **has** to take place. The perspective of a *samsaari* is "I am *ahamkaara:* | *Saakshi* is my neighbor". This perspective **should** be switched over to "'I' am the *saakshi*; *ahamkaaraa* is my neighbor". This 'switch-over' **has** to take place. Without this 'switch-over', even after long years of study, *Vedhaanthee* will appear irrelevant. A student / seeker, who has not made the 'switch-over', will tend to ask: " Even if I accept that *saakshi* is *nithya muktha:*, how does that acceptance help heal my bodily pains or mental worries ?" That is the reason that *Sruthi* is 'drumming' this message loudly, i.e., like a drum sounding '*bhaml* '*bhaml* '*bhaml* '.

As already pointed out, the verb '*bhambaneethl*' is derived from the root '*bharl*', meaning 'utter loudly'. The 'frequentative' form (again, a rare form of usage) of the root '*bharl*', is the verb '*bhambhaneethl*', indicating 'loud and repeated proclamations'. '*Athisayena bhanathi*' is '*bhambaneethl*'. The word '*asakriith*' also means 'not once' or 'repeatedly'. Thus, the *Aacharya* gives dual stress to his view, that *Sruthi* proclaims this fact repeatedly.

And, Sureswaraacharya says " *Sruthi* has not made a mere statement to be accepted without any questioning. *Sruthi* justifies it by reasoning also".

- न्याय्या - by using reasoning / logic,

What is the reasoning? It has been discussed several times before, in different contexts; but, being important, should be noted again, in this context.

It is: "Whatever is subject to arrival and departure has to be my incidental nature. Whatever is **not** subject to arrival and departure is my intrinsic nature. Using a different terminology, whatever is variable is my incidental nature and whatever is non-variable is my intrinsic nature".

If one analyzes the question "Is *ahamkaaraa* subject to arrival and departure?", one will conclude that *ahamkaaraa* **is** certainly subject to arrival and departure.

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, the individual has one *ahamkaara* and its (that particular *ahamkaaraa*'s) own body, the physical body. He has one set of family members, possessions, position etc.; there is one particular *ahamkaaraa*, with its own paraphernalia.

But, that particular paraphernalia is available only in *jaagrath avasthaa* and disappears in *svapna avasthaa*. . In *svapna*, the individual finds himself in another body not infrequently having a different set of family, living in a different place, in a different period etc.

Svapna ahamkaaraa and *jaagrath ahamkaaraa* are themselves, thus, mutually exclusive.

In *sushupthi avasthaa* there is yet another *ahamkaaraa*

- (i) which is an unique *ahamkaaraa*
- (ii) which may be termed 'un-localized' *ahamkaaraa*
- (iii) which has merged into *saakshi*, but is still a potentially existent *ahamkaaraa* and
- (iv) which disappears when it comes into *jaagrath avasthaa*.

Thus we have three *ahamkaaraas*, all of which are subject to arrival and departure.

How can that **variable** *ahamkaaraa*, be 'my' **intrinsic** nature?

Then, what is intrinsic to 'me'? The answer is: "That whatever is non-variable and common to all these three. And, that is the Consciousness principle. 'I' am *sath* and 'I' am *chith* i.e. "'I' **am**" and "'I' am Conscious" ".

Thus, logic itself proves that "*Ahamkaaraa* is incidental and therefore 'neighbour'. 'I', the *saakshi*, is intrinsic".

Sruthi repeatedly talks about the *saakshi* being 'my' real nature.

'Nyaayaa', in this context', means 'anvaya vyathiraka siddhaa' / attained by anvaya vyathirekha exercise.

- योऽयमित्यादिना - through *manthraas* such as the one starting with '*yoyam*'.

By the use of the term '*Yoyam ithyaadhinaa*', the *Aachaaryaa* refers to the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Manthraa* IV.iii.7, wherein begins the discussions on *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, one form of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise.

The manthraa (IV.iii.7) runs: "Yoyam vijnaamaya: praaneshu hrudhyantharjyothi: purusha: ; sa samaana: sannubhau lokaavanusancharathy, dhyayatheeva lelaayatheeveva ; sa hi svapno boothvaa imam lokam athikraamathi mruthyo roopaani" – "This infinite entity (Purusha:) that is mistakenly identified with the intellect and is in the midst of organs, is, in reality, the self-effulgent light within the heart (intellect) ; but, assuming the likeness of the intellect, moves between two worlds; it thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were. Being identified with dream, it transcends this world – the forms of death (ignorance etc.)".

The next Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad manthraa (IV.iii.8) is: "Sa vaa ayam purusha: jaayamaana: - sareeram abhisampadyamaana: - paapmabhi: sansrujyathe; sa uthkraaman – bhriyamaana: - paapno vijahaathi - "That man, the individual Self, when he is born or attains a body, is connected with evils (the body and organs) and when he dies or discards the body, he discards those evils".

And, the next Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad manthraa (IV.iii.9) goes: "Thasya vaa ethasya purushasya dve eva sthaane bhavatha: - idham cha paralokasthaanam cha ; sandhyam thrutheeyam svapnasthaanam; thasmin sandhye sthaane thishtan ethe ubhe sthaane pasyathi – idham cha paralokasthaanam cha | Atha yathaakrama: ayam paralokasthaane bhavathi thamaakramamaakramya ubhayaan paapmana aanandhaamscha pasyathi; sa yathra prasvapithi, asya lokasya sarvaavatho maathraam apaadhaaya svayam vihathya, svayam nirmaaya, svena bhaasaa, svena jyothishaa prasvapithi; athra ayam purusha: svayam jyothi: bhavathi" – "That man has only two abodes, this and the next world. The dream state, which is the third, is at the junction of the two. Staying at that junction, he surveys the two abodes, this and the next world. Whatever outfit he may have for the next world, providing himself with that, he sees both sufferings and joys. When he dreams, he takes away a little of (the impression of) this all-embracing world (the waking state), himself puts the body aside and himself creates a dream body in its place, revealing his own luster by his own light – and dreams. In this state, the man himself becomes the light".

And, so on.

This fantastic *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* portion, *Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam*, introduces the three *avasthaas* and says that *thureeyam* goes through all the three *avasthaas* but is not touched by any one of the *avasthaas*. And, the *Upanishad* gives an apt example for this, in IV.iii.18, which is as follows: "*Thadhyathaa mahaa mathsyaa: ubhe koole anusancharathi poorvam cha aparam cha, evam eva ayam purusha: ethau ubhaavanthau anusancharathi svapnaantham cha vrudhaantham cha*" - "As a great fish swims alternately to both the banks of a river, eastern and western, so does this infinite being move to both these states, the dream and waking states".

The large fish in this example moves from one shore to another shore of a wide river, in which it lives. When it goes near one shore, it does not touch the shore; but it experiences the events happening on the shore. Thereafter, it goes near the other shore and experiences another set of events. And, thereafter, tired of both the shores and events happening on both, it moves through the middle of the river. Even though, thus, the fish moves around from shore to shore, it is not affected by the events of the right shore or events of the left shore also.

A subsequent manthraa, IV.iii.22 of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, stresses this fact (that the *saakshi* is never affected) by saying "*ananvaagatham punyena ananvaagatham paapena theerno hi thadhaa sarvaan sokaan hrudhayasya bhavati*" – "This form of his (the *thureeyam* or *saakshi*) is untouched by good work and untouched by evil work, for he is beyond all the woes of his heart / intellect".

The next manthraa (IV.iii.23) goes on to say "*Yadhvai thanna pasyathi pasyanvai thanna pasyathi, na hi dhrashtur dhrushte: viparilopo vidhyathe avinaasithvaath | Na thu thad dvitheeyam asthi thathonyadvibhktam yathpasyeth*" - " That it does not see in that state is because, though seeing then, it does not see; for the vision of the witness can never be lost, because it is imperishable. But, there is not that second thing separate from it, which it can see".

The whole *Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam* reveals that "*saakshi* is *asangha:*" (*asango hi purusha:*). And, as even as King *Janaka* hears these teachings, he is so excited, that when Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* stops briefly, to rest his voice and breath, as it were, King *Janaka* says "*soham bhagavathe sahasram dhadhaam*" (IV iv. 7) – "I give you a thousand cows, Sir", as if to say " Sir, Do not stop the teaching. I will give you another thousand cows. Continue the teaching".

The teaching goes on and on; and, at last, King *Janaka* says "*Soham bhagavathe videhaan dhadhaami maam chaapi saha dhaasyaam*" (B.U. IV. iv. 23) – "I give you, Sir, the empire of

Videha and myself too, with it, to wait upon you”, implying “I have understood your teachings. Any amount of *dakshina* given to you, will not commensurate with your teachings”.

Thus concludes the teaching of Janaka-Yaagnyavalkya-samvaadhaa in the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad. In Anubhoothiprakaasaa, Swami Vidhyaaranyaa devotes nearly a thousand slokaas to the teachings of the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad. Sureswaraachaarya also exhorts the seeker: “Do not miss this portion”. Repeated study of these and similar portions of the Upanishads will be highly beneficial to a serious student and aspirant.

That is the reason why *sruthi* also repeats this teaching a number of times, as pointed out by Sureswaraachaaryaa, through his statement “*Sruthi: bambhaneethi asakruth*”| And, now, he wants to give some reference points.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 41 (Chapter III):

कथं पुनरयमर्थोऽवसीयते अहंव्याजेनात्रात्मातो बुबोधयिषित इति यत। :

How is it known that the real Self is referred to by the gateway of the Ego?

Sureswaraachaarya pointed out that both *Chaandoghya Upanishad* and *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* have taken great pains to emphasize the need for the ‘switch over’ from “identification with *ahamkaaraa* as myself, with *saakshi* as my neighbour” to “identification with *saakshi* as myself, with *ahamkaaraa* as my neighbour”.

Vedhaanthaa should be studied with the mindset “‘I’ am *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* is only ‘my’ incidental neighbor”. When, with this mindset and conviction, the student / seeker listens to the *Vedic mahaa vaakyam* “*aham Brahma asm*” (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* I.iv.10), the *vaakyam* will appear very, very right and no contradiction will be felt. If, on the other hand, the mindset remains as “‘I’ am *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi* is my neighbor”, the *mahaa vaakyam* “*aham Brahma asm*” will not only not make any sense, but, may even appear as a joke. Therefore, the *Vedic* punch line viz., “the exhortation to make this ‘switch over’ should not be missed by a serious and sincere *mumukshu*”.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, naturally, the question will be asked “how do you know that this ‘switching over’ is essential?”

Even after long years of study a student might have missed this punch line of *Vedhaanthaa* and, therefore, *Vedhaanthaa* might appear irrelevant to him. He may continue to feel: “When I have family problems, I have not got a solution for them from *Vedhaanthaa*, though I have been studying it for long.” What such a student has missed to realize is that,

the family problems belong to the *ahamkaaraa*, his neighbor, and not to his real Self, the *saakshi*.

An individual may desire to assist a neighbor as *loka sangrahaa*, at a time when the neighbor is facing problems. It is, of course, a healthy desire and the rendered assistance a healthy action. But, when, he, thus extends relief to the neighbor, only if he takes care to remember all the time, that they are only neighbor's problems, there will be relaxation in his inner heart, because of which better results will be achieved. That relaxation can be called internal *mokshaa*; experiencing that *mokshaa*, the individual can go to the rescue of the neighbor.

Similarly, after claiming "*aham muktha*:", the *Vedhaanthic* student / aspirant can do some service to *ahamkaaraa* also; but, diligently remembering that *ahamkaaraa* is the 'neighbor', he should not get too involved. The 5th capsule of *Vedhaantha* (in Swamiji's 'Five Capsules of *Vedhaantha*'), can be marginally modified and rewritten as follows: "For the individual, who remembers *ahamkaaraa* is the neighbor, life is an entertainment; but, for the individual, who forgets that *ahamkaaraa* is neighbor and, therefore, considers himself *ahamkaaraa*, life becomes a big struggle".

Reverting to the text:

- कथं पुन अयं :अर्थ :अवसीयते - "How is this meaning known, '*avaseeyathe*' means 'known' / *nischeeyathe* / ascertained.

What is the meaning?

- अहं व्याजेन आत्मार्थ :बुबोधयिषित :इति - that, the real Self / *saakshi* is revealed / referred to, by the word '*aham*' ? "

'*Aham vyaajena*' means 'through the device or means called *ahamkaaraa*' ; '*aham*', in this particular context, means '*ahamkaaraa*' ; '*vyaaja*:' means 'by means of/ through the instrumentality of / pretext / guise .

'*Aathmaartha*:' means 'the *saakshi* meaning'. '*Bubodhayishitha*:' means 'is intended to be revealed'.

The essence: How do you say that *saakshi* is revealed through *ahamkaaraa*?

(इति - If such a question is asked)

यत्तः - the reply follows.

Sureswaraachaarya will be saying: "Not difficult at all; it is *sampradhaaya*".

In Vedhaanthic studies, the *sampradhaaya* guru (traditional teacher) is highlighted. Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his Bhaashyam to the Bhagavadh Githa, (the 13th chapter), warns: "asampradhaayavith sarvasaasthravith api moorkavath upekshaneeya:" – "a teacher who claims to teach Vedhaanthea, but, who does not have *sampradhaaya*, i.e. not taught by a live guru, and therefore, not acquainted with traditional interpretation, is to be neglected as an ignorant man, though he may be learned in all *saasthraas*".

Such a teacher may claim proudly: "I do not have a *guru*; I have learnt everything without a *guru*". One may revere such a scholar, but should never take him as *Aachaaryaa*, because a self-taught *vedhaanthin* is considered to be a '*kanishta guru*', which term means the 'worst form of *guru*'.

An *Utthama guru* is supposed to be a *srothreeya Brahmanishta*;, who comes in *sampradhaaya*. A *sampradhaaya* guru can and will communicate; an *asampradhaaya* guru will make mystic statements, which the student will not understand.

The *Aachaaryaa* says, that, in *sampradhaaya* all these are very clear. What is that? That is said in the *sloka* that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 41 -

एष आत्मा स्वयंज्योती रविसोमग्निवाक्षुसः।

एतेष्वस्तं दृगोवास्ते भासयंस्चित्तचेष्टितम् ॥ ४१ ॥

This Self is self-luminous and it illumines the activities of the mind when the sun, moon, fire and speech subside and set.

In this *sloka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is summarizing part of the *Janaka-Yaagnyavalkya samvaadhaa* - how the *svayam jyothi Brahmanam* develops.

King Janaka asks sage Yaagnyavalkyaa the question (Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad – IV.iii.2): "Yaagnyavalkya kim jyothirayam purusha:" – "Yaagnyavalkyaa, what serves as a light for a man?"

It is common knowledge that all transactions require light in one form or another; without a light, no transaction is possible. That is why, when one enters a dark room in the night, the first job that one does, is to switch on the light in the room. To facilitate this, normally, the

switch is provided outside the room or just at the entrance to the room, because even to switch on the light, which is a *vyavahaaraa*, light is required.

The Svyam Jyothi Brahmanam of the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad starts with this question of King Janaka: "Yaagnyavalkya kim jyothirayam purusha:"]

Sankara Bhagaavdh Paadhaa has written a *sloka*, summarizing the entire *Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam*, in that one *slokaa*, which is considered as one of his *prakaranam*-s, popularly known as '*Eka Sloka*' or '*Eka sloka Vedhaantha*'. The *sloka* is as below:

- किं ज्योतिस्तव भानुमानहनि मे रात्रौ प्रदिपादिकं
- स्यादेवं रविदीपदर्शनविधौ किं ज्योतिराख्याहि मे ।
- चक्षस्तस्य निमीलनादिसमये किं धीर्धियो दर्शने
- किं तत्राहमतो भवान्परमकं ज्योतिस्तदस्मि प्रभो ॥

Sureswaraachaaryaa is making a similar attempt in this *sloka* 41.

The teaching of *Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam* starts with the question from King *Janaka* "Yaagnyavalkya kim jyothirayam purusha:" - "What is the light in which men do all transactions?" Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* answers "Sunlight".

Then, *Janaka* asks the question "What will you do after sunset?" The sage replies: "Moonlight".

Janaka continues his questioning: "If moon is not there, what will you do?" *Yaagnyavalkyaa* replies: "By the light of a fire".

Janaka persists: "If fire is also not there in a dark room, what will you do?" *Yaagnyavalkyaa* replies: "*Vaagevaasya jyothirbhavathi*" (IV.iii.4) – "Speech serves as his light".

Swamiji gives an example: "Imagine an individual is visiting a friend. Just as he enters the friend's house, the power fails and there is absolute darkness in the room. But, fortunately, the host is present in that dark room and being thoroughly aware of the lay of the room and its furniture, he would warn the guest of the possible objects against which the guest may stumble and also would give him directions to a chair where the guest will be asked to sit, till the power returns". What is the 'light' in this situation? It is '*vaak jyothi*:' or 'light of words/ speech'. That is what *Yaagnyavalkyaa* refers to by his terse answer "*Vaagevaasya jyothirbhavathi*"

King *Janaka*, then, asks: "When the sun and moon have both set, the fire has gone out and the speech has stopped, what exactly serves as the light for a man?" and *Yaagnyavalkyaa* replies "*aathmanaa eva ayam jyothisha aasthe palyayathe karma kuruthe vipalyetha*" - "It is through the light of the Self, that he sits, goes out, works and returns" (IV. iii.6).

King *Janaka* is satisfied and concurs "It is just so, *Yaagnyavalkyaa*".

This is true about *svapnaa* also, where there is no sunlight, no moonlight, no firelight and no words also. The dreamer carries out all dream *vyavahaara*-s / perceives everything in his dream, only in the light of Consciousness. That light of Consciousness alone illumines / reveals everything. *Aathmaa eva jyothi: bhavathi* That is said here, in this verse.

रविसोमाग्निवाक्षु अस्तं इतेषु - When the sun, moon, fire and speech have all ended or resolved,

'*astham itheshu*' means '*astham gatheshu*'; '*ravi*' means '*soorya:*', denoting 'sunlight'; '*soma*' denotes 'moonlight' ; '*agni*' denotes 'firelight'. '*vaak*' is 'speech' and since it can give knowledge can be considered 'the light of speech'.

What is there, when all of them are resolved?

- सः एषः स्वयंज्योती आत्मा एव - this Self-luminous aathmaa alone
- दृक् आस्ते - is there as the dhruk / saakshi chaithanyam,
- भासयन् - revealing / illumining
- चित्तचेष्टितम् - the various movements of the mind.

'*Svayam jyothi:*', because of *sandhi* rules of grammar, is written as '*svayamjyothee*', in this context.

During *jaagrath avasthaa*, the mind is an instrument of experience and the world is the object; whereas, in *svapna avasthaa*, the world is not there ; the mind and thought become the objects of experience; because, a dream tiger or a dream mountain is only a thought. That means 'I' am objectifying / revealing the mind; which, in turn, means 'I' am not the mind; but I am the *saakshi*, different from the mind.

The Katopanisahd manthraa (II.ii.15) "Na thathra sooryo bhaathi na chandratharakam nemea vidhyutho bhaanthi kuthoyamagni: | Thameva bhaantham anubhaathi sarvam thasya bhaasaa sarvam idham vibhaathi" - "The sun does not illumine that Self. The moon and the

stars do not. The flashes of lightning also do not illumine. How can this fire illumine? Everything shines after that Self alone, which is self-effulgent. By **its** light all these shine" is very relevant here.

150. Chapter III, Verse 41 to 43 (22-08-2009)

In these portions, Sureswaraachaaryaa is taking the support of sruthi for the teaching that he is giving, by pointing out that, *avasthaathraya vivekaa* is done by most of the Upanishads, as a part of *anvaya vyathireka nyaayaa*.

And, through this *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, 'I', the *aathmaa*, as the *saakshi*, is clearly revealed as distinct from *ahamkaaraa*, which *ahamkaaraa* is nothing but the mind plus *chidhaabhaasaa*.

This *sakkshi-ahamkaaraa-vivekaa* is accomplished through *avasthaathraya* analysis.

The Aachaaryaa first talked about Chaandhoghya Upanishad. Now, he is talking about Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad, especially Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam, where also *avasthaathraya vivekaa* is done.

And, the teaching that is presented is:

'I', by myself, am *saakshi chaithanyam*.

In the *jaagrath avasthaa* by 'my' mere presence, 'I' illumine the inert mind; 'I' enliven the inert mind by providing *chidhaabhaasaa*; and, 'I' experience the inert mind.

Since, thus, 'I', as *saakshi*, illumine, enliven and experience the mind, the mind and its conditions are clearly knowable to me, since mind is the object and 'I' am the subject. In this first stage, 'I' am the *saakshi* and mind is an enlivened object of 'my' experience.

And, in the second stage in *jaagrath avasthaa*, after enlivening the mind, 'I' join the mind; and as the joint entity, 'I' experience the external world.

To repeat, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, in the first stage, 'I' experience the mind, which is, at that stage, an object of 'my' experience; thereafter, in the second stage, 'I' join the mind and *along* with the mind, 'I' experience the external world.

When 'I' am objectifying the mind, 'I' am called *saakshi*; when 'I' join the mind to experience the world, 'I' am called *pramaathaa*. When 'I' objectify the mind as *saakshi*, the mind is away from me, as it were. And, when I join the mind to experience the world, the very same 'I', am called *pramaatha*.

Thus, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, I am *saakshi* also, 'objectifying' the mind and then, I become *pramathaa* also, 'joining' the mind and, thus, have a twofold role in *jaagrath avasthaa*, viz., *saakshi-cum-pramaathaa*.

(Repeating the above in a 'question and answer' format for the purpose of clarity:

Q. When am 'I' *saaksh*?

A: While objectifying the mind.

Q. When am 'I' *pramaathaa*?

A: While 'I' am joining the mind.

Q. When 'I' am joining the mind, what to 'I' objectify?

A. The world is objectified).

And, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, since 'I' am thus functioning both as *saakshi* and *pramathaa*, the *saakshi* status of 'mine' is not distinctly recognizable, because it is jumbled into a mixture of *saakshi* and *pramaathaa*. Therefore, 'I' am not able to clearly distinguish or understand 'my' *saakshi* status, in *jaagrath avasthaa*.

As for *sushupthi avasthaa*, in that *avasthaa* also, 'I' do exist as *saakshi*, but, there is a problem. The mind is in a resolved / dormant condition, because of which there is total blankness. If at all 'something' is said to be perceived during *sushupthi*, 'nothingness' is that 'something' which is perceived. Therefore, my *saakshi* status is not very clear, in *sushupthi avasthaa* also.

It is the third *avasthaa*, in which 'my' status is clear. What is the third *avasthaa*, other than *jaagrath* and *sushupthi*? *Paarishesha nyaayena*, i.e. by the law of exclusion, it is *svapna avasthaa*. *Svapna avasthaa* is the unique state in which 'my' *saakshi* status is distinct and clear.

This statement is justified as follows: In *svapnaa*, mind becomes a clear object of 'my' experience, since all dream experiences are nothing but thoughts and thoughts alone. The dream tiger is a thought; dream river is a thought; dream husband is a thought; dream wife is a thought, dream food is a thought. Everything in dream is nothing but thought; and, thought is nothing but the mind. Therefore, the entire dream world is nothing but mind, and mind alone. And, in dream, 'I' am clearly experiencing a dream world. That means 'I' am clearly experiencing my own mind; that means 'I' am clearly objectifying the mind and the mind alone.

From the above, one can see that there is a difference between *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*, in this aspect. In *svapnaa*, 'I' only objectify the mind; unlike in *jaagrath avasthaa*, 'I' do not

join the mind. Why not? Ans: 'Joining the mind' is required to experience the external world as a *pramaathaa*. But, in *svapna avasthaa*, 'I' do not experience the external world; that means 'I' do not join the mind; that means 'I' do not become a *pramaathaa*; that means 'I' **remain** a *saakshi*, clearly experiencing the mind and the conditions of the mind only.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his *Upadesa Saahasri*, takes this portion from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* and writes a full chapter called '*svapna smruthi prakaranam*'. In this *prakaranam*, he also shows that *svapnaa* is a clear state, in which, the mind becomes an object of experience and 'I' **remain** as *saakshi*.

To understand these facts more clearly, the example of one's spectacles can be given. When a bespectacled individual finds dust settled on the glasses and desires to clean his spectacles, he 'looks' at the spectacles and wipes them. At that point of time, he is the 'subject' and the spectacles is an 'object of experience'. It is clearly an 'object'. Then after wiping the spectacles, he puts on the spectacles. Now, the spectacles is still an object of the individual's experience; but, not merely that; the individual joins the spectacles; and, joining the spectacles, he becomes another type of 'observer'. Earlier, he was the 'observer' of the spectacles, which was the 'object observed'. Now he has become a 'joint observer' along with the spectacles, of the external world. But, what happens is, that, when he experiences the external world, though the spectacles still continues as an object of his experience, he forgets that fact, and instead 'mixes up' the spectacles with him as the 'subject'. He completely forgets spectacles as an object and considers only the external world perceived by him along with the spectacles, as the 'object'.

'Mind' is similar to the spectacles in the example. In *svapna avasthaa*, 'I', purely as a *saakshi*, without doing anything (*saannidhya maathrena*), am watching the mind and the entire *svapna prapanchaa*, which *prapanchaa* has been generated by the mental *vaasanaa*-s in the form of thoughts. At that time, i.e. during *svapna avasthaa*, mind serves only as an 'object of experience'; 'I' do not join the mind to experience the external world, because, there is no external world in *svapnaa*. But, the moment I wake up, (just as I put on the spectacles), I join the mind / the mind joins me and my *saakshi* status is overwhelmed / suppressed by my *pramaathaa* status.

It follows, therefore, that, to recognize or invoke his *saakshi* status, the student should close all his sense organs and should live in his internal world. Obviously, that is difficult, if not impossible.

Therefore, as a compromise, *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* advises the student: "Visualize your dream mind to recognize your *saakshi* status". In *svapnaa*, the mind is clearly objectified; mind does not have a Consciousness of its own; it is inert in nature; it has the

five qualities of 'matter', viz., *dhrusyathvam*, *baudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*. In *svapnaa*, 'I' clearly witness such an inert material mind. Therefore, that is referred to, in *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*. Sureswaraachaaryaa also refers to it in this portion.

Reverting to the text (verse 41):

- एष :आत्मा स्वयंज्योति(भवति) - 'I', the aathmaa, am 'self effulgent';
- रवि सोम अग्नि वाक्षुसु अस्तं इतेषु - when the sun, moon, fire and speech subside and set (i.e., in the *svapna avasthaa*),

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, to experience the external world, one has *soorya prakaasa* or *chandra prakaasaa* or *agni prakaasaa* or *vaak prakassa*, as discussed in the dialogue, given below, between King Janakaa and Sage Yaagnyavalkyaa in the *Svayam Jyothi Prakaranam* of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iii.2 to IV.iii.5):

Janakaa : Yaagnyavakya kim jyothi: ayam purusha:?
 Yaagnyavalkyaa : Aadhithyajyothi: |
 Janakaa : Asthamitha aadhithye kim jyothi: eva ayam purusha:?
 Yaagnyavalkyaa : Chandramaa eva asya jyothi: bhavathi |
 Janakaa : Asthamithe aadhithye chandramasyasthamithe kimjyothi:
 eva ayam purusha:?
 Yaagnyavalkyaa : Agni: eva asya jyothi: bhavathi |
 Janakaa : Asthamithe aadhithye chandramasyasthamithe saanthe
 agnau kim jyothi: eva ayam purusha:?
 Yaagnyavalkyaa : Vaag eva asya jyothi: bhavathi |

But, during *svapnaa* state, *vaak* is also *saanthaa* and all other lights have also gone out. That is mentioned here (in the verse under study) as '*ravi soma agni vaakshu astham itheshu*', which, therefore, has to be interpreted as '*svapana avasthaayam*' |

In *svapna avastha*, when all lights are resolved,

- स :- (and), that *svayamjyothi*: aathmaa, saakshi,
- दृक् एव आस्ते - remains as the 'experiencer' of the mind,

The mind is the object of experience in both *jaagrath* and *svapna avasthaa*-s, but, with the difference as explained above and as repeated below.

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, the external world is also the object of experience; mind is also an object of experience, though, we do not notice that mind is also an object of experience, because we are busy with the external world.

In contrast, in *svapna avasthaa*, since the world is not there to distract our attention, the fact that 'mind as an object of experience' is crystal clear. In *svapnaa*, 'I' am not a *pramaathaa*, because, to become a *pramaathaa*, I should join the mind. Therefore, in *svapna avastha* 'I' remain only as *saakshi*. '*Dhrugeva aasthe*' means '*saakshi eva aasthe*'. '*Aasthe*' means '*bhavathi*'

And, what is 'my' job in *svapna avasthaa*? Obviously, 'I' do not experience the external world; (in a lighter vein) but, 'I' want some fun, as it were, because *sushupthi* is boring, when 'I' alone am there. 'I' am bored; therefore, 'I', the *saakshi*, in *svapna avasthaa* also, as in *jaagrath avasthaa*, by 'my' mere *saannidhyam*, bless the mind, illumine the mind and enliven the mind. Because of the 'enlivening', *vaasanaas* of the mind get activated and become *svapna prapanchaa*.

It may be recalled, that, in the basic text *Thathva Bhodhaa*, *svapnaa* is defined as "jaagrath avasthaayaam yadh dhruhtam yadh srutham thadh janitha vaasanayaa nidhraa samaye ya: prapancha: pratheeyathe saa svapnaa avasthaa" – "The 'world' that is created during sleep, purely by memories of whatever is seen and whatever is heard during the waking stage is the 'dream' state".

Whatever experiences one undergoes in the waking state are all registered in the mind and during disturbed sleep, such registered experiences are activated; the 'activated' thoughts become the 'dream world', which is the 'observed object' in *svapnaa*; but, as already explained, the 'dream world' is only thoughts; and thoughts are only 'mind'. Therefore, mind is the only object observed during *svapnaa*.

If the mind is an object, 'I' will have to be someone other than the mind. And, who am that 'I'? Ans: 'I', the observer of the mind is *saakshi*.

And, what is 'my' role in *svapnaa*? The verse answers.

- भासयन् - illumining
- चित्त चेष्टितं - the activities of the mind.

'*Cheshtitham*' means '*cheshtaa*' or 'activity'. Just as the physical body does a lot of *cheshtaa* in *jaagrath avasthaa*, the mind does a lot of *cheshtaa* in *svapnaa avasthaa*. The dreamer does not have any control over the *cheshtaa* of the mind in the dream. The dreamer is only the 'experiencer' of the dream and not 'controller' of the dream, because the dream is controlled by the *karma* of the mind or *karma* of the *ahamkaara*. *Karma* determines the nature of the dream, whether a nice dream, such as a visit to a temple or a scary dream, such as images of a ghost.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 42:

निर्णेक्ति च पृष्टो मुनिः।

The sage, being asked, specifically settled this matter.

Sureswaraachaaryaa continues to quote from the dialogue between *Yaagnyavalkyaa* and *Janakaa*, in the *Svayam Jyothi Brahmanam* of the *Brahadhaarananyaka Upanishad*.

The question asked by King *Janaka* was: "What illumines all the transactions? (IV.iii.2)". Sun was mentioned as 'illuminator', by *Yaagnyavalkyaa*; then, moon was mentioned; then, *agni* was mentioned; then, *vaak* was mentioned.

"When all of them are resolved, in *svapnaa* and *sushupthi*, what / who is the illuminator?" was the last question of King *Janaka*. To this, Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* answered: "*Aathmaa eva asya jyothi: bhavathi; aathmanaa eva ayam jyothishaa aasthe, palyayathe, karma kuruthe, vilpalyetha*" (IV.iii.6) - "Because of the *aathma jyothi*: alone, all activities are happening (in *svapna avasthaa*)".

When this answer was given by the Sage, King *Janakaa* asked "*kathama: aathmaa?*" (IV.iii.7) - "What is that *aathmaa*, that you are talking about?"

As an answer to this question, the *avasthaathraya vivekaa* was given by Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa*. Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa is referring to this portion of the *Brahadhaarananyaka Upanishad*.

पृष्टः मुनिः - When the Sage (*Yaagnyavalkyaa*) was asked (by King *Janakaa*),

What is the question? Ans: "*kathama: aathmaa?*" - "What is that *aathmaa*, which is the ultimate light?"

In *Vedhaanthaa*, the word 'light' has a special definition. That definition is: "Light is that, in the presence of which, things are known and in the absence of which, things are not known".

Based on this definition, it is easy to comprehend that 'sun', 'moon', 'fire' etc. are 'lights', as in common parlance. But, in *Vedhaanthaa*, extending this definition, 'sense organs' are also called 'lights'. Taking 'eyes' as example, if a person is blind, even in the presence of bright sunlight, he cannot see any object. This fact can be expressed as "only in the presence of eyes, things are seen or 'known' and in the absence of eyes, things are not seen or 'known'". The above definition can therefore, be extended to 'eyes' also, and 'eyes' also called 'light' in *Vedhaanthaa*. So also the ears, since a deaf person will not be able to comprehend or 'know' subjects addressed to him, because of absence of the hearing faculty.

In short, in *Vedhaanthaa*, when the word 'light' is mentioned, it should not be restricted to sunlight, moonlight, light of fires, light of a lamp etc.; 'sense organs' are also looked upon as 'lights'.

And, thereafter, *Vedhaanthaa* says, that, 'mind' also is a light; because, in the presence of mind alone, things are known. In the absence of mind, even if external lights are there and sense organs are there, things will not be known. Needless to say, that, if, during a class, a student's mind wanders away from the class, he will not hear the teachings. Therefore, 'mind' is also a 'light'.

Vedhaanthaa finally says that even if all of them, viz., external lights, sense organs and mind are there, the world cannot be known, if another important entity is missing. Sense organs are made up of matter only i.e. they are inert by nature. They do not have 'knowing power' of their own. Mind is also made up of matter only i.e. it is also inert by nature and does not have 'knowing power' of its own. Sense organs and mind can function only when there is another 'light'.

What is that 'light'?

Vedhaanthaa talks about two types of light – *boudhika jyothi:* and *aboudhika jyothi:* - material light and non-material light. '*Baudhikam*' means 'material' and '*abaudhikam*' means 'non-material' / 'spiritual'.

Soorya:, *Chandra:*, *agni:*, *indriyaani*, *mana:* etc. are all *boudhika jyothi:* / The sense organs and mind are also *boudhika jyothi* only. Therefore, the external lights, sense organs and mind are not 'ultimate light'. All of them are able to function as *jyothis*, only because of an *aboudhika jyothi*, which is none other than *Brahman* or *Aathmaa*.

What is the difference between *boudhikam jyothi:* and *aboudhikam jyothi:*? The difference is : *Boudhika jyothi:* can become *jyothi:*, only in the presence of *aboudhika jyothi:*, whereas the *aboudhika jyothi:* can be a *jyothi:*, without the support of *boudhika jyothi:* |

Mundakopanishad (II.ii.10) declares: "*Hiranmaye pare kose virajam brahma nishkalam thath subhram jyothishaam jyothi:*" – "The spotless, partless *Brahman* is in the supreme effulgent abode. It is pure. It is **the light of lights**". Lord Krishna also refers to *Brahman* in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Ch. XIII – verse 18) as "*Thadh jyothishaam api jyothi:*"- "It is **the light of all lights**".

All *boudhika jyothi:*s are able to function as *jyothi:*, only because of that *aboudhika jyothi:*, *Brahman*, the '*jyothishaam jyothi:*' | And, that non-material '*jyothishaam jyothi:*' is called *svayam jyothi:*, in the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (VIII.12.3).

In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* says "*aathmaa eva asya jyothi: bhavath'*" (IV.iii.6) - "The Self serves as his light". *Aathmaa* illumines the mind and converts the mind into a *jyothi:* | King *Janakaa* questions the sage further : "*Kathama: aathmaa'*" (IV.iii.7) – "Which is the Self ?".

This question is what *Sureswaraachaaryaa* is referring to, in this *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 42, by '*Prushto muni:* - "The sage, when questioned".

When King *Janakaa* thus asks for more clarification on *aathma jyothi:*, what does Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* do? *Sureswaraachaaryaa* says:

- निर्णेनेक्ति - (the sage) clarifies.

The verb '*nirnenekth'* is a rarely used difficult word. '*Nij*' is the root for this verb and '*nir*' is a prefix. The verb literally would mean 'cleanses' or 'washes' and in this context, stands for "washing' the brain' or 'clarifying'.

The use of the word '*muni:*', by *Sureswaraachaaryaa*, to refer to *Yaagnyavalkyaa* in this *sambhandha gadhyam*, is interesting. In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, the third and the fourth chapters are the most important and productive chapters. Both in these chapters, Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* is the central character. He roars like a lion, addressing everyone authoritatively with his brilliant teachings. Since he, a *muni:*, is the main *aacharyaa* in the 3rd and 4th chapters of the *Upanishad*, the two chapters are together called '*Muni kaandam*', while the first two chapters together are called '*Madhu kaandam*' and the last two together '*Kila kaandam*'.

The middle pithy two chapters, together, get the name '*Muni Kaandam*' because of *Yaagnyavalkya Muni*. Presumably, this is the reason that Sureswaraachaarya uses the word '*muni:*', to refer to Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa*, without mentioning his name.

Reverting to the text, how does *Yaagnyavalkyaa* clarify? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers in the next few verses.

Chapter III: Verse 42 –

आत्मनैवेत्युपश्रुत्य कोऽयमात्मेत्युदीरिते ।

बुद्धेः परं स्वतोमुक्तमात्मानं मुनिरभ्यधात् ॥ ४२ ॥

The King, being told 'by the light of the Self, it remains' (*Brahadhaaryaka Upanishad* - IV.iii.6), asks 'Who is the Self?'. In reply, the sage speaks of the Self, transcending the mind and intrinsically free.

- "आत्मना एव "इति उपश्रुत्य - Hearing 'by the light of the Self alone',

The reference is to King *Janaka* hearing the expression of Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa*, in B.U. IV.iii.6. The expression quoted in this verse is '*aathmanaa eva*'. The full sentence is "*aathmanaa eva ayam jyothishaa aasthe palyayathe karma kuruthe vipalyethi*" - "for every individual, *aathmaa* alone is the ultimate and non-material light, which is required for all the transactions".

Even to handle the material lights, one requires the non-material light of Consciousness. Obviously, even an elegant, life-like statue, sculpted with open eyes and also holding a light in the hand, cannot do anything, including 'handling' the light, because the statue is inert; whereas, a live person is able to handle and use all the material lights, because of the non-material light of Consciousness in him. Therefore the statement , "*aathmanaa eva ayam jyothishaa aasthe palyayathe karma kuruthe vipalyethi*" – "because of the grace of the non-material light, *aathmaa*, alone all transactions are possible". Sureswaraachaarya does not give the full sentence here. The sentence will have to be completed as "Because of the grace of the non-material light *aathmaa* alone, the individual does all the transactions".

In which avasthaa? Ans: In all three avasthaas - jaagrath, svapnaa and sushupthi.

In *sushupthi avasthaa*, there is minimum transaction, viz. 'experiencing *ajnaanam* and *aanandhaa*.' '*Ajnaana aananda anubhava*' transaction is going on in *sushupthi*, with the help

of the dormant mind, called *kaarana sareeram*. With the help of the dormant mind, 'I' do the minimum transaction of '*ajnaana aananda anubhavaa*'.

What is the proof for this minimum transaction? Ans: After waking up, 'I' am able to say: "I slept well; and, I was thoroughly happy".

The essence is, that, *all* transactions in *all* the *avasthaas* are possible only because of the non-material *aathmaa*.

Having heard such a statement, what did *Janakaa* do?

- कोयं"आत्मा इति "उदीरिते - (*Janakaa*) asked a question 'Who is that Self?'

Janakaa asked: "What is that non-material light of Consciousness / *saakshh?*"

This question bears comparison to the opening questions in the *Kenopanishad*, "Kena ishitham pathathi preshitham mana: kena praana: prathama: praithi yuktha: kena ishithaam vaacham imaam vadhanthi chakshu: srothram ka vu devo yunakthi" - "Willed by whom, does the mind fall on objects, as though it is forced? Directed by whom, does the main Praana function? Willed by whom, do the people speak these words? Which divine principle, indeed, directs the eyes and ears?", the questions essentially meaning "What is the non material light because of which the material sense organs are functioning and the material mind is functioning?"

The *Kenopanishad guru* commences his answer to these questions as: "*srothrasya srothram manaso mana: yadh vaacho ha vaacham sa vu praanasya praana: chakshusha: chakshu:*" (I.2) – "That principle is indeed the Ear of the ear, the Mind of the mind, the Speech of the speech, the *Praana* of the *praana* and the Eye of the eye" and ultimately reveals that 'light' as "*Yadh vaachaa anabhyudhitham yena vaak abhyudhyathe thadeva brahma thvam viddh!*"(I.5) – "May you understand that *Brahman* is that very Consciousness, which is not revealed by speech, but, by which Consciousness, the speech is revealed".

Reverting to the text, when *Janakaa* asked the question "*Ka: ayam aathmaa?*"- "Who is that Self?", what did *Yaagnyavalkyaa* do ?

मुनि :आत्मानं अभ्यधात् - The sage revealed the *aathmaa*,

Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* reveals the *aathmaa* as the 'observer' of the 'active mind' in *svapnaa* or the 'observer' of the 'dormant mind' / silence in *sushupthi*. Observer of the mind in *svapnaa* is *aathmaa* ; and, observer of the dormant mind in *sushupthi* is also *aathmaa*. But,

in *sushupthi*, the fact "I am the observer" is not very clear. In *svapnaa*, the fact "I am the observer", is clear, because I go through varieties of *svapnaa*. 'Abhyadhaath' means 'taught'.

What is that *aathmaa*?

- बुद्धेः परं - which is distinct from the mind, (as 'observer' of the mind)

The general principle is: "The 'observer' of an 'object' is different from the 'object'. *Ghata dhrashtaa ghataath bhinna: | Vruksha dhrashtaa vrukshaath bhinna: |* 'I am the 'observer' of the tree; therefore, 'I' am different from the tree. 'I' am the 'observer' of the mind; therefore, 'I' am different from the mind. Hence the description '*buddhe: param'*; and, therefore,

- स्वतः मुक्तं - and eternally free.

If someone hesitates to say "I am free", why the hesitation? Because, he considers himself obsessed with worries. Mind, of course, is subject to varieties of worries. But once the individual realizes that he is **not** the mind, he can dump all the worries on the mind and boldly claim "I am *muktha:*", not because worries are absent, but because he knows that worries belong to the objective world, in which objective world, mind is also an entity and 'I', the 'observer' of the worried mind am ever free.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa declares in his Nirvaana Shatkam: "Na me dvesha ragau na me lobha mohau madho naiva me naiva maathsaryabhaava: | Na dharmo na chaartho na kamo na moksha: chidhaanandha roopa: sivoham sivoham" - " 'I' am free from hatred, free from desires , free from greed, free from delusion, free from arrogance and free from jealousy: nor am 'I' obsessed with the four purushaarthaas – dharmaa, arthaa, kaamaa and mokshaa. 'I' am of the nature of pure knowledge and bliss".

People bemoan "I have got *kaama krodhaa* problems. How can I claim I am *muktha:?*" *Yaagnyavalkyaa* argues: "Where do **you** have *kama kridha* or any of the other problems? All of them belong only to the mind. Why can you not move to the binary format, with the conviction "I am *muktha:?*" "

This line of thinking does not mean that one can allow one's mind to be impure. Even though 'I' am different from the mind, I cannot keep my mind dirty; I **should** cleanse my mind; but, I should also remember that 'my' liberation is not connected with the conditions of my mind. I should try to keep my mind clean always; but, whatever be the status of my

mind, I will claim "*nithya muktha: aathmaa asmi aham*"| This is what *Yaagnyavalkyaa* taught *Janakaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "Why do you not also join *Janakaa* and claim "'I' am *muktha:?*" "

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 43:

यस्माच्च आत्मा अत्र अहं व्याजेन प्रत्यङ् मात्रो जिग्राहयिषितस्तस्मादहंवृत्तिः स्वरूपस्य विलयेनैव वाक्यार्थावगमाय कारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यते इतीममर्थमाह ।

The inner Self is to be grasped through the ego-consciousness. Therefore, the ego sheds its own being and leads to the apprehension of the import of the proposition:

When a student comes to *mahaa vaakya vicharaa* and when the teacher says '*thath thvam asi*', at the time of listening, the student has to use the *ahamkaaraa*. This is because, for *sravanam*, the student has to experience the external world; as a mere *saakshi*, he only 'objectifies' the mind and does not know the external world, as in dream. If the student has to experience the external world, what should he do? Not only should he illumine the mind as *saakshi*; thereafter, using the mind, he has to listen to the *vaakyam thath thvam asi*. This is similar to wiping the spectacles as an 'observer' or '*saakshi*' and then putting the spectacles on, to become *pramaathaa*.

When the student hears the word '*thvam*' (in '*thath thvam asi*'), he should first convert it into '*aham*'; in the first stage, when he says '*aham*', he is *premaathaa*, because *pramaathaa* is listening to the teaching.

But, when the student comes to the whole *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., '*aham brahma asmi*', what should he do? He should drop the mind which was used for listening / *sravanam*.

An example can be given. A rocket propelled into space is fitted with three or more fuel tanks; and, in stages drops the tanks, one by one. Ultimately, only a small portion of the rocket that is fired into space, goes round in space. The fuel tanks correspond to the three *sareeram-s*.

In the same manner, the student uses the 'mind fuel tank', for listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*. When he receives the *vaakyam*, at that time, he is *pramaathaa*. Thereafter, what does the student do? He drops the mind i.e. he dissociates from the mind.

When he associates with the mind, he is '*pramaathaa*'; when he dissociates from the mind he is '*saakshi*', different from the mind and 'observer' of the mind. That *saakshi* alone is equated with *Brahman* in '*aham Brahma asmi*'. Associated with the mind, one cannot claim

'aham Brahma asmi'. This deliberate 'dissociating' from the mind is called *bhaaga thyaaga lakshanam*.

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa also says: "Use the *ahamkaaraa* first ; later, drop the *ahamkaaraa* and remain as *saakshi*, while claiming *'aham Brahma asmi'*.

- अहं व्याजेन - By using *ahamkaaraa* as an instrument / through the instrument called mind,

Mind and *ahamkaaraa* are synonymous. Mind with *chidhaabhaasaa* is called *ahamkaaraa*.

- प्रत्यङ् मात्र :आत्मा - the *saakshi aathmaa*, which is the internal Self,
- जिग्राह इषितः - is desired to be taught by the *aachaaryaa*.

What does the statement mean? The teacher wants the student to use the mind, at the time of *sravanam*, because, if the mind is not used, the student cannot hear the *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, use the mind to hear the *mahaa vaakyam*. Thereafter, when you say *aham*, the identification with the mind / inclusion of the mind has to be dropped. The word '*maathra'* denotes this 'exclusion of the mind'. Only *aathmaa* is to be retained; not the *ahamkaaraa*.

'Jigraaha ishitha:' means 'desired to be taught'. The word '*Jigraaha'* is also a peculiar usage, with the root as '*grah*', arrived at, in four stages of grammar.

Therefore, what should be done? *Ahamkaaraa* has to be dissolved at the time of claiming '*aham Brahma asmi'*. Dissolution / falsification / 'neighbourisation' of *ahamkaaraa* is compulsory for *mahaa vaakyam* to work. Unfortunately, quite a few *Vedhaanthic* students do not '*neighbourise'* *ahamkaaraa*; therefore, to them, *Vedhaantha* appears to be irrelevant.

151. Chapter III, Verse 43 to 44 (27-08-2009)

One of the questions often asked by the *Vedhaanthic* student is "Who exactly claims '*aham Brahma asmi*'?"; whether it is the *saakshi* that claims '*aham Brahma asmi*' or whether it is the *ahamkaaraa* that claims '*aham Brahma asmi*', '*saakshi*' meaning the Original Consciousness or *bhimbha chaithanyam* and '*ahamkaaraa*' meaning the mind, associated with *prathibhimbitha chaithanyam*.

If you give a firm and specific reply either way, you will be in trouble, because neither *saakshi* nor *ahamkaaraa* can claim '*aham brahma asmi*'. In fact, *saakshi* cannot do *any vyavahaaraa* without *ahamkaaraa*. That is why, in 'deep sleep' state, when the *ahamkaaraa* is resolved, we are not able to do *any vyavahaaraa*, let alone study *Vedhaantha* or claim '*aham Brahma asmi*'.

What about *ahamkaaraa*? *Ahamkaaraa* also cannot claim '*aham Brahma asmi*', because of the simple reason that, *ahamkaaraa* is **not** *Brahman*; *ahamkaaraa* being a finite, changing entity, it can never claim "I am the infinite *Brahman*". Therefore, *ahamkaaraa* also cannot make this claim and *saakshi* also cannot.

Then, who claims '*aham Brahma asmi*'?

Vedhaantha's answer is: "All *vyavahaaraa*-s are done neither by the pure *ahamkaaraa* nor by the pure *saakshi*; all *vyavahaaraas* are done only by the mixture of *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*. Since all *vyavahaaraas* go on through the mixture, the *saasthric* study is also done by the *saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture only and '*aham Brahma asmi*' is also claimed by the mixture only".

This question "Is it the *saakshi*, that claims '*aham Brahma asmi*' or is it the *ahamkaaraa* that claims '*aham Brahma asmi*'?" is akin to the question "Is it electricity that illumines the room or is it the bulb that illumines the room?" The answer to this (second) question is obvious: "The electricity cannot illumine, if the bulb is not there; and the bulb also cannot illumine, if electrical power is not there. It is the combination of electricity and bulb that illumines or reveals".

In the same manner, *ahamkaaraa* cannot do any transaction without *saakshi*, because the very consciousness of *ahamkaaraa* is borrowed from *saakshi*. Therefore, *kevala ahamkaaraa* cannot do any *vyavahaaraa*. *Kevala saakshi* also cannot do any *vyavahaaraa*, in the absence of the medium, the mind. Mind and thought *are* required for *vyavahaaraa*. So, the *Vedhaanthic* student should clearly know, that all *vyavahaaraas* are done by the *saakshi-*

ahamkaaraa mixture only. This is clearly stated by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* also, in his *Adhyaasya Bhaashyam*, with which he starts his *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam*, that, all transactions are because of this *saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture only.

If you want to know the independent nature of *saakshi* and the independent nature of *ahamkaaraa*, you have a tough job, because, the two cannot be physically separated. *Saakshi* cannot be physically separated and shown; nor can *ahamkaaraa* be physically separated. The 'separation' requires ingenious methods of enquiry. We require *sruthi pramaanam*; we require *yukthi pramaanam*; and we require *anubhava pramaanam* also.

Using the combination of the three, *sruthi*, *yukthi* and *anubhavaa*, we have to **intellectually** separate the *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*.

But, it should be remembered, that, all transactions are always done by this mixture only.

The *avasthaathraya vivekaa* is done, because, we find, that, during *sushupthi avasthaa*, *saakshi* is dominant, and *ahamkaaraa* is dormant, even though I am still a mixture of *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is **not** absent in *sushupthi*; it is only dormant. I am still a mixture only; but, in that mixture, during *sushupthi*, *saakshi* is dominant and *ahamkaaraa* is dormant.

So, to understand or know the *saakshi* component of 'me', I should go to *sushupthi anubhavaa*. 'Going' to *sushupthi anubhavaa* means 'recollection' and 'study' of my *sushupthi anubhavaa*. In *sushupthi*, I find, that, I do not have time limitation; that, I do not have space limitation; that, I do not have *any* limitation.

I do not have any sorrow also in *sushupthi*; not only that; I have all *aananda* in *sushupthi*. What is the proof? Ans: I love to go to *sushupthi*, which fact indicates, that, in *sushupthi*, limitations are absent, sorrow is absent and *aanandhaa* is present. And, since, in *sushupthi*, *saakshi* is dominant, the study of *sushupthi anubhavaa* would show the *saakshi* as *sath-chith-aananda-svaroopaa*: |

Similarly, when I want to know the nature of *ahamkaaraa*, I should 'go' to *jaagarath avasthaa*, i.e. I should recollect and study *jaagarath anubhavaa*. In *jaagrath avasthaa* also I am a mixture of *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*. The mixture is in all the three *avasthaas*. But, during *jaagrath avasthaa*, the 'mind plus *chidhabhaasaad*' or the *ahamkaaraa* is dominant. Space-wise limitations, time-wise limitations, attribute-wise limitations, problems etc. are dominant. Therefore, what is *ahamkaaraa*? Ans: Full of problems. In contrast, what is *saakshi*? Ans: *Nithya muktha*: |

Thus, using the *sruthi*, *yukthi* and *anubhava pramaanam*-s, I separate the higher I and the lower I intellectually. There is **no** state in which *saakshi* alone is present. Many people wrongly think that, in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, I am pure *saakshi* without *ahamkaaraa*. But, it should be realized and remembered that if *ahamkaaraa* is destroyed in my *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, as they wrongly believe, I will never come out of that *samaadhi*. The very fact that people come out from the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, indicates that in the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* also, *ahamkaaraa* is there. Therefore, it should be very clear to the student of *Vedhaanthee* that the 'mixture' is *always* involved.

And, during the *mahaa vaakya sravanam* also, the mixture is involved. Therefore, when I am listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, who am I? Ans: I **am** the *saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture.

But, instead of saying "I am the *saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture", I marginally change the language and say "I am the *saakshi*, operating through the *ahamkaaraa*".

During *Vedhaanthee*, *Saakshi* component is given prominence and therefore, to the question "who am I?", I reply "I am the *saakshi*, but functioning through *ahamkaaraa*, to listen to the *mahaa vaakyam*".

Sureswaraacharya says that the aspirant repeats the *mahaa vaakyam* with the help of *ahamkaaraa* and through the *ahamkaaraa*, he learns to claim the *saakshi* component **alone** as *Brahman*. I use the *ahamkaaraa*; but, later, I should discount the *ahamkaaraa*; I should not include the *ahamkaaraa* part in 'me', when I claim '*aham Brahma asmi*'. This 'discounting' is called *bhaaga thyaagha lakshanam*.

What do I do thereafter? I should remember the *Brahman* description in that part of *Vedhaanthee*, where "*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa*" has been talked about; everything other than *Brahman* is *mithyaa*. Therefore, having claimed the *saakshi* part alone as *Brahman*, *ahamkaaraa* is to be understood as *mithyaa* instrument to claim the *sathya saakshi*. Sureswaraacharya calls this process as '*ahamkaaraa laya*.', in this *sambhandha gadhyam*, using the expression '*vilayena eva*'. But, the 'falsification' should be done only after coming to *saakshi* – not in the beginning of the *Vedhaanthee* study itself. The example given in an earlier context may be recollected: "After drinking coffee from a paper cup, the cup is crushed and trashed".

Reverting to the text:

- तस्मात् - Therefore,

- अहंवृत्ति :स्वरूपस्य विलयेन एव - by 'falsification' of the *ahamkaaraa* component, '*vilayam*' literally means 'dissolution'. Here, 'dissolution' means 'falsification'.
- वाक्यार्थ अवगमाय - leading to understanding the *saakshi* component as *Brahman*,
- कारणत्वं प्रतिपद्यते - *ahamkaaraa* becomes an instrument.

And, even after claiming '*aham Brahma asmi*', I will be using *ahamkaaraa* for transactions; but, with the awareness that the *ahamkaaraa* is a *mithyaa* costume. Therefore, who am 'I'?
Ans: 'I' am *Saakshi* only. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says '*kaaranathvam prathipadhyathe*', meaning that *ahamkaaraa* becomes only a means.

इति इमं अर्थ आह - This idea is clarified in the following *sloka*.

Chapter III: Verse 43 –

अहंवृत्त्यैव तदब्रम यस्मादेषोऽवगच्छति ।

तत्स्वरूपलयेनातः कारणं स्यादहंकृतिः ॥ ४३ ॥

As one understands that *Brahman* through the ego-awareness, the ego becomes instrumental in this matter by self-elimination.

Esha: - The student

'*Esha:*' refers to the student, who is the *saakshi* using the *ahamkaaraa* component as a medium for contacting the external world.

The example of the 'spectacles' may be recollected. When I am merely looking at my spectacles, it is an **object**; when I am wearing the spectacles to perceive the external world, it is an **instrument**. In a similar manner, I use the '*ahamkaaraa* spectacles' as an instrument to listen to the *mahaa vaakyam* coming from the teacher. Therefore, '*esha:*' means '*saakshi* with *ahamkaaraa* instrument'.

अहं वृत्त्या एव - through the *ahamkaaraa* spectacles / instrument,

Obviously, Sureswaraachaaryaa does not say 'spectacles' or use it as an example. But, the example is useful to make the understanding easier.

How do you prove that the *ahamkaaraa* is a temporary spectacles / instrument? Ans: In *sushupthi*, I remove the *ahamkaaraa* and exist as pure *saakshi*. That is the *pramaanam* that

ahamkaaraa is 'usable and removeable'. In *Jaagrath avasthaa*, through the *ahamkaaraa* spectacles :

तद् ब्रह्म अवगच्छति - clearly grasps that Brahman,

'*Thadh*' and '*Brahma*' are two separate words.

This *Brahman*, which is '*sath*', the 'pure Existence', is introduced as the *jagath kaaranam* in *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, where, the teaching starts with 'Pure Existence'; and later, that Existence is equated with 'I', the *saakshi* Consciousness. It is 'Consciousness-Existence-equation' that is done.

And, after claiming "'I' am the 'Consciousness – *saakshi*', which is identical with 'Existence – *Brahma*'", what happens to the mind / *ahamkaaraa*?

तत्स्वरूपलयेन - by self-elimination i.e. by falsification of '*ahamkaaraa*'.

After coming to *sath-chith-Brahman*, the mind is falsified. Mind does not have a consciousness of its own nor does mind not have an existence of its own. 'I' lend both of them (Consciousness and Existence) to the mind. When I wake up to the *saakshi*, mind resolves (falsifies). '*Thadh svarooapa layena*', means '*ahamkaara svarooapa layena*'.

The anvayam of this part of the verse will read: "Aham vrutthya thadh svarooapa layena esha: (saakshi vidhyaarthe) thadh Brahma avagachchathi" |

- अतः : - Therefore,
- अहंकृति कारणं :स्यात् - *ahamkaaraa* becomes a temporary means (to claim the *saakshi* Brahman).

'*Kaaranam*' means 'the temporary means'.

This alone is otherwise called '*adhyaropa apavaadha nyaayaa*', which has been explained by the example of the 'pot and the clay', in earlier contexts and is repeated below.

The example is explained as follows: As a first step, the *guru* introduces: "There is a pot, which is a *kaaryam* or a product". The student recognizes the existence of the pot as '*kaaryam*'. Then, what is its *kaaranam*? The *guru* points out: "The pot is born out of clay", i.e., he introduces clay as '*kaaranam*' for the pot. The student's attention shifts from the

kaaryam pot to the *kaaranam* clay. Once the student's attention has thus shifted to the clay, the *guru* asks the student: "Does the pot exist separate from clay?" On careful analysis, the student arrives at the conclusion that there is no such thing as pot, other than clay. The student may still be holding / handling the pot, but, he understands that there is no pot other than clay. This 'understanding' is called 'falsification' of the pot. But, initially, the very same pot is useful to understand the clay. Thus, through the pot, the clay is understood; and after understanding the clay, the pot is 'falsified'.

'Falsification of pot' does not mean 'physical removal of the pot'; but, understanding that there is no pot other than clay, even while using the pot.

'*Ahamkaara*' is similar to the pot in the example and *saakshi* is similar to the clay. "Use the *ahamkaara* pot; come to the *saakshi* clay; thereafter, falsify the *ahamkaara* pot, even when you are using the *ahamkaara* pot" is the route map.

The *jnaani* understands that there is no *ahamkaara* other than *saakshi*; nevertheless, he uses the 'falsified' *ahamkaara* after attaining *jnaanam* also, for *loka sangraha karmaani*. Therefore, *ahamkaara* **is** useful.

A question may arise: "If *ahamkaara* is false, how can it be useful?" *Vedhaantha* points out that, ironically, only false things are useful. Gold is never, never useful as ornament directly i.e. as a bar or nugget of gold. It is useful only when it is shaped into an ornament i.e. its utility arrives because of *naama* and *roopa*. Similarly, pure wood is not useful; it has to be shaped into 'furniture'; pure clay is not useful; it has to be shaped into a 'pot' to be useful. This shows that only '*naama-roopaa-s'* are useful for *vyavahaara*. But, neither *naama* nor *roopaa* has 'existence-s' of their own; i.e. they are 'false' or '*mithyaa*' by nature. So, we arrive at the inevitable conclusion that only 'false' things are useful. Therefore, the question "If *ahamkaara* is false, how is it useful?" is answered by *Vedhaantha*, as "Because *ahamkaara* is false, it is useful".

Similarly, pure *Brahman* also is utterly useless. "Therefore," *Vedhaantha* advises "Be *Brahman*, use the false *naamaas* and *roopaaas* and do all the transactions".

"Therefore" (in a lighter vein) "I' am useless Reality; but, 'I' use the *mithyaa ahamkaara*, for the entertainment called life".

Chaandhoghya Upanishad (VI.1.4) declares: "Yathaa ekena mruthpindena sarvam mrunmayam vinyaatham syaath vaachaarambhanam vikaaro naamadheyam mritthikaa ithyeva sathyam" – "As by knowing a lump of clay, all things made of clay become known, all transformations have speech as their basis and they are names only. Earth, as such, is

the reality" implying "If one 'knows' Brahman, one 'knows' the entire creation, since the world is only a form of Brahman. It is the Cause, Brahman, which alone has Reality. Everything else is only name and form".

Brahadhaaranayaka Upanishad (I.vi.1) also declares: "*Thrayam vaa idham naama roopam karma*" – "This universe indeed consists of three things, name, form and action". World is nothing but *mithyaa* names, *mithyaa* forms and *mithyaa* functions. The only Reality is *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* is used to understand that *saakshi*.

If, then, a question is raised "If *Brahman* is useless and the world alone is useful, why do we not 'ignore' or 'abolish' *Brahman*?", this question will be similar (in absurdity) to the question "If gold is useless and its *naama-roopaa-s* are useful, why do we not remove the gold?". Obviously, ornaments cannot exist without the material of which they are made. Similarly, *naamaas* and *roopaa-s* cannot have existence without *Brahman*. In a movie theatre, the screen does not participate in the movie as a character; but without the screen, no character can be there in the movie.

The above analysis shows that we require the *saakshi* also and we require the *ahamkaaraa* also, for all *vyavahaaraas*. But, it should be remembered that *ahamkaaraa* is *mithyaa*. *Vedhaanthee* does not want the aspirant to destroy *ahamkaaraa*; it advises him "Use the *ahamkaaraa* ; but understand that it is *mithyaa*". That is called *svaroopa pravilaapanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 44:

अत एव च यः प्रतिजातोऽर्थो "नाहं ग्राहो न तद्वीने" इत्यादिः स युक्तिभिरुपपादित इति कृत्वोपसंहियते।

Therefore, what was declared in the beginning (II.5) stands vindicated through reason and as such, the argument concludes.

अतः एव - Therefore only,

What does the *Aachaaryaa* mean by '*atha*'?

Explanation: It was already seen, that, at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, the student should use *ahamkaaraa*; using *ahamkaaraa*, he should climb up to the *saakshi*; and, after coming to the *saakshi*, he should 'neighbourise' *ahamkaaraa*; he should not say "I am the *ahamkaaraa*, with a *saakshi* component"; but, should say "I am the *saakshi*, with an incidental *ahamkaaraa* neighbour". The attitude "I am *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi* is the neighbor" is of no use, since, in that case, 'my' neighbor is wonderful, while 'I', the *ahamkaaraa* will continue to be miserable.

If, on the other hand, I do *mahaa vaakya sravanam* properly, using *ahamkaaraa* alright, thereafter, climb up to the *saakshi*, and, *thereafter*, arrive at the firm conviction " 'I' am the *saakshi*; *ahamkaaraa* is my neighbor; not only neighbor but a falsified neighbor also", there will be no contradiction in claiming "*sacchidhaanandha: Brahma aham asmi*". This 'neighbourisation' of *ahamkaaraa* is what is referred to, by Sureswaraachaaryaa, by the term '*svaroopasya vilayena*', in the previous *sambhandha gadhyam* (of verse 43).

But, if the student continues as *ahamkaaraa*, because his mind is preoccupied with his family and other circumstances, and considers *saakshi* as the neighbor, the *sruthi mahaa vaakyam* '*aham Brahma asmi*' will not fit . If *ahamkaaraa* is 'neighbourised', "*aham saakshi Brahma asmi*" is not a contradiction. This is what is being referred to, by Sureswaraachaaryaa by the terse term '*atha: eva*' |

In short, by the term '*atha: eva*' he means "because *ahamkaaraa* is neighbor and I am the *saakshi* / because *ahamkaaraa* is costume and I am the wearer".

प्रतिज्ञात अर्थ : - the proposition that was made in the beginning,

Where was the proposition made?

नाहंग्राह्ये"न तद्वीने "इत्यादि : - in sloka 5 of the *dvitheeya adhyaaya*: , starting with '*Na aham graahye na thadveene*',

What was the proposition given in that *sloka*? Ans: "There is no contradiction (*pramaana virodha*;) at all, in the *Sruthi* statement '*aham Brahma asmi*', when I make the claim '*aham Brahma asmi*'".

स :युक्तिभिः उपपादितः - that proposition has been clearly established.

How has it been established? Ans: "If you view the '*aham*' of the *mahaa vaakyam* as the *ahamkaaraa* component of the *saakshi-ahamkaaraa* mixture, the *vaakyam* is a contradiction. But, if you view '*aham*' as the *saakshi* component of the mixture, there is no contradiction. In other words, if you take the *vaachyaartha* of the word *aham*, there is contradiction. If you take the *lakshyaartha*, there is no contradiction."

Bhaaga thyaagha lakshanaa has to be done, if *mahaa vaakyam* is to be understood in the proper sense.

Unfortunately, most *Vedhaanthic* students, even if they thoroughly learn the theoretical meanings of *jahathi lakshanaa*, *ajahathi lakshanaa*, *bhaaga thyaaga lakshanaa* etc., when

they think about themselves / when they do a self-assessment, they tend to continue in the *ahamkaaraa* component and conclude "Life is terrible and I am miserable". This conclusion is the result of *ahamkaaraa* dominating the mind, whereas, *Vedhaantha* says "'You' are wonderful", meaning *saakshi* by the word 'you'. Thus, there is a communication gap.

As already pointed out in an earlier session, suppose a student says "I am not interested in *saakshi*; I am interested in *ahamkaaraa*; I am interested in improvements to *ahamkaaraa*", *Vedhaantha* will tell him "In that case, you have come to the wrong place; you should go to the *karma kaanadaa* of the *Vedaas*; you can go to temples for special prayers and vows; and, also do *parihaaraa*-s as prescribed by the *Karma Kanda*. But, be warned, that all *parihaaraa*-s will be only temporary. Therefore, it is up to you, to decide whether you want 'temporary' *ahamkaaraa* improvements or the permanent solution to *samsaaraa*, viz., the 'saakshi claim with *ahamkaaraa* falsification'".

इति कृत्वा उपसंह्रियते - That topic (the need to attribute 'thvam' and 'aham' in the *mahaa vaakyaa*-s with their *laksyaartha*-s and not *vachyaartha*-s) is being concluded now.

Chapter III: Verse 44 –

गृहीताहंपदार्थस्चेत्कस्मात्जो न प्रपद्यते ।

प्रत्यक्षादिविरोधाच्चेत्प्रतीच्युक्तिर्न युष्मदि ॥ ४४ ॥

If a person has understood the import of 'I' in the proposition "'I' am *Brahman*", why does he not understand the meaning of the whole proposition? If it be said that the proposition goes against the evidence of perception etc., it is untenable. The proposition concerns the inmost and self-luminous Self and not the external world.

Sureswaraacharya asks the question: "What is the problem in grasping the *mahaa vaakyams*, as even as the teacher is revealing them? I do not see any problem at all. The communication must be the smoothest thing. The teacher tells the student '*thath thvam asi*' and in response, the student must say '*aham Brahma asmi*'. And, this communication must be over in a few minutes. I do not know why it should take long years. I am confused as to why there is 'confusion' in this understanding".

अहं पदार्थः गृहीतः चेत् - If the meaning of the word '*aham*', (at the time of the statement '*aham Brahma asmi*') is grasped,

What is *aham padhaartha*? Ans: It is the '*sathyam saakshi*' component. And, what about *ahamkaaraa*? Ans: I am using *ahamkaaraa* for the *Vedhaanthic* study; but, *ahamkaaraa* is

mithyaa superficial component of me; it is the *mithyaa vesham* that 'I' have put on, for the drama called life.

The 5th capsule of *Vedhaanthalaa* (in *Swamiji's* 'five capsules of *Vedhaanthalaa*'), viz. 'By forgetting my real nature, I convert life into a struggle and by remembering my real nature, I convert life into a blessing' is relevant here.

The aspirant should remember that 'I' am '*sathyam saakshI*', and that 'I' only use '*mithyaa ahamkaaraa*' component for all *vyavahaaraa-s*, including study of *Vedhaanthalaa*.

'*Gruheetha: chethI*' (in the verse) means 'if grasped'. If the true meaning of '*aham*' had been grasped:

- कस्मात् अ न प्रपद्यते - why does the student / the listener / the *pramaathaa* not understand (that 'I' am wonderful *Brahman*) ?

'*jnaya:*' refers to the student / the listener of the *mahaa vaakyamI* the *pramaathaa*.

(In a lighter vein) Why does not the student come out of the class saying "'I' am wonderful", instead of saying "The class was wonderful" or "The *Swamiji* was wonderful" or "Sureswaraachaaryaa is wonderful"?

The informed student should claim "'I' am wonderful; life is wonderful". Instead why should he say "I want to die, never to come back again. This must be my last birth"?

He should claim, as in *Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhrguvalli*: "*aham annam aham annaadha: aham slokakrith aham asmi prathamajaa: ruthasya*" - "I am the food. I am the food eater. I am the combiner. I am the eldest of the Creation". Instead, why should the student moan "I am miserable"?

A student might respond: "But, what you say is against all my experiences. I am not able to accept that I am wonderful; all my experiences are terrible experiences. When the experiences are terrible, how can I say I am wonderful? Your statement is contradictory to my experiences". Sureswaraachaarya refers to such a response (in the second line of the verse):

प्रत्यक्षादि विरोधात् चेत् - If it is said "I will never accept I am wonderful, because all my experiences gained through all *pramaanams*, starting with *prathyakshaa*, (viz.,

prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapathi and *anupalabhdhi* are terrible" / If it be said that the proposition goes against the evidence of perception etc.,

"If this is your question" Sureswaraacharya says "I will answer it. If only you think properly, you will understand that if all experiences are found terrible, it only means that *anaathmaa* is terrible. This is because every experience through every *pramaanaa* is dealing only with *anaathmaa* and there is no *pramaanaa* which objectifies the experiencer 'I'. Why do you not think on this? 'All the experiences are terrible' means 'all the objects of experience are terrible'. This may not be totally true; but even granting that this is totally true, it only means that *anaathmaa* is terrible. *Vedhaantha* is not talking about *anaathmaa*. *Vedhaantha* never said that *anaathmaa* is wonderful. *Vedhaantha* says the experiencer 'I', which is experiencing the *anaathmaa* / which is reporting that *anaathmaa*-s are terrible, is the one which is wonderful".

There are two types of *anaathmaa* - remote *anaathmaa* and proximate *anaathmaa*. Out of the *pancha anaathmaa*-s, 'remote *anaathmaa*' refers to one's profession, possessions and family. They are all remote *anaathmaa*. There is the proximate *anaathmaa* consisting of one's body and mind.

All experiences are related to these remote and proximate *anaathmaa*; they may be terrible; and, these experiences are reported by the *pancha pramaana*-s other than *sruthi* – viz., *prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapatthy* and *anupalabhdhi*.

But, *mahaa vaakyam*, on the other hand, is **not** talking about *anaathmaa*. *Mahaa vaakyam* never said *anaathmaa* is wonderful. It is talking about 'you', the *aathmaa*, who is behind the experiences / who is objectifying the *anaathmaa*.

Prathyaksha pramaanam has never seen that experiencer 'I'. Prathyakshaa has not seen the *aathmaa*; *anumaanaa* has not seen the *aathmaa*; nor have *upamaanaa, arthaapatthy* and *anupalabhdhi*.

These five *pramaana*-s - *prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapathi* and *anupalabhdhi* – are all talking about only *anaathmaa* / dealing with yushmath *prathyaya gocharaa*:| These five *pramaana*-s may report *anaathmaa* is terrible. But, *Mahaa vaakya pramaanam* is talking about *aathmaa* / is dealing with *asmath prathyaya gocharam*. *Mahaa vaakya pramaanam* says "'I", the *aathmaa* is wonderful". Where is the contradiction?

"Therefore" Sureswaraacharya says "If you see any contradiction, it is because you have mixed up and messed up the *pramaanam*-s and *prameyam*-s. You have mixed up *Anaathma pramaanam*-s and *anaathma prameyam*-s with *aathma pramaanam* and *aathma prameyam*.

Prathyakshaadhi pramaanam-s are *anaathma pramaanam-s* and all your terrible experiences are *anaathma prameyam-s*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is *aathma pramaanam* and the *aathma prameyam* is 'I', the *saakshi*'.

- उक्तिः - The mahaa vaakya statement
- प्रतीची - is talking about the experiencer 'I',
- न युष्मदि - and not about the external world.

It is the experiencer 'I', which is *sath*, which is *chith* and which is *aanandhaa*. World does not have a drop of *aanandhaa*. The seeker should meditate on this fact. *Pancha anaathmaa-s* do not have a drop of *aanandhaa* of their own. Even mind does not have or produce *aanandhaa*, leave alone the other *anaathmaa* - profession / possession/ family or body.

What happens is, when there is *punyaa*, favourable conditions are created and the mind is able to produce three types of *vrutthi* - *priya*, *modha* and *pramodhaa*; either *priyaa* thought or *modhaa* thought or *pramodhaa* thought.

At best, the mind generates *priya*, *modha* and *pramodhaa* ; and, at that time, 'I', who am the embodiment of *anandhaa* (of which truth there can be no doubt) temporarily get reflected in *priya*, *modha* and *pramodhaa*. Then there is experiential, temporary *aanandhaa*. When the *vrutthi* goes away, the experiential *aanandhaa* also will go away, because the reflecting medium is gone. Thereafter, who is there? 'I', the *aanandha aathmaa* am there.

Thaithreeya Upanishad (Brahmaanadha vaalli) describes *aathmaa* as "*aanandha aathmaa*". Therefore, the seeker should regularly claim this fact, viz., "'I' am *aanandha svaroopaa*:", even more often than "'I' am *sath*" or "'I' am *chith*".

But, when can I experience it? Ans: As already said, whenever *priya vrutthi*, *modha vrutthi* and *pramodha vrutthi* comes. (Of course, one can 'generate' that *vrutthi*, by remembering some wonderful past experience).

Another interesting fact: "When your hand is healthy and functioning, even though the *aanandhaa svaroopaa* is there, you do not experience or enjoy it; but, if, because of an accident or some other temporary disorder, the hand is not functional for a few days and thereafter the hand becomes functional again, you are so happy that you are able to make use of the hand again and 'enjoy' the use of the hand. To enjoy the hand, you required to lose it for some time and get it back. Similarly, *aanandhaa* is always 'mine' only; but, now and then, when it manifests, I understand and enjoy it".

Thus, *priya*, *modha* and *paramodha vrutthi*-s are only manifestations of 'my' *aanandhaa*. But, *aanandhaa* is 'my' nature all the time. The seeker should keep claiming this through *mahaa vaakyam* and whenever there is a sense of contradiction, he should say: "All terrible experiences belong to *anaathmaa* only; but, I **am** *aanadha svarooopa*:". There is absolutely no contradiction in this; not the *ahamkaaraa*.

152. Chapter III, Verse 44 and 45 (05-09-2009)

Sureswaraacharya points out that *mahaa vaakyam* itself will be directly able to give 'aham Brahma asmi' jnaanam, even at the time of the very *sraavanam* itself, if only the student co-operates with the guru and *saasthraas*, keeping aside all pre-conceived notions. On the other hand, if proper co-operation is not there on the part of the student, there will be communication gaps and *mahaa vaakyam* will not be able to do what it has to do.

Mahaa vaakyam says "'I' am wonderful"; but, we are not able to accept or claim this. We have views against the *mahaa vaakyam*. Our argument is "When all my experiences are terrible, how can I believe that 'I' am wonderful? All the *pramaanams* reveal to me only terrible experiences and the *sruthi pramaanam* says 'I' am wonderful. Therefore, *sruthi's* teaching is *sarvapramaana virodha*: | And, when a *sarva pramaana virodhaa* teaching is given, I will not be able to accept it, though I may have respect for *sruthi*."

Dayananda Swamiji often gives an example for this: "Suppose I take a small bunch of flowers in my hand and tell you 'I have got a huge elephant on the palm of my hand ; may all of you look at this elephant for one minute'. Every student will screw his ears and wonder 'what is *Swamiji* saying?' I repeat my statement a second time. Then, out of respect for me and giving me the benefit of doubt, you will ask your neighbor 'My ears seem a little bit hard of hearing. What did the *Swamiji* say?'. The neighbor will confirm: '*Swamiji* says 'look at the huge elephant on my palm'. And, even if all the students have got *sraddhaa* and *bhakthi* for the *Aacharya*, they may continue to do *namaskaaraa* to the teacher, they will not be able to accept this statement, because the statement is contradictory to their *prathyaksha anubhavaa*, which tells them 'there is no elephant here; it is only a small bunch of flowers that *Swamiji* is holding in his palm'."

The essence is that "intellect cannot accept *pramaana viruddha* ideas". This is what happens at the time of listening to *mahaa vaakyam* also. Sureswaraacharya understands this confusion of the student and hastens to assure "There can never be a contradiction between *sruthi pramaanam* / *mahaa vaakya sabdha pramaanam* and other *pramaanam-s*, like *prathyaksha*, *anumaanaa* etc. and there is no contradiction also."

He explains why: "All our experiences are results of *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Mental experiences such as emotions will come under *saakshi prathyaksha pramaanam*. External world comes under *indriya prathyaksham*. All our experiences, external or mental, are, therefore, based on *prathyaksha pramaanam*. But, all experiences deal only with *anaathmaa*. It follows, therefore, that, *prathyaksha pramaanam* deals with *anaathmaa* only; on a similar analysis, you will find that, all *pramaanam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyam*, are

also dealing only with *anaathmaa*. On the other hand, *sruthi pramaanam* is dealing with *aathmaa*. And, it is the only *pramaanam* dealing with *aathmaa*. Thus, when the very subject matter of *sruthi pramaanam* is different from that of *prathyakshaa* and other *pramaanam-s*, how can there be any talk of contradiction between *sruthi* and other *pramaanam-s*?

“To explain this with an example: ‘eyes’ reveal the knowledge of forms and colours; ‘ears’ reveal knowledge of sound; thus, ‘eyes’ and ‘ears’ are functioning in two totally different fields. How can there be any contradiction between ‘eyes’ and ‘ears’?

“If two *pramaanam-s* function in the same field, there is a possibility of contradiction – one *pramaanam* revealing a particular knowledge and the other revealing something contradictory. But, certainly not when they function in two different fields.

“When the very subject matters of *sruthi* and the other *pramaanam-s* are different, how can there be any contradiction? *Mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with ‘*aathmaa*’; all our experiences deal with *anaathmaa*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with ‘Me’, the observer. All our experiences deal with the ‘observed’. *Mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with ‘*saakshi*’; all our experiences deal with ‘*saakshyam*’. Thus, the very fields of operation are different. Therefore, contradiction is not at all possible between *sruthi* and other *pramaanam-s*.

“This fact must be clearly understood and assimilated by a diligent seeker. Otherwise, *mahaa vaakyam* will never function, even if he listens to it for millions and millions of *janmaa-s*”.

As long as the seeker thinks that there is contradiction, he will ask “How can I claim I am free here and now, when my experiences are terrible experiences?”.

Sureswaraacharya is aware of this problem and therefore, emphasizes, in the last portion of the 44th *sloka*, “*pratheechi ukthi: na yushmadhi*”. This is a very important line.

‘*ukthi:*’, in this context, means ‘*mahaa vaakya pramaanam*’ and ‘*pratheechi*’ conveys ‘is dealing with the *prathyak aathmaa*, the *saakshi*’.

Sruthi or *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* does not say that body is wonderful. *Sruthi* will never say “body is wonderful”, because it knows that no physical body can ever be free and totally wonderful. Therefore, no *sruthi pramaanam* will or can say “body is wonderful”.

No *sruthi pramaanam* will also ever say “mind is wonderful”, because mind also is *anaathmaa*, subject to the influence of millions of forces, including biochemical conditions. Mind is also subject to *desaa*, *kaalaa* and the laws of *karmaa*.

Even *Isvara*'s mind can never be relaxed all the time. When *Isvara* sees people suffering because of their past *karmaas* and therefore, screaming in anguish, His mind also will be disturbed by emotion, even if that emotion is called 'compassion'. No mind, including *Bhagavaan*'s, can be perfectly wonderful or free. And, therefore, no *sruthi vaakyam* will say "mind is wonderful".

Everyone's mind is subject to the fluctuations of *sattva*, *rajas* and *thamas* constantly. As for one's physical body, generally, in the first thirty or forty years of one's life, the physical body is fantastic. But, as one ages, the physical body decays gradually and, very often, at an advanced age, it is experienced as 'terrible'

If *sruthi* says "body is ever wonderful", it is 'contradiction'. If *sruthi* says "mind is ever wonderful", it is 'contradiction'. If *sruthi* says that any part of *anaathmaa* is ever wonderful, it is 'contradiction'. *Anaathmaa* is always a mixture of good and bad. If one part of *anaathmaa* is good, another part of *anaathmaa* may be bad. And, also, the very same *anaathmaa*, may be good at times and found to be bad at other times.

Sruthi, through the *mahaa vaakyam*, does not say "*anaathmaa* is wonderful". Then what does it say? When it says '*thvam*', by that word, it means "*pancha kosa vilakshana saakshi aathmaa*". This is what Sureswaraachaarya is emphasizing.

'Ukthi:' literally means 'statement' and refers to the *mahaa vaakyam* here. 'Pratheechi' means 'saakshi chaithanye'. Grammatically 'Pratheechi' is "chakaaraantha: pullinga prathyak sabdha: saphthami eka vachanam". In essence, "Ukthi: pratheechi" means "mahaa vaakyam deals with prathyak aathmaa".

Sureswaraachaaryaa adds emphatically "*na yushmadhi*" meaning "*mahaa vaakyam* never talks about *anaathmaa*".

And, why does not *mahaa vaakyam* talk about *anaathmaa*? Ans: There are so many other *pramaanam*-s that are dealing with *anaathmaa*. Why should *sruthi* also talk about topics which other *pramaanam*-s are dealing with? If a student is learning the subject of Mathematics from one particular teacher, he need not approach another teacher also to learn Mathematics, as the move will only be redundant and thus futile. Why *sruthi* does not talk about *anaathmaa* and chooses to talk only about *aathmaa* is explained by the *Vedhaanthic guru* in a single word, "*apoorvathvaath*". In other words, "*Sruthi pramaanam* has *apoorvathvam*", which means "It talks about something which other *pramaanam*-s do not and cannot deal with".

'Yushmadh' means 'anaathmaa'. "Na yushmadhi" means "not about anaathmaa".

Mahaa vaakyam does not deal with any of the *pancha anaathmaa*, viz., possessions, profession, family, body and mind. *Sruthi* does not say that any of this *pancha anaathmaa* is 'perfect' or wonderful'. *Sruthi* will never say this. '*Anaathmaa*' will be wonderful now and then; it will be terrible now and then. 'Eternally perfect and wonderful' is only the real 'I'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 45:

पूर्वस्यैव श्लोकार्थस्य विस्पष्टार्थमाह ।

The significance of the verse above is cleared:

The content of the 4th quarter of the previous *sloka* is a very important point to be remembered at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. If the seeker is preoccupied with any of the *pancha anaathmaa*, he will not be able to say "I am wonderful". When his mind is hovering around *anaathmaa* or when he identifies himself with *anaathmaa* – either in the form of *ahamkaaraa* or in the form of *mamakaaraa*, he will, at best, say "certain things are wonderful and certain things are terrible". But even those 'wonderful' things will not give him joy, since he knows that they are subject to loss and therefore, will keep worrying as to how long they will last.

Mahaa vaakyam will not work on a mind obsessed with *anaathmaa*. Because of the importance of this aspect, Sureswaraacharya is elaborating on the 4th quarter of the 44th verse, in the ensuing verse also.

- विस्पष्टार्थ - For further clarification
- पूर्वस्य एव श्लोक अर्थस्य - of the essence of the previous *sloka*,
- आह - the following *sloka* is given .

The 'clarification' is to be especially on the 4th quarter of the previous verse.

What is the essence of the 4th quarter? Ans: *Mahaa vaakyam* deals with *aathmaa* and not with *anaathmaa*.

One's experiences deal with *anaathmaa*; and, experiences will always be a mixture of terrible and wonderful things. Nobody, including God, can change that fact about *anaathmaa*. In contrast, *mahaa vaakyam* deals with the eternally wonderful *aathmaa*. Sureswaraacharya is re-emphasizing this distinction in *sloka* 45.

Chapter III: Verse 45 -

पराञ्च्येव तु सर्वाणि प्रत्यक्षादीनि नात्मनि ।
प्रतीच्येव प्रवृत्तं तत्सदसीति वचोऽञ्जसा ॥४५॥

All evidences like perception pertain to external objects and do not concern themselves with the Self. On the contrary, scripture saying 'That ultimate Being, you are', by its very nature, relates to the Self.

This is a very beautiful verse.

प्रत्यक्षादीनि सर्वाणिप्रमाणा) नि (पराञ्च्येव - The pancha pramaanaani, starting with prathyakshaa, viz., prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, upamaanaa, arthaapatthi and anupalabdhi pertain to external objects or anaathmaa only,

In fact, this is true even about part of *sruthi* also, viz., *Veda Poorvaa*. The entire *karma kaandaa* is talking about *anaathmaa* only / about the 'improvement' of the *anaathmaa*. *Karma kaandaa* talks about different *homaas* for the 'improvement' of one's possessions or profession or family or physical body or mind. It also talks about a 'better standard of living' in *svarga lokaa* and *Brahma lokaa*. But, even in these *lokaa-s*, the *anaathmaa* is supposed to be only 'almost' perfect, but never 'entirely'. There are problems in those *lokaa-s* also. And, then, there is the major problem, of which, Krishna warns in *Bhagavadh Githa*, "*Aabrahamabhuvanaath lokaa: punar aavarthina:*" – (Verse 16 – Chapter VIII) – "All the worlds up to *Brahmalokaa*, are subject to 'returning' (the *jeevaas* to *Bhoolokaa*)". Even *Chathurmuka Brahmaji*, who enjoys the best *anaathmaa*, is 'counting down' his age. More than fifty years are supposed to have elapsed for the currently ruling *Brahmaaji*, out of his total lifetime, believed to be of one hundred years. Therefore, there is no such thing called 'perfect' *anaathmaa*.

Veda Karma kaanda pramaanam deals only with the 'imperfect' anaathmaa. Veda Upaasanaa kaanda pramaanam also deals only with the 'imperfect' anaathmaa.

Considering the futility of attempting to 'perfect' *anaathmaa*, *Gouda Paadhaachaaryaa*, in his *Maandookya Kaarika*, comments "Those people who want / strive to 'perfect' *anaathmaa* are unfortunate people (*krupanaa:*) indeed". Such people are 'unfortunate', because, they have not understood the approach / attitude that is to be practiced by an intelligent individual , viz., that "he can only 'contribute' to *anaathmaa* , but, can never 'control' *anaathmaa* ; he should enjoy 'contributing' to *anaathmaa* with his body-mind instrument, without attempting to 'control' *anaathmaa*".

Reverting to the text, the *Aachaaryaa* points out that all *pramaanaas* other than *sruthi*, are dealing with *anaathmaa* by saying "*prathyakshaadheeni sarvaani (pramaanaani) paraanchi*

eva'. Use of the word '*paraanchi*', is to convey that the *pancha pramaanaani*, starting with *prathyakshaa*, viz., *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi* and *anupalabdhi* are 'extrovert'. The word '*paraanchi*' is used as adjective or as subjective complement to '*prathyakshaadheeni pramaanaani*'. Sureswaraachaarya intentionally uses this word, to remind the student of the popular and well-known *manthraa* of the *Katopanishad*: "*Paraanchi khaani vyathrunath svayambhoo:| thasmaath paraang pasyathi na antharaathman| kaschiith dheera: prathyagaathmaanam aikshadh aavrutthachakshu: amruthathvam icchan*" (II. i.1) – "The Lord destroyed the sense organs, by making them extrovert. Therefore, everyone perceives outside, not the inner Self. Desiring immortality, a rare discriminative one turns away his eyes and sees the inner Self".

न आत्मनि - and not with *aathmaa*, which is the real 'I', which is the wonderful *sath-chithaanandhaa*.

But, what about *sruthi pramaanam* or *mahaa vaakyam*? That is said in the second line of the verse, as "'*thath sadh asi' ithi vacha: pratheecheyeva pravruttham*"|

वच : - The *mahaa vaakyam* (says)

तत् सत् असि इति - that you are that pure 'Existence' Brahman,'*Thath sath asi'* is another form of the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi'*.

This *mahaa vaakyam* does not deal with any *anaathmaa*. It does not talk of 'your body' or 'your mind'. It talks of 'you', the *aathmaa*.

प्रतीचि एव प्रवृत्तं अञ्जसा - clearly operating only in the field of 'I', the *saakshi*.

'*pravruttham*' means 'engaged in' or 'occupied with'. '*pratheechi*' means '*prathyak aathmaa*', as explained in the previous verse or in other words, 'I', the *Saakshi*, which *Saakshi* can never be objectified, at any time. It is always available only as the 'Subject'- as 'I', the Consciousness. This 'I' is what *Sruthi mahaa vaakyam* is talking about. '*anjasad*' means 'clearly' / 'by very nature'.

Therefore, what is the conclusion? Ans: There is no contradiction between my experiences and *mahaa vaakyam*. Experiences may be terrible; but, that can never challenge my knowledge that "'I' am wonderful." In fact, it is a standard principle that "a valid knowledge received from / through a valid *pramaanam*/ source of knowledge can never be challenged by the opposite 'experience'".

The following two examples are given in support of this principle:

1. We know through the study of the science of Astronomy, that all the stars are very much bigger than the earth or even the sun. That 'all the stars are very huge' is the knowledge gained through valid sources. But, in the nights, my experience / *prathyaksha anubhavaa* is contradictory; every star appears only as a 'dot', though diamond-like. I have a counter experience. But, even as I experience the 'smallness' of the star, my knowledge that the star is huge, is not challenged.
2. Similar is my experience of the 'sunrise' or 'sunset'; every day, I see the sun 'rising' in the East and 'setting' in the West. But, these experiences can never challenge my knowledge from Astronomy, viz., that it is the earth that goes round the Sun, from West to East and not the sun that moves around the earth, 'rising' and 'setting'. This knowledge is never challenged. Earth is not a stationery entity. It spins around on its own axis at a speed of about 1000 miles per hour, at the same time, going around the sun at a speed of about 60,000 miles per hour. This 'knowledge' is never challenged through my 'experience' of a 'stationery' earth.

Therefore, what is the important principle? Ans: "Valid knowledge derived through valid *pramaanam* can never be challenged, by an opposite experience."

By this principle, when I learn "'I' am wonderful", through *mahaa vaakyam*, a valid *pramaanam*, that knowledge that "'I' am wonderful" cannot be challenged by any of the terrible experiences of my life. Even a *jnaani* may / will go through different experiences at different *anaathmaa* levels. As mentioned earlier, this applies even to *Bhagavaan*. *Bhagavaan*-s mind will have to identify with the sufferings of his *bhakthaas*, and, at that moment of suffering of the *bhakthaas*, *Bhagavaan*'s *vrutthi* also cannot be *aanandha vrutthi*. But, if *Bhagavaan* does not have any *samsaaraa* problem, it is only because of His conviction "'I' am wonderful, not because of My experiences; but 'I' am wonderful *in spite* of different types of experiences".

Experiences have nothing to do with 'my' status. But, this does not mean that an aspirant can abandon *anaathmaa* to wallow in 'miserable' conditions ; if there are health problems, one can certainly do whatever is possible to contribute to the improvement of the health; 'Contribution' to *anaathmaa* is one aspect; the knowledge that "'I' am wonderful" is another. The two issues should not be mixed up.

The conclusion is: "There is no contradiction between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and other *pramaanam*-s".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 46:

तस्मात्प्रमातृप्रमाणप्रमेभ्यः हीयमानोपादीयमानेभ्यः अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां मुञ्जेषीकावत्
 अशेषबुद्धिविक्रियासाक्षितया आत्मानं निष्कृत्य तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येभ्यः अपूर्वादिलक्षणं आत्मानं विजानीयात् ।
 तदेतदाह ।

Therefore, in the total world of experience consisting of the knower, knowing and the objects of knowledge, and the things to be appropriated and rejected, one must, through rational discrimination, distinguish the Self, that is the witness of all the modifications of the mind and understand through texts like 'That thou art', its nature of which time-sequences etc. are denied in the scripture. This is drawn out now:

"And, therefore" Sureswaraacharya implies, through this *sambhandha gadhyam* portion, "Oh! Student, co-operate with the *sruthi* and *aacharya* , when the *mahaa vaakyam* is employed or taught".

तस्मात् - Therefore,

What does this word 'therefore' signify? The elaboration of the word will be as follows: "Since *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* deals with *aathmaa* or *saakshi* and all the other *pramaanams* deal with *anaathmaa*, they cannot contradict among themselves. Therefore:"

आत्मानं - (at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*,) may you use the word 'I', for the *saakshi chaithanyam*,

Why should the word 'I' mean only the *saakshi chaithanyam* ? Ans: Because, the aspirant is going to claim "I am wonderful" and only *aathmaa / saakshi chaithanyam* can be wonderful and not the *anaathmaa / ahamkaaraa*.

And, what type of *aathmaa*?

- निष्कृष्य - which (*aathmaa / saakshi chaithanyam*) has been separated
- प्रमातृप्रमाणप्रमेभ्यः - from the *pancha anaathmaa*,

The use of the term '*pancha anaathma*', to denote possessions, profession, family, body and mind, is not a conventional / traditional usage ; it is an expression 'coined' by *Swamiji*, for easier communication to his regular students. *Pancha anaathmaa* might mean *pancha kosaas* also, in other contexts.

Since, this '*pancha anaathma*', consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind, is the main cause for mental obsession and preoccupation and consequently a major obstacle in assimilation of *Vedhaanthaa*, *sanyaasa aashramaa* is considered more conducive to *Vedhaanthic* study, though, of course, a *grihastha* is not disqualified from the pursuit of *Vedhaathaa*, if he has *vairaaghyaa*.

An aspirant without *vairaaghyaa* will not have the *sthitha pragnya lakshanaa*-s, the perfect parameters, listed by Lord Krishna in the second chapter (verses 54 to 72) of the *Bhagavadh Githa*. He will not be '*sukheshu vigathaspruha*:' – 'one who is free from craving after pleasures' or '*dhu:khesu anudhvignamanaa*:' – 'one whose mind is unperturbed in troubles' (*Bhagavadh Githa* – Ch. II – verse 56). On the other hand, he will be obsessed with worries all the time, about 'perfecting' *anaathmaa*. He will be 'stuck' with these thoughts and efforts. And, as long as one is 'stuck' with one of the *pancha anaathmaa*, one can never claim "I am *muktha*:", since he will always have one issue or another to be sorted out. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa exhorts '*pramaathru pramaana prameyebhya: nishkrushya*', meaning 'extricating yourself from the *pancha anaathma*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa presents the *pancha anaathmaa* using the compound term *pramaathru-pramaana-prameyam*. '*Prameyam*' means 'object of knowledge' and in this context, stands for the external world, including possessions, profession and family. All these are included in '*prameyam*'.

'*Pramaanam*' means 'instrument of knowledge', and, in this context, stands for 'physical body and sense organs (*golakam*-s and *indriyam*-s), another *anaathmaa*, which also will always have problems. As one advances in age, one's hearing faculty, eyesight, faculty of speech etc., will all gradually deteriorate. Therefore, *pramaanam*-s also will have problems, like *prameyam*-s.

The '*pramaatha*', literally means 'knower', and, in this context, denotes the mind with *chidhaabhaasaa* or *antha:karanam*, which also will always have some issue or other. It is possible and it is nice and healthy to 'improve' or 'better' one's mind. But, a 'perfect' mind is only an ideal, similar to the 'perfect gas' in Chemistry.

Specialists in the science of Chemistry say that a 'perfect gas', fulfilling all conditions to be called 'gas', exists only on paper. Similarly, a 'perfect mind' or a 'perfect body' can exist only on paper. A discerning aspirant should have the realization that, while he can / should 'contribute' to the well-being of his body and mind, their 'total perfection' cannot be a condition for *mokshaa*. If it were so, no aspirant will ever be 'liberated'.

हीयमान उपादीयमानेभ्यः - which (*pancha anaathmaa*) are subject to arrival and departure,

The five features of *anaathmaa* have been discussed repeatedly earlier. They are (1) *dhrusyathvam* (2) *bhoudhikathvam* (3) *sagunathvam* (4) *savikaaraathvam* and (5) *aagamaapaayithvam*. Sureswaraacharya is referring to this fifth feature '*aagamaapaayithvam*', by using the adjective '*heeyamaana upaadheeyamaanebhya:*' to '*pramaathru pramaana prameyebhya:*'|

The example of 'spectacles' given earlier, may be recollected . Mind is comparable to 'spectacles', something which one 'puts on' in *jaagrath* and *svapna avasthaas* and removes during *sushupthi*. One type of *pramaathru-pramaana-prameyam thriputi* arrives in *jaagrath avasthaa*; another type of *thriputi* arrives in *svapna avasthaa* ; but, *thriputi* dissolves in *sushupthi avasthaa*. That is why, *jaagrath* and *svapna* are called *savikalpa avasthaa-s* and *sushupthi* is called *nirvikalpala avasthaa*. From this, it is also very clear that: "I' am **not** the *thriputi*; all the *thriputi-s* come under *anaathmaa* only; therefore, detach from the problematic *thriputi*".

अन्वय व्यतिरेकाभ्यां - by applying anvaya vyathirkhaa logic, the argument of variables and in-variable,

मुञ्जा इषीकावत् - similar to separating the stalk from *munja-grass*,

This is an example borrowed from the Katopanishad (Chapter II – Section 3 – manthraa 17): "anghushtamaathra: purusha: antharaathmaa sadhaa janaanaanam hrudhaye sannivishtha: tham svaath sareeraath pravruheth munjaath iva isheekaam dhairyena tham vidhyaath chukram amrutham" – "Purushaa, the inner Self, which is of the size of the thumb, is ever seated in the heart of the people. One should separate that Self, from one's body, with diligence, like separating the stalk from the munja-grass. One should know that Self to be pure and immortal"

Munjaa is the name of a type of grass with very fine sharp, blade-like edges. If not handled carefully, it will hurt the hands. Within the *munjaa* grass, there is a very tender stalk, which is found useful for certain purposes. If one, therefore, desires to remove the tender stalk or pith within, from the outside grass, one has to carefully handle the grass, without hurting oneself.

Similarly, aathmaa is the inner Self, which is other than the annamaya sthoola sareeram, other than the praana maya- mano maya- vijnyaana maya sookshma sareeram and other than the aanandha-maya kaarana sareeram. Thaitheeya Upanishad – Brahnavalli explains this, step by step: "Thasmaath vaa ethasmaath annarasamayaath anyonthara aathmaa praanamaya:| ...Thasmaath vaa ethasmaath praanamayaath anyonthara aathmaa

manomaya: |... Thasmaath vaa ethasmaath manomayaath anyonthara aathmaa
 vijnyanamaya: |...Thasmaath vaa ethasmaath vijnyanamaayaath anyonthara aathmaa
 aanandhamaya: |...Aananda aathmaa| Brahma puccham prathishta " meaning "In fact,
 praanamaya is self, inner than that annamayaa..... In fact, manomayaa is self, inner than
 that praanamayaa.....In fact, vijnyanamayaa is the self, inner than that manomayaa.....In
 fact, aanandamayaa is the self, inner than that vijnyanamayaa....Aanandhaa is the Self.
 Brahman is the tail, which is the support".

Anaathmaa, the external shell, is like the *munjaa* grass, sharp-edged, which can be hurtful;
 and, *aathmaa* like the interior stalk, *isheekaa*, is tender, the wonderful *sath-chith-
 aanandhaa*.

Therefore, an aspirant should carefully separate the two, '*pramaathru-pramaana-
 prameyebhya: aathmaanam nishkrushya munja isheekaavath*' - 'separating 'I', the *aathmaa*,
 from the *anaathmaa*, like the stalk from the *munja* grass'.

What is the meaning of *aathmaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* points out:

असेष बुद्धि विक्रिया साक्षितया - (understanding *aathmaa*) as the Witness of all the thought
 modifications of the mind, 'I' am not the mind, but the *saakshi*.

Saakshi of what? Ans: *buddhi vikriyaa* – the thought modifications of the mind.

What are 'thoughts' dependent on? Ans: This topic has been discussed earlier.

Thoughts are of three types: (i) world based (ii) will based and (iii) *vaasanaa* based.

When one is using one's sense organs and is observing the world outside, what thoughts
 one has, depend on what is around. For instance, while reading a newspaper, if the news is
 about burglary, the thought obviously will be 'burglary' and when the news read is about a
 helicopter crashing, the thought will be 'crash' thought. Such thoughts are 'world based'/
 'experience based'.

Some other thoughts are will based. When one wants to plan an action or an event, one
 deliberately entertains thoughts about the proposed action or event, based on one's own
 will. Even a *Naishkarmya Siddhi* 'class' is an instance of such will based thoughts. Both the
guru and the students deliberately entertain thoughts on the subject studied, *Naishkarmya
 Siddhi*, for one hour. Their *Naishkarmya Siddhi* thoughts are based on their 'will'.

Next on the list of the types of thoughts, comes the third one, viz., *vaasanaa* based thoughts, which thoughts are totally beyond one's control. And, how many *vaasanaas* does one have? The quantity beats imagination. '*Anaadhi avidhyaa vaasanayaa*' is a well known term, from the *mahaa sankalpam* of the *Upaakarmaa* ritual. Over innumerable earlier births, millions of *vaasanaas* have been accumulated; because of their sheer volume, the individual would not even be aware of most of them. That is the reason why, quite often, a dreamer is surprised by the dreams he gets. All kinds of unimaginable dreams are only results of *vaasanaas*.

Many of the thoughts are not 'world based' i.e. they are not based on experiences in the *jaagrath avasthaa*. Many of the thoughts are not deliberate or 'will based'. A very large number of thoughts are '*vaasanaa* based'. And, nobody can remove all the *vaasanaa-s*, because *vaasanaa-s* being infinite, removal of all the *vaasanaa-s* will require infinite *janmaas*.

An interesting relevant fact: In *Vedhaantha sashtraa*, the scholars use a term, *vaasana kshaya*:| This term, very often, causes confusions in *saadhakaa* circles. Because of this term, *vaasanaa kshayam*, some *saadhakaa-s* wrongly believe that, by practicing certain *sadhanaa-s*, all the *vaasanaa-s* can be removed. But, it is not so; total *vaasanaa kshayam* is not possible at all.

The essence is that, the mind is always full of thoughts – either 'world based' or 'will based' or '*vaasanaa* based' thoughts.

But, who am 'I'? The *Aachaaryaa* gives the answer as '*asesha buddhi vikriyaa saakshi* – 'witness of all modifications of the mind'.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "Saakshi aham asmi ithi aathmaanam nishkrishya" - "having segregated the aathmaa from the anaathmaa and understanding the aathmaa as only the Witness of anaathmaa".

When should the aspirant do this? Ans: When he is in the process of *mahaa vaakyaa sravanam*.

(Swamiji elaborates: "Before coming to the *Vedhaanthic* class, spend a few minutes contemplating 'I am going to *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class. Let me leave at home, the *pancha anaathmaa*, along with my children and grandchildren'. Or, at least, when you enter the hall, along with your footwear, may you remove all the *anaathmaa*. Then, you will find, that, there is no contradiction at all in *mahaa vaakyam*. That is why, Sureswaraachaaryaa wonders: 'Where is the blessed problem?' and says "It is you who are giving the problem.")

'*Aathmaanam nishkrishya*' means 'having segregated'. This advice can be, otherwise, expressed as '*bhaagathyagha lakshanam kruthvaa*'. Having done this:

तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येभ्यः - through mahaa vaakyam-s such as thath thvam asi,

'Thath thvam asi' is a mahaa vaakyam occurring in the Channdhogya Upanishad of Saama Veda; 'aham brahma asmi' occurs in the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad of Yajur Veda, 'ayam aathmaa brahma' in the Maandookya Upanishad of Atharvana Veda and 'pragnyaanam Brahma' in the Aithrya Upanishad of Rig Veda.

While these four are the most important and well-known mahaa vaakyam-s, each representing a particular Veda, there are many other mahaa vaakyam-s such as *ayaschaayam purushe yas chaassavaadhithye* (Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhrgu Valli-manthra 10), *sa eka:*, *anyadeva thaadh vidhithaath atho avidhithaath adhi* (Kenopanishad I-4), *thadeva brahma thvam viddhi nedham yadhitham upaasathe* (Kenopanishad 1-5) etc.

Through the millions of such *mahaa vaakyaa-s*,

आत्मानं विजानीयात् - may you claim *aathmaa* as 'my' self,

This claim can / must be made without any hesitation / without any reservation / without any jerk; also, not in later meditation, but, right during the *sravanam* itself. Sureswaraacharya's teaching is: "*sravanam* gives *aparoksha jnaanam*; not *dhyaanam* ; *sravanam* gives *saakshaathkaara*: not *dhyaanam*". This is the main thesis of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

And, what type of *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa* is none other than *Brahman*. This is stressed by the *Aachaaryaa*, at this juncture, since, by repeated use of the word *aathmaa*, the student may lose sight of this fact, that *aathmaa* is none other than *Brahman*.

The question "what type of *aathmaa*" can be reframed as: 'What is the definition of that *Brahman*?' So, Sureswaraacharya says:

अपूर्वादि लक्षणं - with features such as *apoorvam* etc.

Brahman is defined by the various *Upanishads* in different manners.

For instance, in the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (VI.2.1), *Brahman* is defined as 'sath - 'Pure Existence', in the well known *manthraa* addressed by Sage *Uddhaalaka Aaruni*, to his son *Svethakethu* : "sadheva soumya idham agra aaaseeth"- "O good looking one, in the beginning this was Existence alone". .

In the same *Upanishad*, in *Bhooma Vidhyaa* (VII.23.1) *Guru Sage Sanath Kumara* declares to his disciple, Sage *Narada*: "Yo vai bhoomaa thathsukham"- "That which indeed is the Infinite, that is 'Pure Happiness'". Here, 'Pure Happiness', *aanandhaa*, is the definition of *Brahman*. What type of happiness? Not *prathibhimbha aanandhaa*. *Prathibhimbha aanandhaa*, also termed 'experiential *aanandhaa*' belongs to *aanandha maya kosaa*. 'Original *aanandhaa* / *bhimbha aanandhaa* does not belong to 'me'; it is 'me', myself. 'Experiential happiness' will come and go / arrive and depart. When the mind is conducive, it 'reflects' the original *aanandhaa*; when it is not conducive, it does not 'reflect' the *aanandhaa*. On the other hand, 'I' **am** the 'original *aanandhaa*', which does not 'come and go'. When one looks into a mirror one's reflected face appears or 'comes'; when the mirror is removed, the reflected face disappears or 'goes' away. But, even when the reflected face 'goes' away, the original face is available, though, of course, one cannot see the original face. Similarly original *aanandhaa* cannot be objectified, because it is 'I', myself.

Again, in *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (Chapter VIII), *Brahman* is defined as *chith roopa*: as 'aham thureeyam chaithanyam asmi'. Thus, *Chaandoghya Upanishad* gives *sath* , *aanandham* and *chith*, as *Brahma lakshaanani*.

In a similar manner, *Brahadhaaaranyaka Upanishad* also gives wonderful definitions of *Brahman*, in various *manthraas*.

Part of II.v.19 of the *Brahadhaaaranyaka Upanishad*, the last *manthraa* of *Madhu Brahmanam*, runs: "Thath ethadh brahma apoorvam aparam anantharam abaahyam ayam aathmaa brahma sarvaanubhoo:" – "That *Brahman* is without prior or posterior, without interior or exterior. This Self, the perceiver of everything, is *Brahman*".

Using this term '*apoorvaadhi lakshanam*' (*apoorvam*, *anaparam*, *ananthram*, *abhaahyam*') from this *manthraa*, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* is reminding the student that *aathmaa* is none other than *Brahman*.

The import of this *sambhandha gadhyam* may be expressed in simple language, as follows:

"The *anaathmaa* consisting of this world, the physical body and the mind is of the nature of ever being subject to arrival and departure. *Aathmaa*, in contrast, is ever eternal- of the nature of 'Pure Existence, 'Pure Knowledge' and 'Pure Happiness'. *Aathmaa* should not be

confused with the mind. Mind is always obsessed with different thoughts. But, *aathmaa* is only a Witness of the mind and its thought modifications. A *Vedhaanthic* seeker, therefore, as even as he listens to the *Vedic Mahaa vaakyam*, should diligently distinguish *aathmaa* from all *anaathmaa*, including his own mind, using the logic of *anvaya-vyathirekha*, as one would diligently remove the tender stalk from the *munja* grass. He should understand the word '*thvam*' in the *Mahaa Vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*' as the *saakshi* – *aathmaa*, and not as the physical body or mind. He should further understand that *aathmaa* is none other than *Brahman*'.

153. Chapter III, Verse 45 to 48 (12-09-2009)

Sureswaraacharya points out that when the *sruthi pramaanam*, through the *mahaa vaakyam* reveals 'my' *saakshi svaroopam*, that teaching is not and cannot be contradicted by any experience received through other *pramaanam-s*.

The justification for this statement is as follows: All our experiences gained through various *pramaanam-s* other than *sruthi* or *sabhdha pramaana*, are dealing with *anaathmaa* only. All those *pramaana-s* deal only with *anaathma prapanchaa*; for instance, the *saakshi prathyaksham* deals with our mind and emotions. But, the *saakshi* itself is not an object of any *pramaana* and that *saakshi* is what is being talked about by *mahaa vaakyam*. In other words, *mahaa vaakyam* deals with *saakshi*, while other *pramaanams* deal with *saakshyam*. And, since the very fields of operation are thus different, there is no question of *mahaa vaakyam* contradicting our experiences or our experiences contradicting the *mahaa vaakyam* knowledge.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya advises (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 46): "*pramaathru pramaana prameyebhya: nishkrushya*" which implies "when you say '*aham brahma asmi*', the meaning of the word *aham* must be *saakshi*, which should be understood as distinct from *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*".

'*Pramaathaa*' refers to the *ahamkaaraa*, which is the mind. The mind does have its emotional problems; *saasthraa* is never challenging that statement.

Pramaathaa is a *samsaari*. Nobody is challenging that statement; *mahaa vaakyam* never says '*pramaathaa is nithya muktha*.' | *Mahaa vaakyam* is not talking about *pramaathaa*, but is talking about the *pramaathru saakshi*, which **is** *nithya muktha*:/

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says '*nishkrushya saakshithayaa aathmaanam*' meaning 'separating 'my'self as the *saakshi* of the mind and its emotions'.

He proceeds:

thathvamasyaadhi vaakyebhya: - with the help of all the *maaha vaakyaa-s*, *apoorvaadhi lakshanam aathmaanam vijaaneeyaath* - may you claim your *aathmaaas Paramaathmaa*, Which is defined as *apoorvam, anaparam, anantharam, abhaahyam* etc.

The reference by the *Aachaaryaa* is to the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad manthraa*, II. v. 19, the last *manthraa* in *Madhu Brahmanam*.

We get the well known mahaa vaakyam, 'ayam aathma Brahma', in the concluding portion of this manthraa, "thadethadhbrahma apoorvam anaparam anantharam abhaahyam ayam aathmaa Brahma sarvaanubhoo:"

This mahaa vaakyam 'ayam aathmaa Brahma' occurs in both Maandookya Upanishad and Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad.

Thus, Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad has two famous mahaa vaakyam-s, viz., "aham Brahma asmi" and "ayam aathma Brahma".

What is that *Brahman*? Four descriptions are given in this *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad Manthraa* - *apoorvam*, *anaparam*, *anantharam* and *abhaahyam*. The first two adjectives '*apoorvam* - *anaparam*' together mean 'neither a cause nor an effect'. They aver that *Brahman* is '*kaarya kaarana vilakshana thureeyam*'. The latter two adjectives '*anantharam*-*abhaahyam*' together mean 'without anything inside or outside', which, in turn, means 'non-dual / without a second / *adhvitheeyam*'.

Thus, 'kaarya kaarana vilakshana adhvitheeyam brahma' is the definition derived from this Brahdhaaranyaka Manthraa.

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa exhorts 'apoorvaadhilakshanam aathmaanam vijaaneeyaath' – 'may you claim that Brahman as aathmaa / saakshi chaithanyam'.

When this equation is made, if the seeker takes '*thvam*' or '*aham*' as *pramaathaa*, the *ahamkaaraa*, the equation will not work. If he takes '*thvam*' or '*aham*' as the *saakshi*, there is no contradiction.

Thadethadaaha - That is being said in the following *sloka*.

Chapter III: Verse 46 –

अहं दुःखी सुखी चेति येनायं प्रत्ययोऽधुवः ।

अवगत्यन्त आभाति स म आत्मेति वाक्यधीः ॥ ४६ ॥

The scriptural proposition is to the effect 'He is my Self' referring to that, through whose light of consciousness, the fleeting experiences such as 'I am miserable', 'I am happy' etc. occur, culminating in definite cognitions.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about the method of differentiating the *saakshi* from the *pramaathaa*. He has already talked about this earlier. But, in this context, he is once again

reminding the student of the method of this differentiation, because, the *saakshi* and *pramaathaa* are so integrally mixed together, that we always have difficulty in segregating, 'I', the *saakshi*. How to do that? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

- अहं दुखी सुखी: च इति प्रत्यय (अस्ति) :- At times, there is the thought "I am miserable", and , at times, the thought "I am happy/ wonderful",

'*Prathyaya*:' means 'thought'. It is common experience to have different types of thoughts at different times, more often, the thought '*aham dhu:khee asmi*' - 'I am miserable' ; and now and then, because of some *punya praarabhdhaa*, '*aham sukhee asmi*' - 'I am happy'. We do have this alternate experiences 'I am miserable' and 'I am happy'. So, how do we define 'thought'? Ans: fluctuating / changing.

- अधुवः - thus fluctuating / changing.

When we are referring to the 'fluctuating' / 'changing' experiences, whom are we referring to, as subject to the 'fluctuating' / 'changing' experiences?

When I say "I was unhappy *previously*; I am happy *now*", I am talking about fluctuating experiences. In addition, this statement is also referring to what I am or what type of I, I am. It is referring to a fluctuating I.

How does one say it is referring to a fluctuating I? Because previously I said "**I** am unhappy" and now I say "**I** am happy". Therefore, both these experiences "I am unhappy" and "I am happy" are referring not only to fluctuating experiences, but also to a fluctuating I.

In what way is it fluctuating? Previously it had unhappiness as its attribute; now it has happiness as its attribute. Thus, we are talking about a changing substance, I, which had unhappiness as its attribute before and has happiness as its attribute now. So, we are talking about a changing 'I'.

But, in turn, what is this changing 'I' referring to? Ans: We know it is referring to the mind only. Previously, the changing mind had unhappiness as its attribute; now we have got a changing mind which has happiness as its attribute.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "When I say 'I **was** unhappy' and 'I **am** happy' ", both these experiences are referring to a changing mind, which had unhappiness as its attribute earlier and which has happiness as its attribute now.

Since I am referring to this mind with unhappiness in the past and happiness in the present, in other words, since I am talking about the past unhappy mind and the present happy mind, both the minds are known to me. The word 'both' is used here to mean (i) the unhappy mind of the past and (ii) the happy mind of the present. Both are referred to, by the expression "I was unhappy and I am happy".

Sureswaraacharya says: "If you are referring to the unhappy mind and the happy mind, that reference must be possible because of its objectification; without objectifying the mind, you cannot refer to the unhappy mind which was in the past or the happy mind which is in the present. Both of them have to be objectified by another I. When you say '*aham dhu:khee*', the word '*aham*' refers to the mind ; when you say '*aham sukhee*', there also, the word '*aham*' refers to the mind. Both these *aham*-s must be objectified by another constant *aham*. In other words, both these *aham*-s, viz., the past *aham*, the changing mind and the present *aham*, which is also the changing mind, must be known because of another non-fluctuating *aham*, about which we have discussed before. At this moment, may you shift your attention to this third *aham*. First *aham* is '*dhu:khee aham*', which refers to the mind (say mind no. 1) ; the second *aham* is the '*sukhee aham*', which also refers to the mind only (say mind no. 2) . The third *aham*, because of which only, both these *aham*-s are known, is the *saaksh*'.

First *aham* is *aham padha vaachyaartha*; second *aham* also is the *aham padha vaachyaartha*; both refer to the fluctuating *aham*, the mind. Both are known because of the third *aham*, which is the *aham padha lakshyaartha*.

Mahaavaakyaa is not referring to *aham* no 1, which is temporary *dhu:kee*; nor is it referring to *aham* no. 2 which is temporary *sukhee*. These two *aham*-s are referring to temporary *dhu:khee aham* and temporary *sukhee aham* respectively, thus, to a fluctuating *aham*, which is the mind. But, both are known because of a non-fluctuating Consciousness, which Consciousness is not *dhu:khee* and which Consciousness is not *sukhee* also. In that case, what is it? Ans: It is '*Sukham*'.

Consciousness is not *sukhee*; it is not happy; but, it is 'Happiness' itself, which is neither a substance possessing happiness; nor an attribute also; but 'Happiness' itself. That Consciousness / Happiness, is what the *mahaa vaakyaa* '*aham Brahma asm*', referring to, by the word '*aham*'.

And, what is the nature of that 'Happiness'? The 'five features' of Consciousness are to be remembered and applied to that 'Happiness' also:

(1) That 'Happiness' is not a part, product or property of the mind.

-
- (2) That 'Happiness' is an independent substance which pervades the mind and
 - (3) makes the mind 'now and then' happy.
 - (4) That 'Happiness' is not limited by the boundaries of the mind
 - (5) That 'Happiness' survives even after the mind has resolved
 - (6) But, that surviving 'Happiness' is not available for experience, since, there is no medium (mind), through which alone, it can be manifested or experienced.

'I', the *saakshi*, **am** that 'Happiness' *Brahman*. Where is the contradiction?

To repeat the essence: Mind is *sukhee* and *dhu:khee*; but, 'I' am the Consciousness, which is neither *sukhee* or *dhu:khee*, but *Sukham* itself, as declared by the *Chaandhoghya Upanishad* (VII.23.1) "*Yo vai Bhoomaa thadh sukham*".

'You' are not *sukhee*; but, 'you' are *Sukham* itself. Reverting to the text,

- येन - "That non-fluctuating Principle, because of which,
- अहं दुःखीः सुखी च इति अयं अध्रुवः प्रत्ययः - these two-fold fluctuating emotional experiences of mental pleasure and mental pain, अवगत्यन्तः - which go along with corresponding experiences,

'*avagathantha*.' is adjective to '*prathyaya*.' | '*prathyaya*.' refers to 'thoughts' and '*avagathi*.' means 'experience'. '*Adhruva: avagathantha: prathyaya*.' , therefore, means 'the fluctuating thoughts, which go with fluctuating experiences'.

In both these fluctuating emotional thoughts, 'I am unhappy' and 'I am happy', which go along with corresponding experiences, the word 'I' refers to the 'changing' mind. But, both of them, viz., the fluctuating emotional thoughts and the fluctuating mind are known / revealed because of the non-fluctuating Consciousness. The adjective 'non-fluctuating', to Consciousness, is very important.

- आभाति - are known / are revealed
- सः मे आत्मा - is my real nature".
- इति वाक्यधीः - This is the proposition / declaration of the scriptures.

Then, what about *ahamkaaraa* ? That is a *vesham*, which I have to use for all the transactions. Even to claim "'I' am the *saakshi*", I require the mind. I use the mind for all the transactions, including the transaction of *Vedhaanthic* study.

Sureswaraacharya says "Use the mind; but never claim the mind as 'I am'".

In fact, the greatest use of the miserable mind is to claim "'I' am not the miserable mind".

An interesting question: Is mind a 'curse' or a 'blessing'? Mind appears to be a 'curse', because it is miserable very often. But, in spite of the mind being miserable, the greatest irony, is that, the miserable mind alone can claim "'I' am not the miserable mind".

So, is mind required or not? Ans: It *is* required. The seeker can never afford to say "I want to escape from the world", because, he requires the world, he requires the body, and, he requires the miserable mind, to claim "I am using the miserable mind. But, 'I' am not the miserable mind".

So, if 'I' am not the miserable mind, who am 'I'? Ans: 'I' am the user of the miserable mind, different from the miserable mind, the unparalleled *aathmaa*.

Therefore, mind *is* a great blessing.

Another interesting fact: Let us imagine a hypothetical situation. Assume, that, because the mind is miserable, you decide to 'remove' the mind (by some means, say, deep sleep or *samaadh*). There *is* an advantage in removing the mind. What is the advantage? Misery is gone. Because mind is gone, misery is gone. But, there is a very big disadvantage also, which disadvantage has to be carefully noted. What is that big disadvantage? Ans: Mind is gone ; misery is gone; I am there as *aanandha svaroop*; but, unfortunately, even though I exist as *aanandha svaroop*, in the absence of the mind, I cannot claim 'I am *aanandha svaroop*.' | *Dhu:kham* is gone, because mind is gone ; but, *sukham*: is **also** gone, because, I am not able to claim the *aanandha* ; and, if I cannot claim the *aanandha*, as in 'deep sleep' state, what is the use of remaining *aanandha* permanently , without being able to claim 'I am *aanandha*? Likewise, when I want to claim 'I am *sacchidhaananda Brahman*', I do need the mind. What type of mind? Ans: Ironically, very often miserable.

Vedhaanthaa understands the utility of the miserable mind and therefore advises "Stop complaining about the miserable mind". Physical pains also are experienced in the mind only. Despite this fact, a knowledgeable *Vedhaanthin* says: "I am blessed to have a mind; even though it is miserable, it does not matter, because I *have* to use only that mind to claim 'I am the *adhishtanam Brahman*'. I have no problem in letting the mind continue, because I know that, that mind is *mithyaa*. Let me possess the *mithyaa* mind to claim '*aham sacchidhaanandha svaroop*: *brahma asmi*'.

A *jnaani*, therefore, has no complaint against his mind / has no desire to get rid of his mind , just as, in the mundane world, the owner of a car does not desire to get rid of his car, even though the car gives him several problems. He finds the car essential to carry out all his activities, in spite of the problems it gives. The same is true about one's family also. The family gives umpteen problems, in spite of which, most people do not desire to give up the family and take to *sanyaasaa*.

Vedhaantha points out : "Mind gives several problems; still, I have to hold on to the mind, because, however miserable it has made me, that is the only blessed instrument with which, I can claim 'I am not the mind; but, *aham sacchindhaanadham Brahma asmi*."

Pure *Brahman* without mind, can never claim "I am pure *Brahman*". That is why *jeevan mukthi* is considered wonderful.

'Escape from the world' is a wrong approach. Let body be there; let mind be there; but, may you always remember *aham brahma asmi*.

Remember the 5th capsule of *Vedhaantha* : "By forgetting 'my' real nature, I convert life into a burden; by remembering 'my' real nature, viz., that, " 'I' am not the miserable mind but *sukahasvaroopa aathmaa*", I convert life into entertainment".

'Making the miserable mind into the wonderful mind' is what *Vedhaantha* does. What is that 'wonderfulness' of the mind? It helps claim "*aham sukha roopam Brahma asmi* – not *sukhee*"|

The anavaya of verse 46 is: "Yena aham dhukhee sukhee cha ithi avagathantha: adhruva: prathyaya: aabhaathi sa: me aathmaa" ithi vaakyadhee:|.

'*Prathyaya:*' means 'thought' ; '*adhruva:*' means 'temporary'; '*avagathantha:*' means 'leading to fluctuating experiences' ; '*avagathi:*' means '*anubhava:*'.

The meaning of the verse, in simple English, is: "All fluctuating experiences are because of the non-fluctuating *saakshi*, which 'I' am" is the declaration of the *saasthraas*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 47 & 48 : (Part)

प्रमाणान्तरानवष्टब्धं निरस्त अशेष कार्यकारणात्मक द्वैतप्रपञ्चं सत्यजानानन्दलक्षणमात्मानं 'तत्त्वमसि,'
'अहंब्रह्मास्मि' इत्यादिवाक्यं संशयित मिथ्याज्ञान अज्ञान प्रध्वंसमुखेन साक्षात् अपरोक्षात्
करतलन्यस्तामलकवत् प्रतिपादयति एव इति असकृत् अभिहितम् ।

The ultimate Self goes beyond the other modes of knowledge and is divested of the whole world of plurality consisting of cause and effect. It's essential nature is constituted of reality, knowledge and bliss. It is this Self that texts like 'That Thou art' and 'I am Brahman' reveal by destroying doubt, false understanding and ignorance and present to direct apprehension, as if it were a fruit in one's own hand. All this has been stated by us over and over again.

This is a long sentence with long words. In this long sentence, Sureswaraachaaryaa is consolidating what he has established until now, with the intention to introduce a very big objection by another philosopher. Before introducing that objection or challenge, Sureswaraachaaryaa is consolidating what he has established till now. His teaching is going to be challenged by a group of *meemaasakaa* philosophers, who also accept *Veda* as a *pramaanam* and who also interpret the *Veda Pramaanam*. Those *Meemaamsaka poorva paksha* is to be introduced by Sureswaraachaaryaa, before which, he consolidates what he has taught .

- 'तत्त्वमसि 'अहंब्रह्मास्मि' , ' इत्यादिवाक्यं - The mahaa vaakyam-s such as 'thatthvam asi', ' aham Brahma asmi' etc.,
- प्रतिपादयति एव - definitely reveal

The *mahaa vaakyam-s* definitely reveal a liberating fact. When does it do the job of 'liberating'? Ans: As even as we 'grasp' the teaching / At the very moment of our 'grasping' the teaching.

This is similar to a dreamer waking up from his dream. When a dreamer wakes up from his dream, at the very waking moment, he shakes off *all* the problems of the dream together , not one by one. Dream is falsified instantaneously on waking up; and, all the dream problems also instantaneously go away; the individual, who wakes up from the dream, need not put in any special effort to 'gradually' remove the dream problems.

In the same manner, the *mahaa vaakyam* awakens the aspirant to a *Paaramaarthikaa* order of reality, reducing the *pramaathru – pramaana- prameyaani* / the entire world, to a lower order of reality. Even a successful aspirant is not solving the problems of the world; he is only converting the problems into a lower order of reality. This is called 'waking up', in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*. 'Waking up' is 'conversion of the order of reality' .

Just as (i) the dream is real until the dreamer wakes up and (ii) when the dreamer wakes up the contents of his dream have not changed, but only their 'order of reality' has changed, in

the same manner, when the aspirant wakes up to his *saakshi svaroopam*, the content of the world is not changed, but, the 'order of reality' of the content is changed. The aspirant's physical body is the same, probably old and diseased. The aspirant's family still has got its problems. *Mahaa vaakyam* does not change any of the 'content' of the world. *Mahaa vaakyam* only changes the order of reality. The 'waking up' is 'waking up to another order of reality'.

There is, of course, a small difference, between waking up from the 'normal' dream and waking up from the 'worldly' dream. When one wakes up from the 'normal' dream, the dream world totally disappears from perception. Dream is falsified and the dream world disappears; whereas, in the *mahaa vaakya* operation, while the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya* world is 'falsified', it does not disappear. World appearance continues. Only its 'order of reality' is changed.

And, what is the benefit of this change in the 'order of reality'? Ans: Once the 'reality' of any substance / event is changed to a lower order, its importance/ seriousness comes down. A tragedy in a movie is called 'entertainment', while a tragedy in real life is not considered 'entertainment'. *Mahaa vaakyam* converts a tragedy in real life also, into a level similar to that in a movie.

We do not change the contents of the world, but, we change 'the order of reality' of the contents. This is the effect of *mahaa vaakyam*, if the student travels along with the teacher. This is implied by the *Aachaaryaa's* use of the word 'eva'. And, how do the *mahaa vaakyam*-s reveal? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् - directly and immediately,

To quote the dream example again, a dreamer, immediately upon his waking, understands that he does not really suffer the problems in the dream. For instance, if he had dreamed that he had a limb amputated, immediately on waking, he realizes that the 'amputation' is false, by physically seeing his 'whole' limbs. That realization is '*aparokshaa*' (immediate) knowledge. He instantly realizes "I am not a person with an amputated limb; I am a *poorna purusha*."| Just as this waker claims *poornathvam* in the very waking, the aspirant also gets the *aparokshaa* realization '*aham poorna*.', as even as he grasps the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

- **करतलन्यस्त आमलकवत्** - as if it were a fruit in one's hand,

'*aamalaka*' is the fruit, berry, **நெல்லிக்காய்**, in Tamil. '*karathala nyastha*' means 'kept in the hand'. A fruit kept in the hand can be experienced with all the sense organs. All its attributes - *sabdha*, *sparsa*, *roopa*, *rasa* and *gandha* – will be known. This example is quoted by the *Aachaaryaa* to stress the 'immediacy' and 'doubtlessness' of the knowledge received through the *mahaa vaakyam*. The fact "*aham aanandha svarooopa*:" is clearly cognizable or recognizable, as a fruit on the palm of one's hand. And, how does the 'knowledge' rise?

- संशयित मिथ्याज्ञान अज्ञान प्रध्वंसमुखेन - and by the destruction of doubt, false knowledge and ignorance,

As even as the knowledge from the *mahaa vaakyam* is received and understood, that knowledge destroys three things instantaneously. What are they? Ans: (1) *samsayitha jnaanam* (doubtful knowledge) (2) *mithyaa jnaanam* (false idea / misconceptions) and (3) *ajnaanam* (ignorance). All the three are eliminated.

What does it mean?

Swamiji, addressing the students, explains: "Hereafter, whenever the thought '*aham dhu:kee*' comes, if, as a *Vedhaanthic* student, you have understood this 46th verse clearly, during the rest of your life, whenever you are assessing your own life / whenever your mind is chattering on 'what am I, what is my life, is it a successful one or an unsuccessful one' etc. / whenever you are in autobiographical mood, and at that time, if you get the thought 'I am miserable', if you have grasped the 46th verse, immediately from that thought, this class should be remembered. When you say 'I am miserable', what 'I' are you referring to? That 'I' is referring to only the fluctuating mind. Mind is called 'fluctuating', because even though miserable experiences are there, you have also had wonderful experiences. You should understand that the fluctuating mind is only one of the components of this changing world. Mind is a material substance, which has got the five material qualities of *dhrusyathvam*, *boudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaa paayithvam*. That mind 'fluctuates' because of *praarabhdhaa*. Negative thoughts arise because of some old *vaasanaa*. Because of the *vaasanaa*, the fact that 'I am ever *aanandhaa*' is not reflecting in the mind and therefore, the mind is thinking 'I am *dhu:khee*'. Let the mind go through the fluctuating negative thoughts. But, even when the mind is going through the fluctuating *dhu:khee* thoughts, who am 'I'? 'I' am the Consciousness, blessing that fluctuating mind also.

"Body also has its own fluctuations because of *praarabhdhaa*; mind also has its fluctuations because of *praarabhdha vaasanaa*. Nobody can stop it.

"Lord Krishna, in the Bhagavadh Githa (verse 22- Chapter 14) , while talking of gunaatheetha lakshanaani, says 'Prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha Paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaankshathi' – 'Oh Arjuna! He (a person beyond the three gunaa-s) does not hate brightness, activity and delusion as they arise; nor does he desire them, as they withdraw'. The Lord points out that a jnaani also can have prakaasaa, pravrutthi and mohaa. Even for a guna atheetha jnaani, mind goes through fluctuations. Mohaa is also a thought. For a jnaani, moha vrutthi will be less / very rare; but, he will not be totally free of it.

"So, even when that thought 'I am miserable' comes, a diligent student should remember this *Naishkarmya Siddhi* portion. And, he should watch the mind going through that 'miserable' thought also, remembering that a drama should have *navarasaa*. Dayaananda Swami, in a lighter vein, would say that a movie in which all the characters are portrayed as ever happy will not be a success, since the audience look forward to *navarasaa*-s in a movie. So also real life.

"Life should have miserable occasions also ; otherwise, the happy occasions cannot be enjoyed. Now and then, miserable occasions can come. This must be the *nidhidhyaasanam*, when depression arises / negative tendencies arise/ fears such as 'Who will take care of me, when I become old?' etc. arise. A *Vedhaanthic* student should let the 46th *sloka* of the 3rd chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, run parallel in his mind along with *aham dhu:khee* thought, if any.

"Therefore, if he is questioned 'are you liberated or *dhu:khee*?', he should confidently reply 'In spite of my mind going through *dhu:kha vrutthi*, I will claim '*aham sukham aananandha: asmi*'. Let this be the *nidhidyaasanam* all the time.

"This is the implied message of Sureswaraachaaryaa, in these portions".

'*Samsayitha*' denotes 'doubtful knowledge', indicated by doubts such as 'am I *totally* liberated?' There is no 'partial' liberation. *Saakshi* is always totally liberated. There is no possibility of partial liberation. Mind is miserable at times and happy at times. *Mahaa vaakyam* destroys '*samsayitha jnaanam*'; it also destroys *mithyaa jnaanam* – misconceptions. What are misconceptions? Ans: For instance, the thought '*aham dhu:khee*'. '*aham*', in reality, means '*saakshi*', which can never be *dhu:khee*. My mind can be *dhu:khee* or *sukhee*. But, 'I' am not *dhu:khee* or *sukhee*. *Mahaa vaakyam* destroys such misconceptions as '*aham dhu:khee*'. *Mahaa vaakyam* also destroys ignorance or '*ajnaanam*'. *Mahaa vaakyam* destroys all these three, viz., *samsayitha jnaanam*, *mithyaa jnaanam* and

ajnaanam instantaneously. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* avers by the use of the complex term '*samsayitha mithyaa jnaana ajnaana pradhvamsamukhend*'.

The *Aachaaryaa* says '*vaakyam ithi prathipaadhayathi eva*', meaning '*mahaa vaakyam* definitely reveals this'. What does the *mahaa vaakyam* reveal?

- सत्यं ज्ञानं आनन्दं लक्षणं आत्मानं - the ultimate Self, whose essential nature is constituted of reality, knowledge and bliss,

Mahaa vaakya reveals 'me', the *aathmaa*, not the mind, but the non-fluctuating Consciousness, which is of the nature of '*sathyam*' (pure Existence), which is of the nature of *jnaanam* (pure Consciousness) and which is of the nature of *aanandhaa* (pure Happiness).

We are not talking about experiential happiness, which will be always temporary. 'My' pure *aanandhaa*, reflecting in the mind is the experiential happiness. Reflections will come and go. 'Original happiness' can never be experienced. The question 'How can I experience original *aanandhaa*?' can, therefore, be never asked. 'Original *aanandhaa* is 'myself'; 'I' am *aanandhaa*: | Mind becomes *aanandhee*, now and then, when the reflection (of the original *aanandhaa*) comes. For some people, mind becomes *aanandhee* quite often; for some people, mind becomes *aanandhaa* less often, the frequency depending on the individual *praarabhdhaa*. In contrast, 'I' never **become** *aanandhee*. I **am** *aanandhaa*: |

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*mahaa vaakyam sathya jnaana aanandha lakshnam aathmaanam prathipaadhayathi eva*" and wonders: "When the *mahaa vaakyam*, thus, reveals that 'I', as '*aham aanandha: asmi*', why cannot you accept it and claim your *aanandha svaroopam*?"

It is freely given.

And, even if there are a large number of aspirants, when the *mahaa vaakyam* gives the *aanandhaa*, it is not divided into parts. For worldly happiness, there is a problem. For instance, 'family happiness'. When the mother / father is with one member of a family, another member complains 'you do not seem to miss me'. Family happiness has to be shared, quite often resulting in sibling rivalry. When the younger child gets attention, the elder child misses it. Worldly *aanandhaa* is shared *aanandhaa*. Therefore, complaints are bound to be there. But this *aanandhaa* (of the Self) is undivided *aanandhaa* – *akanda aanandhaa*. You are also *akanda aanandhaa*; the other aspirants are also *akanda aanandhaa*. How many *akanda aanandhaa*-s are there? Ans: There is one *akanda aanandhaa*, *poornathvayaa* available for everyone.

-
- निरस्त अशेष कार्य कारणात्मक द्वैतप्रपञ्चं - which is divested of the whole world of plurality, consisting of causes and effects / in which the whole world is *mithyaa*, like a movie,

'nirastha' means *'adhyastha'* rejected as *mithyaa*. This 'rejection' is essential, because without seeing the *mithyaathvam* of the world / without falsifying the world, world cannot be converted into an entertainment. World will become a movie, only when it is falsified. So, as even as the aspirant claims *'aham sathyam'*, *'jaganmithyaathvam'* should be equally certainly ascertained. That is what the *Aachaaryaa* says here.

154. Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (19-09-2009)

With an intention to introduce a meemaasaka poorva pakshaa with regard to the mahaa vaakyam, Sureswaraachaaryaa is first consolidating what he has been teaching so far in this treatise, Naishkarmya Siddhi, viz., that, (i) the mahaa vaakyam is the greatest pramaanam, which is capable of giving the liberating knowledge and (ii) the mahaa vaakyam is the most unique pramaanam also, which functions as the final pramaanam destroying the pramaathaa himself. 'Destroying', in this context, means 'falsification'.

When the *mahaa vaakyam* 'destroys' the *pramaathaa* himself, thereafter, no other *pramaanam* is relevant, because a *pramaanam* is needed for the use of a *pramaathaa* only and it is this fundamental *pramaathaa* himself that the *mahaa vaakyam* has 'destroyed' or falsified.

To repeat: Not only is the *mahaa vaakyam* great as a liberating *vaakyam*, but it is also an unique *pramaanaam*, which removes all *pramaanams* including itself. This is because, after the falsification of *pramaathaa*, there is no more *pramaanam* in the seeker's life, since *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* itself is falsified.

In the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad, Sage Yaagnyavalkyaa also refers to this perspective in manthraa II.iv.14. He asks: "Yathra vaa asya sarvam aathmaiva abooth thath kena kam jigreth, thath kena kam pasyeth, thath kena kam srunyaath, thath kena kam abhivadeth, thath kena kam manveetha, thath kena kam vijaaneeyaath? Yena idham sarvam vijaanaathi tham kena vijaaneeyaath? Vignyaathaaram arey kena vijaaneeyath?" – "But, when to the knower of Brahman, everything has become the Self, then, what should one smell and through what, what should one see and through what, what should one hear and through what, what should one speak and through what, what should one think and through what, what should one know and through what? Through what should one know That, owing to which all this known? Through what, O Maithreyi, should one know the Knower?"

Once the *mahaa vaakyam* is assimilated, the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* is falsified and the successful aspirant remains as *apramaathaa saakshi*, in the cozy, comfortable 'binary' (*aathma-anaathma*) format. This goal can be achieved by the seeker, only with the help of *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, according to the *Advaithin*, *mahaa vaakyam* is the greatest statement in the entire cosmos. In contrast, the *meemaamsakaa* holds that, the *mahaa vaakyam* is the most *apramaana vaakyam* in the *Vedas*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is extremely important for the *Advaitha vedhaanthin* and *mahaa vaakyam* is absolutely useless for the *Meemaasaka ekadesi*.

Sureswaraachaarya wants to refute that *meemamsakaa*. Before commencing his refutation, he consolidates his stand, in this long, first sentence of the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 47. The most important portion of the sentence is "*vaakyam aathmaanam prathpaadhayathi eva*", where '*vaakyam*' denotes '*mahaa vaakyam*', '*aathmaanam*' means 'the *thureeya aathmaanam*' and '*prathipadhayathi eva*' means 'does reveal'. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* **is** a *pramaanam*, since the definition of a *pramaanam* is 'that which reveals something which is not known through any other *pramaanam*'. "*Anadhigatha abhaadhitha asandhigdha vasthu vishayaka jnaana janakam pramaanam*" is the definition, already explained in an earlier session.

To consolidate: *Mahaa vaakyam* does 'reveal' the *Saakshi aathma*. Whatever 'reveals' something new is a *pramaanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* 'reveals' something new; therefore, it does enjoy a *pramaanam* status.

And, what type of *aathmaa* does it reveal? One adjective used by *Aachaaryaa* is:

- प्रमाणान्तर अनवष्टब्धं - not accessible to any *pramaanam* other than *mahaa vaakyam*,

'*anavashtabhdam*' means 'beyond the scope of' / 'not accessible' / *anadhigatha vishayam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* uses another adjective also (which was discussed in the earlier session), viz., "*nirastha asesha kaaryakaaranaathmaka dvaitha prapancham*", meaning "which is divested of the whole world of plurality, consisting of causes and effects".

'*nirastha*' means 'free from' ; '*dvaitha prapancham*' means 'dualistic world'. '*nirastha dvaitha prapancham*' means 'free from all this dualistic world'.

This term should remind the student of the seventh *manthraa* in the *Maandookya Upanishad* "***prapanchopasamam saantham sivam advaitham***" – "**free from the world**, tranquil, auspicious and non-dual".

The *Aachaaryaa* calls the world '*dvaitha prapancham*'. What kind of *dvaitha*? The description given by the *Aachaaryaa* is '*kaarya kaaranaathmaka*' meaning 'consisting of causes and effects'. Therefore, what does '*nirastha asesha kaaryakaaranaathmaka dvaitha prapancham*' mean? Ans: *Thureeyam* is free from all the *kaaryam*-s and *kaaranam*-s / causes and effects. *Thureeyam* is *kaarya kaarana vilakshanam* ; it is also *desa kaala atheethem*.

When it is, thus, said "'I', the *Thureeyam*, am free from *dvaitha prapancham*", the student should not imagine a mystic state, in which 'I' alone will be there, without experiencing the dualistic universe. *Vedhaanthee* is **not** talking about a mystic state. Even in the waking

stage, the successful aspirant understands himself to be free from the perceived universe. *Perceiving* the universe, he says "I am free from the perceived universe". How can he say so? Ans: Because of his firm understanding and conviction that the perceived universe is of a lower order of reality, while, 'I' am of a higher order of reality. Therefore, even while perceiving the world, he says the world is as good as 'not there'. The successful aspirant is in *advaitam*, not in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* alone; he is in *advaitam* **always** – *thrishu api kaaleshu, sarvaasu avasthaasu*. *Vedhaanthaa* is talking about an *advaitam*, which is available in *jaagrath avasthaa* itself. That is the reason why Sureswaraacharya says : "Mahaa vaakyam produces *advaita jnaanam* on *sravanam* itself. You do not have to go to another so-called higher state".`

'I' am in *advaitam* even now, if I understand that the perceived universe is of a lower order. And, that non-dual 'I' is called '*nirastha asesha kaarya kaaranathmaka dvaita prapancham*'. That is 'my' title. What a title? To remember the title is difficult. But 'I' have got this wonderful title, which every diligent seeker should claim.

"*Nirastha: prapancha: yasmaath sa: advitheeya aathmaa aham asm'*" ("I' am the non-dual *aathmaa*, from whom the whole universe is divested") is what is revealed by the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Sureswaraacharya gives a third definition (also discussed in the earlier session) to *aathmaa*, using the compound term "*sathya jnaana aanandha lakshanam aathmaanam*". *Thaithreya Upanishad* says: "'I' am *sathyam jnaanam anantham*". Sureswaraacharya makes a modification. Instead of using the word '*anantha*', he uses the word '*aanandha*'.

(Swamiji says in a lighter vein: The use of the term '*aanandha*', by the *Aacharya*, is probably deliberate, since, he presumably wants more people to be attracted to the study of *Vedhaanthaa*. An "'*anantha*' *aathmaa* existing somewhere" may not interest people. But the possibility of achieving an "'*aanandha*' *aathmaa*" is bound to attract more people, human nature being what it is.)

And, Sureswaraacharya avers "*Mahaa vaakyam prathipaadhayathi eva*" meaning "*Mahaa vaakyam* does reveal such an *aathmaa*".

What else does the *mahaa vaakyam* do ? The *Aacharya* answers this, by the term "*samsayitha mithyaa jnaana ajaana pradhvamsamukhena*". By its revelation / by giving this knowledge about *aathmaa* (Self), *mahaa vaakyam* destroys three things: *ajannam*, *mithyaa jnaanam* and *samsayitha jnaanam*. '*Ajannam*' means 'Self- ignorance'. '*Mithyaa jnaanam*' means 'misconceptions (about the Self)'. '*Samsayitha jnaanam*' means 'doubts (about the

Self)'. *Mahaa vaakyam* destroys the ignorance, the misconceptions and the doubts, with regard to 'me', as a liberated person.

To clarify the distinction between *jnaanam*, *mithyaa jnaanam*, *samsayitha jnaanam* and *ajnaanam*, Swamiji talks of an 'experiment', that might be conducted. He says: "Suppose I conduct an experiment. I arrange two sets of chairs, one on my right and the other on my left. I tell you, that, the chairs on my right side are for 'liberated' people and the chairs on my left are for *samsaari*-s. I invite you to choose your seat on my right or on my left, as you deem suitable for you. I can visualize the result of my invitation. There will be some students who will choose to come and sit on the 'liberated person' chairs, making me happy. Another set of students will sit on the '*samsaari*' chairs, arguing that 'liberation is far away'. A third group will stand wondering where to sit; and there will be a small, fourth group also, who will continue to sit in their present seats, without any reaction. This shows that there are (i) one set of people who have **no ignorance** about the true nature of their Selves (ii) one set of people who have the **misconception** that their Selves are not liberated (iii) a third group which is in **doubt** of the nature of their Selves and (iv) a fourth group which is **totally ignorant** of the concept of 'liberation'. If *mahaa vaakyam* is listened to properly, **all** the students without exception, should head for the *asamsaari* chairs and there must be no occupant of the *samsaari* chairs". Again in a lighter vein, Swamiji adds: "I am not conducting this experiment for the present, since I do not want to get disappointed. I am postponing the experiment to the last day of my life, assuming that I will continue to teach till my last day, when I will conduct the experiment, so that my 'disappointment' will last only for one day".

Sureswaraachaarya confidently avers that the *mahaa vaakyam* will give *aathma jnaanam*, totally destroying ignorance, doubt and misconceptions. How can he be so confident? Ans: Because, it has worked for him.

And, how does the *mahaa vaakyam* 'reveal'? Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the word '*saakshaath*' meaning 'directly'. This word is very important, since, according to Sureswaraachaaryaa, '*aparoksha jnaanam*' is in *sravanam* itself. 'Realization' has to take place in *sravanam*, in the form of clear understanding. 'Realization' is not in the form of a mystic experience in *samaadhi*. It is a clear understanding, during *sravanam* itself. That is why he uses the word *saakshaath*.

The *Aachaaryaa* gives an example for the 'clarity' of the revelation given by *mahaa vaakyam*. He says that the *mahaa vaakyam* 'directly' gives 'clear' knowledge, '*karathala nyastha aamalakavath*' meaning 'like an *aamalakaa* fruit, kept on the palm of the hand'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes the sentence with the statement "*ithi asakruth abhihitham*", meaning "This particular idea, I have said repeatedly".

He implies: "But, in spite of that, the *poorva meemaasakaa* or *meemaamsaka ekadesi* is challenging my statement and says: '*mahaa vaakyam* is not a *pramaanam*. It does not give any knowledge. When it does not give any knowledge, where is the question of a 'liberating' knowledge? No knowledge takes place; no liberation takes place. The *mahaa vaakyam* is utterly useless; in fact, the entire *Vedhaanthaa* portion is a 'barren' part of *Veda*. *Veda ooshaaraa: Vedhaanthaa* | Just as in a country, there are fertile lands and there are barren lands also, the *Veda* also has got a fertile portion, as well as a barren portion. The fertile portion is the *Veda Poorva* or *Karma Kaandaa* portion, which talks of *karmaa*-s of all types - *nithya*, *naimitthika*, *kaamyaa*, *praayaschittha* and *nishiddha karmaani*. The *Karma Kaandaa* is the useful portion of *Veda*. *Vedhaanthaa* comes under the 'barren' portion of *Veda*. The *mahaa vaakyam*, which comes in that portion, has no relevance at all".

This is the *poorva pakshaa*, that is going to be introduced. The *Aachaaryaa* says '*asakruth abhihitham*' - 'I have repeatedly taught the importance of *mahaa vaakyam*'. And, seems to imply: "Now, look at the arrogance of the *poorva meemaamsakaa*".

(Further) Sambhandha Gadyam to Verses 47 & 48:

तत्र केचिदाहुः तत्त्वस्यादिवाक्यैः यथावस्थितवस्तुयाथात्म्यं अन्वाख्याननिष्ठैः न यथोक्तोऽर्थः प्रतिपत्तुं शक्यतेऽभिधाश्रुतित्वात् तेषाम् ।

In this connection, some raise the following objection: The texts like 'That thou art', purporting to expound reality as it actually is, cannot convey the meaning ascribed to them for they are existential in import.

- तत्र - This being so,

What does 'this being so' mean? Ans: It means "While the *Advaitin's* view is that *mahaa vaakyam* is the most productive *vaakyam* for a seeker",

The *Aachaaryaa* is introducing a counter-point given by the *meemaamsaka ekadesi*.

- केचित् - the *meemaamsaka ekadesi*
- आहुः - argues (as follows):

The quotation of the *poorva pakshin's* objections starts with the term '*thathvamasyaadhi*' in this second sentence of this *sambhandha gadhyam* and continues up to the word '*niyogasya*' in the fourth sentence of the same *sambhandha gadhyam*.

What does the *meemaamsakaa* say? This particular view of the *meemaamsakaa* is presented by Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, and also refuted by him, in an elaborate analysis, while discussing the 4th *soothraa* - '***thath thu samanvayaathi***' - in the *Brahma Soothraa*-s. There, Sankaraachaaryaa points out, that, the very word '*thu*' is in refutation of the *meemaamsaka poorva paksham* and follows up with an elaborate analysis. A similar analysis is done here, by Sureswaraachaaryaa, but briefly.

To present the *Meemaamsakaa's* objection:

The *meemaasakaa* says that statements can be classified into two types – (i) *siddha bodhaka vaakyani* and (ii) *kaarya bodhaka vaakyani*. He claims that any statement uttered by anyone, can come only under one of these two types.

'*Siddha bodhaka vaakyani*' may be interpreted as 'statements of facts'. For instance, the statements "(i) There is a place called *Gangodhri* (ii) It is at an elevation of 10,000 ft., above sea level (iii) There is a temple for *Ganga* there (iv) River *Ganga* flows there etc." are 'statements of facts'. In 'statements of facts', there is no commandment / no prescription of any action. There is no direction to the listener to carry out something. 'Statements of existential facts' are called '*siddha bodhaka vaakyani*'. Negatively expressed, 'non-action-prescribing' statements are called '*siddha bodhaka vaakyani*'.

The second group of statements is '*kaarya bodhaka vaakyani*', meaning 'statements of commandments'. Examples are: (i) Get up early in the morning (ii) Do *soorya namsakaaraa* (iii) Take bath (iv) Worship / do *Puja* to *Bhagavaan* (v) perform some *japa* etc. All the verbs in these sentences, viz., 'get up', 'do', 'take', 'worship', 'perform' etc. are commandments, termed 'imperative modes' in English grammar. The statements are not statements with present tense verbs but statements with 'imperative modes', where the listener is enjoined to do various actions. *Karma kaandaa* is full of statements directing an individual to do one action or another. *Sathyam vadha, dharmam chara, svaadhyaayaath maa pramadha:, sathyaan na pramadhithavyam* etc., are all 'imperative modes', otherwise called 'potential modes', in short, 'instructions'. All the instructive statements are called '*kaarya bodhaka vaakyani*'. *Karma Kaandaa* is full of *kaarya bodhaka vaakyani*, while *jnaana kaandaa* contains mostly *siddha bodhaka vaakyani*.

What the *poorva meemaamsakaa* says is that, all *siddha bodhaka vaakyani* are *apramaanam*. According to him, they are not valid statements / not worth considering as

pramaanam, whereas, all *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani* are *pramaana vaakyaani*, because they enjoin new activities, which are not known through any other means. For instance, *Sandhya Vandhanam* can never be prescribed by a book on any other subject, say Physics or Chemistry.

Sandhya Vandhanam is a new 'action' prescribed, which we learn only from *Veda Poorvaa*, and through the 'action', we derive some benefit also. "Instructive' *vaakyaam-s* are *pramaana vaakyaam-s*. They are new and they are also useful, whereas *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are not *pramaana vaakyaani*" is the *poorva meemaasakaa's* statement. Later, the *poorva meemaasakaa* himself explains the reasons for his view.

Reverting to the text:

- तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्यैः : - From the statements like *thathvamasi* etc.

The use of the term '*aadhI* (etc.)' implies inclusion of other *maaha vaakyams* also.

- यथावस्थित वस्तु याथात्म्य अन्वाख्यान निष्ठैः - which are in the form of *siddha bodhakam*,

The whole compound '*yathaa vasthitha vasthu yaathaathmya anvaakyaana nishtai:*', in simpler language means '*siddha bodhaka roopai:*' |

'*yathaa vasthitha vasthu yaathaathmyam*' means 'nature of a thing as it is' and simply means '*siddham*'.

'*Yathaa vasthitha*' means 'as it is'; '*vasthu*' means 'thing'; '*yaathaathmyam*' means 'nature'. '*Yaatha vasthitha vasthu yaathaathmyam*', therefore, means 'nature of a thing as it is', exactly as in the statements 'there is a place called *Gangodhri* etc. The statements "(i) There is a place called *Gangodhri* (ii) It is at an elevation of 10,000 ft., above sea level (iii) There is a temple for *Ganga* there (iv) River *Ganga* flows there etc." are all statements of facts about *Gangodhri*, as *Gangodhri* is.

In simple language, '*yathaa vasthitha vasthu yaathaathmyam*' means '*siddham*'.

As for the term '*anvaakyaana nishtai:*', the term literally means 'committed to reveal'. '*Nishtai:*' means 'committed'. What are committed? Ans: The sentences are committed. What are the sentences committed to? Ans: '*anvaakyaanam*', which means 'revelation'. '*anvaakyaana nishtai:*' is adjective to '*vaakya:*', meaning 'committed to reveal'. '*Yathaa vasthitha vasthu yaathaathmya anvaakyaana nishtai:*', therefore, means 'sentences which

are committed to reveal the nature of a thing as the thing is'. In simple English, it means 'statements of facts'. By such statements (the *poorva meemaamasakaa* holds):

- प्रतिपत्तुं न शक्यते - it is not possible to know 'prathipatthi.' means 'knowledge'; 'prathipatthum' means 'to know'.
- यथोक्त अर्थ : - any new fact,

"By such statements as 'thath thvam asi', it is not possible to know any new facts" is the essence of this sentence 'thathvamasyaadhi vaakyai: yathaavasthitha vasthuyaathaatmyaana anvaakhayaanaishtai: na yathokthortha: prathipatthum sakyathe'. To express in simple language "they are not pramaana vaakyams / they do not enjoy the status of pramaanam / they do not deserve the definition as pramaanam".

Why do they not deserve such a definition?

These are all technical portions which had been discussed earlier, while talking about four conditions of a *pramaanaa*, in verses 35, 36, 37 and 38 of this same chapter III. In that portion, four conditions were given for a *vaakyam* to enjoy the *pramaanam* status. The *poorva meemaasakaa* is questioning one of the four conditions stated as required for a statement to be valid. According to the *poorva pakshin*,

- तेषां अभिधा श्रुतित्वात् - because such statements are *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani*.

'*abhithaa sruthi*' is another word for '*siddha bodhaka vaakyam*', translated as 'statement of facts, as they exist', also implying 'not statement of commandment'.

Having said this, hereafter the *poorva pakshin* has to explain as to why a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* cannot be a *pramaanam*, because that is the *vyaapthi*.

'Mahaa vaakyam apramaanam siddha bodhaka vaakyathvaath' is the *poorva pakshin*'s *anumaanam* (conclusion by inference). For this, he is using a *vyaapthi jnaanam* (an universal rule), viz. "yathra yathra siddha bodhakathvam thathra thathra aparamaanathvam" meaning "whatever statements are 'statements of facts', those statements are apramaana vaakyani". Now, he has to establish why. He has to answer the question "Why do you say this?" The *poorva pakshin*'s justification follows.

(Further) Sambhandha Gadhyam to Verses 47 & 48:

न हि लोकेऽभिधाश्रुते :प्रमाणान्तरनिरपेक्षायाः नध्यास्तीरे फलानि सन्तीत्यादिकाया :प्रामाण्यभ्युपगतम्।

In ordinary life, existential statements like 'On the bank of the rivers, there are fruits', not supported by other corroborative evidence, are not accorded validity.

The *poorva meemaamsaka's* logic is to be studied carefully.

Going back to the examples of 'statements of facts', given earlier, viz., "There is a place called *Gangodhri*; it is at an elevation of 10,000 ft. above sea level; it is a very cold place; river *Ganga* is flowing there" etc., if the question "Are they *pramaanam* or not?" is asked, the *poorva meemaamsaka* would say "These statements do not enjoy *pramaanam* status. Though they are revealing facts, they do not enjoy *pramaanam* status".

He would justify his view in the following manner:

"Definition of *pramanaam*, is 'that which produces knowledge'. In other words: 'Producer of knowledge', is '*pramaanam*'. Expressed in Sanskrit, '*Pramaa janakam Pramaanam*'. Now, in these statements, how were the particular facts, viz.,

- (i) there is *Gangodhri*
- (ii) it is at an elevation of 10,000 ft.
- (iii) that place is very cold and
- (iv) that river *Ganga* is flowing there etc., known by the person making those statements? He might have read them in a book or heard them from someone. But, ultimately, this knowledge is derived from somebody, who had gone to *Gangodhri*, measured the elevation, observed the cold climate, the flowing of the *Ganga* etc.

"In other words, this knowledge about *Gangodhri* was generated by *prathyaksha pramaanam* alone, though it may not be known as to who visited *Gangodhri* and made these observations first.

"And, after *prathyaksha pramaanam* had revealed the facts about *Gangodhri*, the person who got that *prathyaksha pramaana* knowledge had transferred that knowledge through 'words'. Now, the question is: 'Are the words 'transferring' the knowledge or 'generating' the knowledge? i.e. Are they 'carriers' of knowledge or 'generators' of knowledge?' The answer to this, will have to be: 'The words do not have the power to *produce* the knowledge of *Gangodhri*. They are only 'carrying' / 'transferring' the knowledge which was generated by *prathyaksha pramaanam*'.

"The *vaakyaani* / statements are '*prathyaksha pramaana janya jnaana anuvaadhaka vaakyaani*- 'sentences restating the knowledge which was and can only be gathered by *prathyaksha pramaanam*'. Therefore, it follows, that, there is no new knowledge generated by these *vaakyaani*.

“*Pramaanam*’ is defined as ‘*anadhigatha, abhaadhitha, asandhighdha jnaana janakam pramaanam*’. Something is a *pramaanam*, only when it reveals something which cannot be known through another *pramaanam*. A ‘source of knowledge’ is so called only because it reveals or produces a knowledge which is not generated by any other source.

“Knowledge on *Gangodhri* was gained only through *prathyaksha pramaanam*. The knowledge about the ‘coldness’ of *Gangodhri* can be gathered only through *prathyaksha pramaanam* and that *prathyaksha jnaana* is only re-stated or ‘carried’ by *vaakyam*. Therefore, it should be called *anuvaadhaka vaakyam*. All *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are *pramanaanaanthara janya jnaana anuvaadhaka vaakyaani* and an *anuvaadhaka vaakyam* can never be a *pramaana vaakyam*”.

In this *sambhandha gadhyam*, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* gives another example, in the place of *Gangodhri*:

नध्या तीरे पलानि सन्ति : - On the bank of the river there are many fruits strewn .

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* says: “Imagine that there is a fruit tree on a river bank and that, ripened fruits have fallen from the tree. Therefore there are many fruits on the bank. An onlooker makes a comment ‘*nadhyaa: therey palaani santhi*’ - ‘on the bank of the river there are many fruits strewn’. Can this *vaakyam* be taken as a *pramaana vaakyam*?” The *poorva meemaamsakaa* proceeds: “According to my logic it cannot be taken as *pramaana vaakyam*. ‘*Siddha bodhavathkaathvath idham vakyam apramaanam*’ – ‘being only a statement of an observed fact, this sentence is **not** a source of knowledge’. *Prathyaksham* alone is the *pramaanam*. This *Vaakyam* is only *anuvaadhakam*, since it is only revealing the observed fact of fruits being there, and not *pramaanam*. An *anuvaadhaka vaakyam* is a ‘transporter’ of knowledge, **not** a ‘producer’ of knowledge; therefore, it is *apraamaanam*. Now, what about your *mahaa vaakyam*? It is also only a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. My *vyaapthi jnaanam* / general knowledge, is ‘*yathra yathra siddha bodhakathvam thathra thathra apramaanathvam*’. What is my example? The *vaakyam* ‘*nadhyaa: therey palaani santhi*’. From that *vaakyam*, I get this *vyaapthi jnaanam*, that, any statement which is *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* is *apraamaanam*. I apply this *vyaapthi jnaanam* to *mahaa vaakyam* also. I make an *anumanaam*: ‘*mahaa vaakyam apramannam siddha bodhakathvaath, nadhyaa: therey palaani santhi*’ *ithi vaakyavath*”.

Addressing the Vedhaanthin, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* would say: “In the face of these facts, why are you harping on *mahaa vaakya vichaaram*, with all its emphasis on *thath padha vichaaraa, thvam padha vichaaraa, saamaanaadhikaranya sambhandhaa, viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa, lakshana-lakshya-sambhandhaa* etc.? It is a waste of time. What

have you achieved by just saying aathmaa is the same as Brahman? Your physical and mental problems have not been solved in any manner. Therefore, instead of Veda anthaa, why do you not get interested in the Veda Poorvaa or Karma Kaandaa of the Vedas? May you take to performing rituals and parihaaram-s, as prescribed in the Karma Kaandaa, to tide over your worldly problems. Listening to 'jeevaathma - Paramaathma - aikyam' even for a length of time, has not helped you in your worldly problems. From this itself, it must be clear to you, that Vedhaanthaa is useless and that, Karma Kaandaa is useful. Therefore, drop Vedhaanthaa and move to Veda Poorvaa". Therefore, he says:

- लोके - In ordinary life,
- अभिधा श्रुतेः - siddha bodhaka vaakyam-s,
- 'नध्या इत्यादिकाया ' तीरे पलानि सन्ति : : - like the statement 'on the bank of the river, there are fruits strewn' etc.,
- प्रमाणान्तर निरपेक्षायः : - if not supported by another *pramaanam* like *prathyakshaa* / if not supported by other corroborative evidence ,

The term 'pramaanaanathara nirapekshayaa:' is adjective to 'abhidhaa sruthe:'. 'abidhaa sruthi:' means 'siddha bodhaka sruthi vaakyam'.

- प्रामाण्यं न अभ्युपगतम् - are not accorded validity at all.

If and when the statement "Gangodhri is cold" is made by someone, the normal tendency of the listener would be to question the speaker "Have you visited Gangodhri?" If the speaker replies in the affirmative "Yes, I have visited Gangodhri", then his word will be accepted and any statement made by him about Gangodhri will get better validity. Conversely, if a person describes some place eloquently without visiting that place, even his eloquent descriptions will not be treated with validity.

In the context of Vedhaanthaa also, the student is eager to know whether the guru has had directly experienced Brahman. If the guru is a Brahmanishta:, his statements are more readily accepted as valid; otherwise the guru is looked upon to be just a scholar.

These facts show that, any 'statement' is expected to be proved through another *pramaanam*.

A Sanskrit saying goes: "vidwan eva vijaanaathi vidvath jana parisramam; na hi vandhyaa vijaanaathi kurveem prasava vedhanaa" - "Only a jnaani knows what is jnaanam; a barren woman cannot talk about labour pain".

If a man gives 'labour pain' as example for some physical pain, the listener is bound to be amused and ask "How do you know about labour pain?" Such non-experienced examples will give only *samsayitha jnaanam* and not clear knowledge.

Thus, any eloquent description of some fact without experiencing the fact through another *pramaanam* – generally *prathyaksha* - will not get absolute validity.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* applies these *lokika* experiences to the *mahaa vaakyam* also. He says "In the same manner, *mahaa vaakyam* also can never be valid by itself. If at all it should get validity, that must be a knowledge gathered through some other *pramaanam*".

That is why people think that the other *pramaanam* is *samaadhi* and believe that whoever had gone to *samaadhi* and had directly experienced *Brahman*, for them, this *vaakyam* is *pramaanam*.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* firmly believes that a 'statement of fact' can never have validity, without the support of another *pramaanam*, which gives direct experience.

Therefore, what should the seeker do, according to him?

He says: "You should extend the same principle to *Veda vakyam* also. We do want to accept the entire *Veda* as *pramaanam*. All *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani* are *pramaanam*. Therefore, we have no problems with the *karma kaandaa* of the *Veda*, which contains only *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani*. But, *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are *apramaanam*, because of the logic '*yathra yathra siddha bodhakathvam thathra thathra apramaanathvam*'. If any part of *Veda* contains any *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, that part of *Veda* will become *apramaanam*. But, what we also want is, that, the entire *Veda* should be *pramaanam*. Therefore, a modification is needed to make the entire *Veda* a *pramaanam*. The needed modification, in such places, is to add the verb '*ithi upaaseetha*'. '*Ithi upaaseetha*' means 'thus may you meditate'. Once you add 'may you meditate' after the *mahaa vaakyam*, the *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* will be converted into a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* – a commandment or an injunction. The commandment is to do a *saadhanaa* - 'meditation *saadhanaa*'. The activity of 'meditation' is assigned to the seeker. Following the injunction, the seeker will do the *karma* called meditation; his *samsaara* will gradually fade as even he practices intense meditation round the clock; and, as a result of long meditation, will at last be destroyed totally. '*aham Brahma asmi upaasanaa dhyana karma* will give the *sadhakaa* 'liberation' in the future. Therefore, convert *mahaa vaakyam* into *dhyana kriyaa bodhaka vaakyam*; do not say that *mahaa vaakyam* is 'revealing' a fact; if you say it is revealing a fact, it will become a *siddha*

bodhaka vaakyam and if it is *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, it will become *apramaanam*. Therefore, kindly listen to my words”.

That is what is said here, in the next sentence, by the *Poorva Meemaamsakaa*.

This conversion is called *niyoga*. *Niyoga vaakyam*, when used for *mahaa vaakyam*, means *vidhi vaakyam* or *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*.

155. Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (26-09-2009)

In this introduction to verse 47, Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting a *poorva pakshaa* from *meemaamsaka ekadesi*; '*ekadesi*' refers to a particular group among *poorva meemaasaka* philosophers.

In the earlier session, two types of statements were discussed: *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* and *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani*. The *meemaamsaka ekadesi* uses another word '*abhithaa sruthi:*', for the *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. In this word, '*sruthi:*' refers to '*sruthi vaakyam*' and the word '*abhithaa*' means 'naming' or 'revealing'.

According to the *meemaamsaka ekadesi*, the **entire** *Veda Poorvaa* **is** *pramaanam*, whereas the **entire** *Vedhaanthaa* is **not**, because, according to him, only *kaarya bodhaka vaakyaani* are *pramaanam* and *Veda Poorva* alone prescribes activities for attaining specific results. In *Vedha Anthaa*, there are only some sentences prescribing activities like *upaasanaa*. The *meemaamsaka ekadesi* holds, that, among *Vedha Anthaa* statements, only such statements which prescribe activities can be taken as *pramaanam*, while any statement which reveals only a fact cannot be accepted as a *pramaanam*. Therefore, according to him, the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thathvamas*' also cannot be taken as a *pramaanam* as it is, because '*thathvamas*' does not prescribe any action.

The *meemaamsaka ekadesi* gives the reason also for his view. He cites a sentence as an example: '*naddyaa: theerey palaani santhi*'. The sentence means 'there are fruits on the bank of the rivers'. He points out that this statement cannot be considered a *pramaanam*, because, it does not satisfy one of the conditions to be a *pramaanam*, viz., the condition that 'a *pramaanam* should be revealing something which is not accessible to any other *pramaanam*'. This criterion is called '*anadhigathathvam*' or '*apoorvathad*'.

'*Anadhigathathvam*' or '*apoorvathad*' is the status of a *pramaanam* and that status indicates that the *pramaanam* reveals something which is not available for any other *pramaanam*. Eyes are called *pramaanam*, because they reveal forms and colours, which cannot be revealed by any other sense organ, ear or nose or tongue. Similarly, each sense organ is a *pramaanam* in its own field, because each reveals an unique knowledge. This 'uniqueness' is a criterion for a *pramaanam*.

With regard to the sentence '*naddyaa: theerey palaani santhi*', the *vaakyam* does not reveal anything unique, since that knowledge had already been gained by *prathyaksha pramaanam*. And, a person who had gained that knowledge through *prathyakshaa* is only conveying that already acquired knowledge through the sentence '*naddyaa: theerey*'

palaani santhi. Therefore, that *vaakyam* is only a 'knowledge-carrier' and not a 'knowledge-producer'.

Then, in that case, what produced the knowledge? Only the eyes revealed that there is a river, there is a riverbank and that there are fruits. And, importantly, even the receiver of the statement can understand the meaning of the sentence only if he had experienced a river before and only if he had experienced fruits before. Only a person who had already experienced *nadhi, theeram, palaani* etc., can receive the knowledge.

So, the receiver of the sentence (the listener) also must know *nadhi, theeram, palaani* etc., previously through *prathyaksha pramaanam*; and, the speaker also talks about them, only after employing *prathyaksha pramaanam*. In the absence of *prathyaksha pramaanam*, the speaker cannot talk about *nadhi, theeram* or *palaani*; nor can the receiver understand the sentence. A blind person cannot talk about them and a blind person cannot also understand this statement. Thus, the *vaakyam* depends on *prathyaksha pramaanam* for conveying the message and for receiving the message also. Since the knowledge had to be obtained by another *pramaanam* viz., *prathyakshaa*, it follows that, '*naddhyaa: theerey palaani santhi*' is '*apraamaanam*' – 'not a *pramaanam*', '*pramaananthara gamyathvaath*'.

The *meemaamsaka* ekadesi extending the argument to *mahaa vaakyam*, says "thaththvamsi' apramaanam siddha bodhaka vaakyathvaath 'naddhyaa: theerey palaani santhi' vaakyavath" meaning "similar to this sentence 'there are fruits on the riverbank', 'that thou art' is also *apraamaanam*, since it is only a statement of a fact".

But the *meemaamsakaa* has a problem. He cannot totally reject the *mahaa vaakyam* 'thaththvam as', since it is a *veda vaakyam* and the *meemaamsakaa* also is a *mahaa vaidhikaa* (believer in *Vedas*). In fact, for him, *Veda* is '*pramaana moordhanya*:', 'the greatest *pramaanam*'. Since *Veda* as a whole has been accepted as a *pramaanam* by the *meemaamsakaa*, he cannot throw away or totally reject the *mahaa vaakyam*. At the same time, he cannot also totally accept it as a *pramaanam*.

In Tamil, there is a saying "மெல்லவும் முடியவில்லை, முழுங்கவும்முடியவில்லை"- "impossible to chew and impossible to swallow also", to denote such dilemmas. There is a similar saying in Malayalam also. Therefore, the *meemaamsakaa* desires to manipulate the *mahaa vaakyam* and to 'raise' the *apraamaana vaakyam* into a *pramaana vaakyam*. How to do that? The *meemaamsakaa's* theory is that 'only *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are *apraamaanam*, while *kaarya bodhaka vakkayaani* **are** *pramaanam*'. '*Kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*' means 'a statement of commandment', a statement which prescribes some action or other. Therefore, what does he do? He converts *siddha*

bodhaka vaakyam into *kaarya bodhaka vaakya*, by adding a commandment. The *meemaamsakaa* resorts to this stratagem very often, in his *Veda Poorva* commentary also.

We have such cases in worldly affairs also. An example was discussed in an earlier session. Suppose somebody says "I am very, very thirsty" and a listener responds "There is water in that corner". Even though the listener's sentence is only a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, there is a suggestion implicit in the sentence, viz., "go and drink the water, so that, your thirst will be quenched". The suggestion / commandment is not directly given but is implied. Similarly, if the *guru* says "I am thirsty", the *sishtyaa* will immediately run and fetch some water, even though the *guru* had not issued any direct command. He had made only a statement of fact / a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, viz., "I am thirsty".

In a similar manner, the *meemaamsaka ekadesi* adds an implied command to the *mahaa vaakyam* also. What is that implied command? Ans: "*Ithi upaaseetha*". He does not stop merely with the statement '*thath thvam asi*', but, modifies it as "'*thath thvam asi*' *ithi upaaseetha*".

This 'supplying' of the '*upaaseetha*' verb is not totally unprecedented. In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, there is a famous saying '*aathmaa itheva upaaseetha*' (I. iv. 7). The *poorva pakshin* (the *meemaamsaka ekadesi*) says "since a similar commandment is available in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, why not 'lift' that '*upaasanaa*' and add it here to the *mahaa vaakyam*?"

So, according to the *poorva pakshin*, *Vedhaanthaa's* exhortation is: "O Student ! Do not stop with just listening to the *guru* stating the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*', assuming that the learning process is complete. You should listen to the *vaakyam*, understand it as a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* and then go on meditating '*aham brahma asmi*'. Does not the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* also exhort '*aathmaa vaa arey dhrashtavya: , srothavya: , manthavya: , nidhidhyaasithavya:*' (II.iv.5)? Does not that *manthraa* mean that '*aathmaa* should be meditated upon?'".

The only difference between '*upaaseetha*' and '*nidhidhyaasithavya:*' is that '*upaaseetha*' is in active voice and '*nidhidhyaasithavya:*' is in passive voice. One is a direct commandment 'meditate upon (*aathmaa*)' and the other says '(*aathmaa*) should be meditated upon.

So, in the opinion of the *poorva pakshin*, *Vedhaanthaa* directs the seeker to do a *saadhanaa* – viz. 'meditation', for a length of time. He avers: "This commandment to 'meditate', is the meaning of *mahaa vaakyam*. Just 'understanding' the *mahaa vaakyam* is not enough".

This is *poorva pakshaa*. Unfortunately, many *Vedhaanthic* students find this *poorva meemaamsakaa* very appealing and tend to erroneously think "What is the use of saying 'aham brahma asmi'? My problems continue, as usual. I should engage in meditation. I have to do the *saadhanaa*, 'aham brahma asmi' meditation, for a length of time. And, as a result of this meditation, sometime in the future, *mukthi*: or *mokshaa* will result for me".

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verses 47 & 48:

अतो नियोगमुखेनैवाभिधाश्रुतेः प्रामाण्यं युक्तं प्रामाणान्तरनिरपेक्षत्वानिनियोगस्य ।

Hence such statements must be thought as valid by means of their connections with injunctive propositions, for injunctive propositions are independent of other sources of knowledge.

- **अतः** - Therefore,

'Therefore' means: 'siddha bodhaka vaakyam is not pramaanam; mahaa vaakyam is a siddha bodhaka vaakyam; therefore, mahaa vaakyam is not a pramaanam; and, therefore'.

- **नियोगमुकेन एव** - only by converting *mahaa vaakyam* into a commandment,

'*niyoga*.' means '*vidhi*.' / '*aagnyaad* / commandment. And, 'commandment' in the context of *Vedas*, always refers to some *saadhanaa* on the part of the seeker.

It is generally seen, that all spiritual seekers are anxious to take to some *saadhanaa* or other.

(Swamiji, from his own experience, says: "Whenever my students have a private meeting with me, they ask "Swamiji! Do you have some special advice for me?" That means that they want a secret, special commandment which I can give and which they can follow, so that *mokshaa* will come quickly".)

Every seeker is eager to receive advice on some 'action', so that *mokshaa* will be brought nearer. On the other hand, Sureswaraachaaryaa is struggling to convey "*mokshaa* need not be 'brought'; it is your *svaroopam*". The student nods his head, as if he has understood the teaching and is also in total agreement with it, but, wants to 'do' some *saadhanaa*, so that the process of '*mokshaa* event' can be hastened.

With the same misconception, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* says "nyogamukhena eva" meaning "only by converting *mahaa vaakyam* into a commandment prescribing intense meditation, preferably culminating in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, by that process".

This is a school of thought which is now widely preached also: "You have to regularly practice *samaadhi*, because of which the mind will gradually 'melt away', like an ice block becoming smaller and smaller, while melting. Every time you sit in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, a percentage of '*mano naasaad*' takes place; when sufficient *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* is practiced the '*mano naasaad*' will be complete; and, when mind perishes, you are liberated '*aathmaad*'. This is **not** the real teaching of *Vedhaanthaa*; but, is only one of the prevailing confusions in understanding *Vedhaanthic* teaching. This erroneous concept, viz., "regular practice of *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* results in '*mano naasaad*', hastening the '*mokshaad*' process" is a result of every seeker thinking "I should **become** *muktha*.". This 'becoming' tendency is so rampant and deep, that any *saadhanaa* prescribed, mystic or regular, is 'lapped up' by the aspirant.

Reverting to the text: The *meemaamsakaa* has said '*nyogamukhena eva*', meaning 'by only converting to a commandment'. '*mukhena*' means 'by means of'.

And, how to do that? It is not explicitly mentioned here; but, the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* suggestion is that, it is to be done by adding the commandment '*ithi upaaseetha*' – 'thus, you meditate'.

- **प्रामाण्यं** - validity (and utility)
- **युक्तं** - can be ascribed
- **अभिधाश्रुते** : - to all siddha bodhaka vaakyam-s;

The *poorva pakshin* gives his reason also for this.

नियोगस्य प्रमाणान्तर निरपेक्षत्वात् - because, 'commandment' does not depend upon other *pramaanam*-s.

Whenever a fresh action is prescribed, it has not been known earlier, through other *pramaanam*-s i.e., it is not dependent on other *pramaanam*-s.

Up to this is the *poorva pakshaa*.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa has to negate the *poorva pakshaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verses 47 & 48:

अस्य परिहारार्थं अशेषप्रत्यक्षादिप्रमेयत्व निराकरणद्वारेण अतीन्द्रियार्थविषयत्वात् अभिधाश्रुते :प्रामाण्यं सुप्तपुरुषप्रबोधकवाक्यस्य इव वक्तव्यं इत्ययमारम्भः। :

In order to rule out this objection, it has to be pointed out now that these existential texts of the *sruthi* relate to a theme, which being super sensuous, transcends all other means of knowledge like perception and hence are valid, like the words that wake up a man from sleep. For this purpose, the next phase of the argument is initiated:

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa discusses this topic very, very elaborately, in his bhaashyam for the fourth Brahma soothraa, 'thatthusamanvayaath'. The two varieties of meemaamsaka vaadhaa-s – Praabhaakara meemaamsaka vaadhaa and Bhaatta meemaamsaka vadhaa - are discussed and refuted by him there. Even among the Vedhaanthins, there is a group who are closer to the meemaamsakaa-s. They are called Vedhaantha eka desi-s or vrutthikaraa-s | Vrutthikaara madhaa is closer to meemaamsakaa in its beliefs. The views of the vrutthikaraa-s are also elaborately discussed and refuted by Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in the context of the 4th soothraa of Brahma Soothraa-s.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is summing up those discussions here. One particular aspect discussed by Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in the *bhaashyam* to the '*thatththu samanvayaath/soothraa*', is **not** covered by Sureswaraachaaryaa here, but, is worth studying in this context.

The course of that argument is as follows: "Just for argument's sake, (this type of approach is called *abhyupedhya vaadha*), let us accept the *meemaamsakaa's* views. Let us assume (i) that, *mahaa vaakyam* is not a *pramaanam* (ii) that, we supply the words '*ithi upaaseetha*' (iii) that, the *mahaa vaakyam* becomes a *pramaanam*, because of conversion into an *upaasana kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*, *upaasanam* being a *maanasa karma* (iv) that, a spiritual seeker practices *mahaa vaakya upaasanam* for several years and (v) that, as a result of long *upaasanaa*, he 'gets' *mokshaa*.

"Now, what is that *mokshaa*? It is *upaasanaa palan*. What is *upaasanaa*? Ans: It is '*maanasa karamaa*'. As a result of meditation, a mental activity, that aspirant 'got' *mokshaa* on a particular date.

"Sankaraachaaryaa asks 'what will be the nature of that *mukthi*?' and answers himself : "That *mukthi*: will be *anithya*;, because it has a beginning and whatever has a 'date of manufacture' will have a 'date of expiry' also". So, that *mokshaa* will be *anithyam*.

"But, all the *aasthika dharsanaas* glorify *mokshaa*, only because of its nature of eternity. *Mokshaa* is distinguished from all other accomplishments as an unique goal, only because of

its uniqueness of eternity. If *mokshaa* also is presented as ***anithya upaasanaa palan***, the uniqueness of *mokshaa* will go.

"Gowda Paadhaachaaryaa says in the *Maandookya Kaarika* "*ananthathaa chaadhimatha: mokshasya na bhavishyathi*" – "**for a *mokshaa*, which has a beginning, endlessness is not possible** (Verse 31 – *Alaathasaanthiprakaranam*).

"If *Mokshaa* is *sa adhi:*, it will be *sa antha:* also.

"Further, if *mokshaa* also is another *anithya karma palan*, *Veda* need not be separated into *Karma* and *Jnaana kaandaas*. The whole *Veda* will become one *Karma Kaandam*. But, the fact is, *karmaa is* distinct from *jnaanaa*. *Karmaa* gives *anithya palam* and *jnaanaa* gives *nithya palam*. All these differentiations will become meaningless, if *mahaa vaakyam* is a matter for meditation".

It follows from the above arguments of Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, that all diligent *Vedhaanthic* students should clearly note that *mahaa vaakyam* is not 'matter for meditation' for 'attaining' of *mokshaa* at a later date ; that, *mahaa vaakyam* is a statement to be understood; and, that, they have to 'claim' *mokshaa* as a fact.

Of course, *nidhidhyaasanam* is prescribed as an essential step in *Vedhaantha vichaaraa*; but, it should be clearly understood that '*nidhidhyaasanam*' is **not** for 'attaining' *mokshaa* ; on the other hand, it is to **drop** the expectation of *mokshaa*. To repeat : *Nidhidhyaasanam* is never practiced **for** *mokshaa* ; *nidhidhyaasanam* is practiced **for 'dropping'** the expectation of *mokshaa*.

The orientation / the *vaasanaa* / the *vipareetha bhavanaa* viz. "I should become a *jnaani* and I should become a *muktha*:" should be dropped by a diligent *Vedhaanthic* seeker. 'Understanding' *mahaa vaakyam* is, to be convinced "I am a *jnaani* and I am a *muktha*: | Neither *jnaanam* nor *mukthi*: is a future event. This is the aim of *mahaa vaakyam*.

But, the *meemaamsakaa* converts *mahaa vaakyam* into a 'meditation exercise' which will produce *mokshaa* in future. The *Vedhaanthin* refutes this, because (as explained above) if *mokshaa* is a result of *upaasanaa*, it will be *anithya mokshaa* and *anithya mokshaa* will **not** be *mokshaa*. It will be like *svargaa*, which will come at a later date, as a result of long *saadhanaa* and will also end on a given day. About *Svargaa*, Lord Krishna points out in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Ch. IX – *Sloka 21*): "*They tham bhukthvaa svargalokam vishaalam ksheene punye marthyalokam visanthi*" - Having enjoyed that vast heavenly world, they (the *karmi-s* and *upaasakaa-s*) come back to the world of mortals, when their *Punyaa* is exhausted". If *Mokshaa* is an *Upaasanaa palan*, as the *Meemaamsaka ekadesi* holds, Lord

Krishna's above verse can be applied to *Mokshaa* also, with minor modifications, as "*they tham bhukthvaa mokshaa lokam visaalam ksheene punye samsaaralokam visanth'*", which is absurd and untenable, *Mokshaa* being *nithyam*.

The above is one argument (among several arguments) given by *Gowda Paadhaachaaryaa* in *Maandookya Kaarika* and by *Sankaraachaaryaa* in his *Brahma Soothra Bhashyam* in the context of the '*thaththu samanvayaath' soothra*. But, here, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* does not mention that argument.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is attacking the *poorva pakshin's* view. What is the *poorva pakshin's* view? It is, as already stated, "Any *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* is *apraamaanam*, similar to the statement '*nadhyaa: theerey palaani santh'*, which statement is *apraamaanam*, because that statement is revealing something which is known through other *pramaanam*, namely, *prathyakshaa'*".

The *Vedhaanthir's* answer to this view of the *poorva pakshin* would be on the following lines: "A *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* is *apraamaanam* only when it is a *pourusheya, loukika vaakyam*. In other words, any *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* coming from a common man is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* dependent on another *pramaanam* like *prathyaksham*. An example is news that we read in the newspapers, such as 'an earthquake happened in such and such a place; the intensity of the earthquake in the Richter scale is such and such' etc. This statement is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* which is dependent on some other *pramaanam*. Someone had experienced the earthquake i.e. learnt about it through *prathyaksha pramaanam* and has also measured its intensity with an instrument, which observation also is dependent on *prathyaksha pramaanam*. This applies to all *loukika* facts, including scientific facts. Scientists get 'knowledge' on scientific facts, through 'experimentation' *prathyaksha*, which is also based only on *prathyaksha pramaanam*. I do admit that all *loukika siddha bodhaka vaakyam-s* coming from human beings are *vaakyam-s* depending on some other *pramaana*, mostly *prathyaksham*. **But, this law cannot be applied in the case of *aloukika, apourusheya Veda vaakyaani'*.**

The *Vedhaanthir's* answer, briefly, is "*Pourusheya siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are not *pramaanam*, because they reveal facts known through 'experimentation' or 'direct perception'; whereas, when *Veda* talks about something, that statement will not come under *pramaananthara gamya vaakyan'*".

The *Vedhaanthin* can establish his assertion, by an example, the topic of 'Heaven'.

Suppose, the *Vedhaanthin* asks the *poorva meemaamsakaa*: "Does Heaven exist or not?", the *poorva meemaamsakaa* would reply in the affirmative: "*Svarga: asthi'*".

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* accepts 'Heaven' as an existent fact.

According to the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, *svargaa* is not an imagination, but, a *vyaavahaarika sathyam*. This is true about the *Vedhaanthin* also, for whom also, *svargaa* is not an imagination; nor is it only a 'happy life' on earth, as some people wrongly believe. Both *poorva meemaamsakaa* and *Vedhaanthin* accept that there is a *vyaavahaarika sathya svarga lokaa*.

The difference is, that, according to the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, *svarga* is eternal, while for the *Vedhaanthin*, it is not eternal. Also, unlike the *Vedhaanthin*, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* believes that 'going to an eternal *svargaa*, as a result of performance of appropriate rituals , is alone *mokshad*. That is his philosophy.

Therefore, the *Vedhaanthin* asks the *poorva meemaamsakaa* the question "how do you know that there is a *svargaa*; and, also, that, by doing rituals, you go there? For you, *svargaa* is a fact, obtaining even now. But, how do you know this?"

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* would reply: "I know it from the *Veda*".

The *Vedhaanthin* pursues: "You say that you have come to know about *svargaa* from *veda vaakyam*, which reveals the nature of *svargaa*. I agree with that. For instance, *Katopanishad* declares '*svarge loke na bhayam kinchannaasthi na thathra thvam na jarayaa bibhethi ubhe theerthvaa asanaayaa piphaase sokaathiga: modhathe svargaloke*' (I. 11. 12) – 'In the heavenly world, there is no fear at all, because, there you are not afraid of old age. Having crossed both hunger and thirst and having gone beyond grief, one always rejoices in the heavenly world'. But, tell me, what kind of *vaakyam* is that *svarga bodhaka vaakyam*? Since, it reveals a fact about the existence of *svargaa*, is it not a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*? Then, is it *pramaanam* or *apramaanam*?"

The *Vedhaanthin* continues: "If you say it is *apramaanam* / not valid, that means there is no *svarghaa*. If there is no *svarghaa*, then, according to you, nobody can 'get' *mokshaa*, since you believe that eternal *svarghaa* alone is *mokshaa*. If, on the other hand, you say that the *Vedic svarga bodhaka vaakyam* is *pramaanam*, then, I will ask the you the question 'how do you accept that *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* as a *pramaanam*, since you strongly hold, that *siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are *apramaanam*?"

Then, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* will have to answer: "Even though *Vedic svarga bodhaka vaakyam* is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, it is a different type of *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. It reveals something which is not available for other *pramaanam*-s. It is a kind of *siddha*

bodhaka vaakyam, which is different from statements such as '*naddhya: theerey palaani santhi*'| It is true that '*naddhya: theerey palaani santhi*' is also a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* and the *Vedic vaakyam* '*svarga: asthi*' is also a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. But, there is a difference between the two. '*Naddhya: theerey palaani santhi*' is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, the contents of which is knowable through other *pramaanam*-s like *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Therefore, the statement '*Naddhya: theerey palaani santhi*' is called '*pramaananthara ganya siddha bodhaka vaakyam*'. But, *svarghaa* cannot be known through any other *pramaanaa* - *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthapatthi* and *anulpalabधि*. Since the content of the *vaakyam* is not available for any other *pramaanam*, (expressed in Sanskrit, '*Pramaananthara agamyathvaath*') it should be accepted as *pramaanam*".

(An interesting aside: *Svarghaa* is beyond the scope of all material sciences also; it is available only in the *Vedas* or other religious scriptures. That is the reason why the so-called rationalists do not accept *Svarghaa*.)

From the above dialogue, it is clear, that, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* accepts this *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, viz., the *svarga bodhaka vaakyam*, as *pramaanam* because of the reason '*pramaananthara agamyathvaath*'.

From the dialogue, we can also make a generalization. What is that? Ans: *Loukika siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are *apraamaanam*, whereas *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* can be *pramaanam*, when they reveal facts not available for any other *pramaanam*.

There are some *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* which reveal facts which can be known by other *pramaanam*-s also. An example is the *veda vaakyam* '*agni: himasya beshajam*', meaning 'when the climate is intensely cold, fire is a remedy'. '*agni: himasya beshajam*' is a *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. Though it is a *Vaidhika vaakyam*, we will not say that this *vaakyam* is *pramaanam*, because, the import of the *vaakyam* is known from *prathyaksha pramaanam*. It is common knowledge, that, in regions with extremely cold climates, people have fireplaces in their homes and light up fires. Therefore, this *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, viz. '*agni: himasya beshajam*' reveals only something known / knowable through other *pramaanam*-s. The rule is: Even *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* which state what is known by other *pramaanam*-s, are *apraamaanam*. But, when a *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyam* reveals something not known through other *pramaanam*, then that *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* should be accepted as *pramaanam*.

The *Vedhaanthin* (continuing the dialogue) will confront the *poorva meemaamsaka*: "We have so many things which are revealed only through *vaidhika siddha vaakyaani*. We know the concept of *punyam* only through *Veda pramaanam*. *Punyam* is not available for scientific

study. So is *paapam*. So are all the different *lokaa-s*; they are not available for *prathyaksham* or any other *pramaanam* or scientific study. It is only *Veda* that reveals all such things and therefore, such *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyaani* are to be accepted as *pramaanam*. If you do not do that, your own *svargaa* will be in trouble. When your *svargaa* is in trouble, your *mokshaa* will be in trouble, because your *mokshaa* is 'going to eternal *svargaa*'".

(One more aside: The *poorva meemaamsaka's* belief about *svargaa*, is similar to the belief of Christianity. Christians believe in an eternal Heaven; some of the *poorva meemamsakaas* also talk of an eternal Heaven and consider 'reaching that eternal Heaven' as *mokshaa*.)

To continue the Vedhaanthin's above response to the *poorva memaamsakaa*: "You accept the *vaidhika svarga bodhaka vaakyam* as *pramaanam*. Extending the same logic, *mahaa vaakyam* also is *pramaananthra agamyam siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. It is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, but, it reveals something which is not available for other *pramaanam-s*."

Veda need not reveal 'I am', since, 'I am' is a known fact. But the fact "'I' am *Brahman, nithya muktha:, parichhedha rahitha:*" (i.e., the *Brahmathvam* status of 'mine') is *pramaananthara agamyam*.

Also, *Brahmathvam* status is something not to be accomplished through meditation. It is a fact which should be understood through *mahaa vaakyam*. Until that understanding is achieved, the aspirant should continue to analyze the *mahaa vaakyam*. If, by the word 'meditation', the *poorva meemaamsakaa* means 'analysis', the *Vedhaanthic* teacher will not object. But, if 'mediation' is considered as "closing the eyes and going to *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*", the *Vedhaanthin* will protest that, *that* meditation is useless. Similarly, if meditation is considered as "just doing the *japa`aham brahma asmi*", *that* meditation is also not useful. Only if the word 'meditation' is used to mean 'analysis of *mahaa vaakyam* and consequent understanding that *Brahmathvam* is 'my' nature, which is the benefit of the *siddha bodhaka vaakya vicharaad*, the *Vedhaanthin* will accept the use of word in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*.

Reverting to the text:

- अस्य परिहारार्थ - For answering this *poorva pakshaa*,
- अभिताश्रुते : प्रामाण्यं - the validity of the *vaidhika siddha bodhaka vaakyam*
- वक्तव्यं - has to be established.

This is to be done by dividing siddha bodhaka vaakyaani into two types: (i) pramaanaanthara **gamyā** siddha bodhaka vaakyani and (ii) pramaanaanthara **agamyā** siddha bodhaka vaakyani. How ? By showing that the 'saakshi aathmaa' revealed by mahaa vaakyam, is **not** available to other pramaanam-s. That is said here.

- (अभिताश्रुतेः) अतीन्द्रियार्थ विषयत्वात् - Since *mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with a subject (*aathmaa*), which is not available for other *pramaanam-s*,

'*atheendriyaartham*' means 'beyond all sense organs'; '*vishayathvaath'* means 'the subject being'.

The subject of the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz. '*aathmaad*', is beyond all sense organs and beyond all other *pramaanam-s*, similar to *svarghaa*, which is also not available for any *pramaanam* other than *sruthi*. Whereas, the content of the sentence '*naddyaa: theerey palaani santh'*' is available for other *pramaanam-s* and is therefore, very unlike the *mahaa vaakya vishayam*. Both the examples (i) the example for similarity viz., the *vaidhika svarga bodhaka vaakyam* and (ii) the example for dissimilarity viz., '*nadhi-theeram-palaani* etc.' should be remembered by the student. He should understand, that, the *poorva pakshin's* quoting the sentence '*naddyaa: theerey palaani santh'*, as though it is similar to the *mahaa vaakyam*, is not right. It is what is termed '*vishamo dhrushtaantha.'* /

But, how does the *Vedhaanthin* show that *saakshi* is '*atheendriyaartham*' or 'super sensuous'? Sureswaraacharya says:

- प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमेयत्व निराकरणद्वारेण - by negating the idea that *aathmaa* is available for other *pramaanam-s* such as *prathyaksham*,

"By negating the idea that *aathmaa* is available for other *pramaanams*" is a circuitous manner of expression. It only means "by pointing out that *aathmaa* is not available for other *pramaanam-s*".

Thus, *mahaa vaakyam* is revealing an unique fact and it is waking 'me' up to 'my' own *saakshi* status. It **is** a wake-up call. And, therefore, the *Aacharya* gives the example of '*suptha purusha prabhodhaka vaakyam*' meaning 'words used to waken up a sleeping person':

- सुप्तपुरुष प्रबोधकवाक्यस्य इव - similar to the words that wake up a man from sleep

'*Utthishtatha jaagratha praapya varaan nibodhatha*' – 'Arise, awake, having approached the great ones, know the *aathmaa*' is a well-known exhortation of the *Katopanishad* (I. iii. 14).

'*suptha purusha:*' means 'a sleeping person'; '*prabhodhaka*' means 'awakening'; '*vaakyam*' means 'a statement'.

This '*suptha purusha prabhodhaka vaakyam*' is supposed to be an unique *vaakyam* by *Vedhanthaa*, with an '*achinthyaa sakthi:*', which term means 'extraordinary power'. The *vaakyam* has been analyzed in a number *Vedhaantha saasthraas*. Exactly like that *vaakyam*, '*thaththvamas*' is also an unique statement with an '*achinthyaa sakthi:*'. Sureswaraachaaryaa will be discussing the *achinthyaa sakthi:* of *suptha purusha bodhaka vaakyam* and the *achinthyaa sakthi* of *mahaa vaakyam* later, in verses 105 and 106 in the same chapter.

A gist of that discussion is given below. The steps indicated here are important:

Who is a *suptha purusha:*? *Suptha purusha:* is a sleeper who has withdrawn from *jaagrath avasthaa* – the 'waking' state. He might be either in a dream (*svapna avasthaa*) or in 'deep sleep' (*sushupthi avasthaa*). In other words, he might be either a '*thyjasa:*' or a '*praagnya:*', but certainly not a '*viswa:*' |

That means *suptha purusha:* has broken his link or connection with *jaagrath avasthaa* | In fact, that is the definition of *suptha purusha:* | A *suptha purusha:* has disconnected himself from all *jaagrath avasthaa vyavahaaraa*. He has separated from *jaagrath avasthaa*; he has de-linked from all the *jaagrath avasthaa vyavahaaraa*; that means that he is not a participant in *jaagrath avasthaa vyavahaaraa*.

What does a 'participant in *jaagrath avasthaa*' mean? A 'participant' should be either *pramaathaa* or *pramaanam* or *prameyam*. *Suptha purusha:* does not participate as a *jaagrath pramaathaa* by using *jaagrath pramaanam*. He is not a *jaagrath prameyam* also, since he is not an object of any *jaagrath pramaanam*. He is neither utilizing a *jaagrath pramaanam* nor is he an object of a *jaagrath pramaanam*. If he is an object of *pramaanam*, he will become *premayem*; if he is an 'user' of *pramaanam*, he will be a *pramaathaa*. *Suptha Purusha:* is neither *jaagrath pramaathaa* nor *jaagrath pramaanam* nor *jaagrath prameyam*. In short, he is *jaagrath vyavahaara atheetha:* | Again, this term is important.

Suptha purusha: cannot be accessed in *jaagrath avasthaa*; and, he does not access *jaagrath avasthaa*. He is totally apart from *jaagrath avasthaa*. When this is a fact, how can a 'wake-up' call, i.e., when the words 'wake up' are used, which 'wake-up' call is a *jaagrath avasthaa vyavahaara vaakyam* / a *jaagrath sabdha pramaana vaakyam* / a *pramaana vaakyam* in

jaagrath vyavahaaraa, reach the '*jaagrath vyavahaara atheetha suptha purusha:*' ? How can it reach, because it is supposed to function only on a person existing within the scope and range of *jaagrath avastha*. *Pramaathru-pramaana-prameya vyavahaaraa* belongs to *jaagrath avastha*. How can it reach a *suptha purusha:*? It is not logically possible. Still, it works in a mysterious manner and reaches the *suptha purusha:* and removes his *nidhraa*. Similarly, *mahaa vaakyam* functions in a peculiar manner and removes the spiritual *nidhraa*.

Just as *suptha purusha prabodhaka vaakyam* reaches *suptha purusha:* and removes *loukika nidhraa*, *mahaa vaakyam* reaches the *saakshi* peculiarly and removes the *aadhyathmika nidhraa*.

156. Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (03-10-2009)

The Advaita Vedhaanthin-s look upon mahaa vaakyam as the most important vaakyaa-s of the Upanishad and therefore devote a lot of time to analyze and assimilate the mahaa vaakyaa-s. A large number of texts, written by great aachaaryaa-s, exclusively for mahaa vaakya vicharaa, is available. In this Text, Naishkarmya Siddhi also, the subject of the 2nd and 3rd chapters is the analysis of the mahaa vaakyam only.

In contrast to the *Advaitin*, the *poorva meemaamsaka*., who is also a great *vaidhika*, i.e. one who also accepts *Veda* as *apourusheya pramaanam*, holds "mahaa vaakyam is not a *pramaanam* at all, and therefore is not worth studying", in spite of his being a believer in *Veda*. He generally gives two important objections, of which one objection is given here.

That first objection of the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, is, that, a *vaakyam* that only reveals a fact (such a *vaakyam* is termed *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*) cannot be taken as *pramaana vaakyam*. He gives his reason. He explains: "Before revealing the fact by the *vaakyam*, the speaker must have already learnt the fact, by using *prathyaksha pramaanam* and since the knowledge has been gained through the *prathyaksha pramaanam* itself, the *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* is not the 'producer' of the knowledge; but, is only 'carrying' / 'conveying' the knowledge, which has been already gathered by *prathyaksha pramaanam*, and, therefore, cannot be considered as a *pramaanam*."

Sureswaraachaarya refutes this *poorva pakshaa*. He argues: "This perception of the *poorva meemaamsakaa* holds good in the case of only *loukika sabdhaa*. When human beings use words for revealing a fact, they would have already gathered the knowledge about the fact, through *prathyaksha pramaanam*. *Loukika* knowledge can be and are gained through *prathyakshaa*. Therefore, it is true, that, **loukika sabdhaas** are not 'producers' of knowledge, but, are only 'carriers' of knowledge, already produced by other *pramaanam*-s. We agree that *pourusheya loukika sabdha*-s are not *pramaanam*, because of the above reason. But, *vaidhika sabdhaa* **is** different. The facts revealed by *vaidhika sabdha* **cannot** be known by any other *pramaanaam*. The *veda poorva bhaaghaa* itself talks about *paralokaa*, *punar janmaa*, *punyam*, *paapam* etc., all of which also are knowable only through *vaidhika sabdhaa* and never through any other *pramaanam*; the *poorva meemaasakaa* has no reservation in accepting these as facts. He should, therefore, accept, that, *Vedas* are not just 'carriers' of information gleaned through other *pramaanam*-s. *Vedas* do give new facts. Hence, *vaidhika vaakyaa-s* **are pramaanam**".

Loukika, *pourusheya vaakyaani* cannot be considered as *pramaanam*, since they are not themselves 'producers' of the 'knowledge' conveyed by them. The 'knowledge' has been gathered earlier, generally through *prathyaksha pramaanam* and only presented through the

loukika vaakyaani. This is true about scientific knowledge also, since scientific knowledge has been produced by 'experimentation', which also uses only *prathyaksha pramaanam*. That is why, even if all the Science books are destroyed by an accident, it need not be a cause for concern, since scientists can experiment again and come to the same conclusions again. The Science books are not 'producers' but only 'containers' of knowledge produced by other *pramaanams*.

But, *vaidhika vaakyaani* are different from *loukika*, *pourusheya vaakyaani*. The *vaidhika vaakyaani* are *aloukika sabdhaa / apourusheya sabdhaa*. It is said about the *Veda*: "prathyakshena anumithyaa vaa yasthupaaayo na vidhyathe yenam vidhanthi vedena thasmaath vedasya vedasaa"

With regard to new 'knowledge', *Veda* is a distinct *pramaanam*, similar to the five sense organs. Just as each sense organ reveals something which cannot be known through any of the other sense organs, *Veda* also reveals facts which cannot be known by any sense organ. *Veda-s* may verily be called the 6th sense organ.

Veda should not be deemed to be similar to books written by human beings. Since *Veda* is in the form of a book, human tendency *is* to equate *Veda* to other books, which is a blunder that is committed. *Veda* can never be equated to any book written by any human author. Instead, *Veda* should be equated only to the five sense organs. *Veda* is '*chakshu:*' | That is why, in *Brahma Soothraa*, *Vyaasaachaaryaa* replaces the word '*Veda*', by the word '*Prathyaksha*', in several places. Just as every sense organ is valid by itself and does not require further proof or validity, *Veda* is '*svatha: pramaanam*' | 'independently valid'.

Mahaa vaakyam also is revealing something not revealed by any other instrument. In *karma kaaandaa*, when *poorva meemaamsaka* learns about rituals leading to *svarghaa*, the knowledge about *svarghaa* is acquired only through *Veda pramanaam*. Even though *vaidhika svarga bodhaka vaakyam* is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, its contents are not knowable through any other *pramaana*. Therefore, the *poorva meemaamsakaa's vyaapthi* (general conclusion), namely, "yathra yathra siddhathvam thathra thathra pramaanaantheragamyathvam" – "whatever sentence is revealing a fact, it is revealing something known through other *pramaanam*" is proved wrong. That *vyaapthi* cannot be accepted. What is the example? Ans: "*Svarga bodhaka vaakyam* is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*. Still, *svarghaa* cannot be known through other *pramaanaa*".

"In the same manner" the Advaitin argues "though *jeevathma-Paramaathma-eikyaa vaakyam* is a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, it is not *pramaanaanthera gamyam*".

The *poorva meemaamsakaa's* *anumaanaa* was "mahaa vaakyam apramaanam pramaanaanharagamyathvaath 'naddyaa: theerey palaani santhi' ithi siddha bodhaka vaakyavath"- "mahaa vaakyam is not a pramaanam, since, similar to the statement 'there are fruits on the river bank', the mahaa vaakyam is only stating a fact, which can be gained through some other pramaanam." The Advaita Vedhaanthin strongly refutes this. He finds a 'dhoshaa' / defect in this *anumaanaa*, pointing out that the *poorva meemaamsakaa* himself does not apply this *anumaanaa* to the *svarga bodhaka vaakyam*.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa's* first objection is, thus, refuted by the *Vedhaanthin*, by giving the example of Heaven and pointing out that the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* law "*yathra yathra siddhathvam thathra thathra pramaanaanharagamyathvam*" cannot be applied in relation to *apourusheya pramaana vishayaani*.

Thereafter, the *poorva meemaamsakaa* comes up with a second objection, which is not discussed by Sureswaraacharya, in this context. It is discussed very elaborately by Sankaraacharya in his *Bhaashyam* for *Brahma Soothra-s*, in the 4th *soothraa*, which *soothraa* starts as "*thaththusamanvayaath*". Those details are worth studying here.

What is that second objection of the *poorva meemaamsakaa*? He says: "I am willing to accept *svarga bodhaka vaakyam* as a *pramaanam*, even though it is only a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, revealing a fact. The knowledge given by the content of the *vaakyam* "*naddyaa: theerey palaani santhi* " is not generated by the *vaakyam* itself, but, by *prathyaksha pramaanam* earlier; whereas, in contrast, '*svargha*' is a new knowledge given by the *svargha bodhaka vaakyam*, which knowledge cannot be revealed by *prathyaksha* or any other *pramaanaa*. Therefore, the *pramaanathvam* of that *veda vaakya* is acceptable to me. But, even if I accept *svargha bodhaka vaakyam* as a *pramaana vaakyam*, I will not accept it as an useful *vaakyam*. Even though it is a giving a new knowledge / a new fact, still the *vaakyam* is an useless *vaakyam*, since it does not serve a purpose; because, just knowing about *svarghaa* will not give me any benefit. Learning the fact '*svargha: asthi*' is not going to solve my problems in this mundane existence. The *svargha bodhaka vaakyam* may be a *pramaanam*, because, it reveals a new fact, namely '*svarghaa*'; still, it is an useless *vaakyam*, *prayojana abhaavaath*".

Thus, the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* new argument is "Svargha bodhaka vaakye thaathparyam naasthi; it is arthavaadha vakyam, because there is no prayojanam derived from the *vaakyam*. Merely knowing that there is *svarghaa* is of no use. Svargha bodhaka *vaakyam* will be valid only if it is connected with a ritual or a *saadhanaa*, because, when I do the prescribed ritual, I can reach Heaven and will get some benefit. In the same manner, any *siddha bodhaka vakyam* will be valid only when it is connected with a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*".

To go back to the example quoted in an earlier session, if an individual is thirsty and is given the information that there is water available, the mere knowledge of the availability of water will be of no use. The knowledge should be followed up with the action of getting the water and drinking it. *Kaaryam* should follow *jnaanam*, if *jnaanam* is to be of any use.

The *poorva meemaamsakaa's* second argument is, therefore, "*siddha bodhaka vaakyam*, **by itself**, will not give any benefit; it should be followed by a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*, based on which, an action can be done to acquire benefit. *Mahaa vaakyam* is also a *siddha bodhaka vaakyam*; it may be revealing a great fact; but, mere knowledge of the fact is of no use; you have to do something to tap the benefit from that fact."

To repeat: the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* theory is: "*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam asadharthaanaam*; any amount of knowledge will be of no use; it should be followed by some *saadhanaa*, by which the seeker actualizes the fact and taps the benefit. Similarly, '*aham brahma asmi*' may also be a fact; but the seeker has to 'actualize' the fact by doing some *saadhanaa*."

The *poorva meemaamsakaa* continues: "Therefore, you should prescribe some action to follow the *siddha bodhaka mahaa vaakam*. 'Meditation' is an ideal action to follow the *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. You should ask the seeker to 'meditate'. He has to do the 'action' of meditating. Action produces result. Knowledge, by itself, does not produce any result. The knowledge '*Aham brahma asmi*', by itself, is useless. The seeker has to 'apply' the knowledge, do some action and make *mokshaa* a reality".

There are some mundane examples seemingly in support of this *poorva pakshaa* theory: (i) Pure Science is useless; only applied science is useful. (ii) 'Knowing how to cook' is of no use. Only the action of 'cooking' will result in the benefit of 'eating' (iii) 'Knowing how to use a treadmill' is of no use, by itself; only the action of 'using' the treadmill in the prescribed manner, will give the benefit of staying fit. From such examples, it appears that 'mere knowledge' will not be useful; 'corresponding action' alone will be useful.

Sankaraacharya, in his *Brahma Sootra Baashyam*, strongly refutes this theory of the *poorva meemaamsakaa* in the context of *Sruthi vaakyaani*. He answers the *poorva meemaamsakaa* in a very elaborate manner.

In this context also, he points out that what is applicable to *loukikaa* contexts, need not be applicable to *Vedic* statements. He tells the *poorva meemaamsakaa*: "Your view, namely, 'knowledge cannot give any benefit; it has to be followed by an action', is a general rule, applicable in most of the cases. But every general rule has an exception. The general rule

should not be blindly and thoughtlessly used in all the cases. You say 'the knowledge *'aham brahma asmi'* is useless; the seeker should 'know' and then 'meditate' ; only thereafter, he will attain *mokshaad'*. It means that you are applying the general rule to the *mahaa vaakyam* also.

"But, this general rule is **not** applicable in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Kindly think a little bit. When a problem is caused by ignorance, 'removal of the ignorance' will naturally result in 'removal of the problem'. And, you cannot dispute the fact that 'knowledge' is capable of removing 'ignorance'. That means 'knowledge', by removing the ignorance, will remove the problem also. That means 'knowledge' is an end in itself. 'Removal of the ignorance' and 'removal of the problem' are both achieved by acquisition of 'knowledge'. The 'removals' do not require even an iota of *saadhanaa*.

"Up to gaining knowledge, the seeker may require *saadhanaa*; in fact, *mahaa vaakya vicharaa* itself is a *saadhanaa*. And, when it produces 'knowledge', that 'knowledge' removes the ignorance and since ignorance has caused the problem, then 'removal of ignorance' gives the seeker the benefit of 'removal of problem' also. The end has been attained. Then what more *saadhanaa* is required after gaining knowledge?"

An example will make the *Aachaaryaa's* reasoning clearer: "Assume that an individual finds a tumor in some part of his body. It is an innocent, problem-free, benign tumor. The person would not require treatment for cancer, since the tumor is not malignant. But, he does not know that the tumor is benign. His doctor, on seeing the tumor, talks about a biopsy. The very suggestion of a 'biopsy' causes panic and anxiety in the patient, entirely because of ignorance of the benign nature of the tumor. After receipt of the results of the biopsy arrive, the doctor says 'it is a benign tumor and no treatment is required'. Under the circumstances, if the patient replies 'I have understood; I have the *jnaanam* that I do not have a disease; but, please tell me what treatment should I take?', would it not be a ridiculous response?"

Sankaraachaaryaa points out that when the problem is caused by 'ignorance', 'knowledge' has to be sought to remove the 'ignorance' and once the 'ignorance' is removed, 'knowledge' need not be followed by any action at all.

Vedhaanthic meditation, otherwise called '*nididhyaasanam'*, is **not** to attain *mokshaa*; *vedhaanthic* meditation is for removal of the seeker's orientation "I have to get *mokshaa*". To repeat: *Vedhaanthic* meditation, after *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*, is **not** a *saadhanaa* for *mokshaa*; it is only to remove the expectation of *mokshaa* i.e., to remove the orientation 'I have to get *mokshaa*'.

Therefore, after *jnaanam*, no *saadhanaa* is required; *mahaa vaakyaa* will give fulfillment directly. "*Aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam asadharthaanam*" is applicable with regard to *svarghaa*, because, mere knowledge of the existence of *svarghaa* will not give any benefit. It has to be followed by the prescribed ritual to attain *svarghaa*. But, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*, the resulting 'knowledge' / 'understanding' is: "'I' was, 'I' am and 'I' ever will be free". This 'understanding' is an end, in itself. Other than that 'understanding', nothing else is required. Therefore, *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* **is** *pramaanam*; it gives the 'knowledge' and also the message, that, 'understanding' is the end in itself.

That is why, the seeker has to study a lot; first, he has to study *Vedhaantha* to understand the *mahaa vaakyam*; then, he has to continue to study *Vedhaantha*, to understand that 'understanding' is enough. Many students have not understood that the first understanding alone, namely, the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*, is not enough; that is why, they say "I have **only** understanding". The term 'only' in this statement shows that they feel that, 'other than 'understanding' something else is required'. Such students will have to resort to *sravanam* for some more time to understand that 'nothing else is required other than 'understanding' ".

Thus, there are two steps: (i) understanding the *mahaa vaakyam* and (ii) understanding that 'understanding' is enough. Until the seeker can say "I have the 'understanding'; therefore, I am '*jnaan*!'; therefore, I am free", only *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* should be employed. 'Meditation' is certainly not the appropriate *saadhanaa*. "Only repeated *sravanam* is required. No meditation is required" is the stand of Sankaraacharya, in his *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam*, in reply to the *poorva meemamsakaa's* second objection. Sureswaraacharya also will express this view later, though he does not refer to the *poorva pakshin's* second objection, in this context.

In dealing with the first objection, Sureswaraacharya concludes with the assertion "*abhidhaa sruthe: praamaanyam*" - "*Mahaa vaakyam is pramaanam*".

Like what?

He gives an example: "*Suptha purusha prabodha vaakyavath*"- "similar to a statement which wakes up a sleeping person in a mysterious manner". The *Aachaaryaa* discusses this topic of *suptha bodha vaakyam* later, in verses 105 and 106 of the same chapter. A more detailed analysis will be done there.

Reverting to the text (last line of *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 47):

इति अयं आरम्भः - For this purpose the next phase of the argument is initiated.

Chapter III: Verse 47 –

नित्यावगतिरूपत्वादन्यमानानपेक्षणात् ।

शब्दादिगुणहीनत्वात्संशयानवतारत ॥ ४७ ॥ :

Because of the nature of eternal awareness, not needing any other proof, without physical qualities like sound, about whose existence doubts can never arise...

Here, Sureswaraacharya is refuting the view expressed by the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, who used the sentence '*naddyastheerey palaani santhi*' as an example for his view. The *poorva meemaamsakaa* had said "Similar to this sentence '*naddyastheerey palaani santhi*', whenever *sabdha pramaanam* is talking about a fact, that fact is available for *prathyaksha pramaanam*". Of course, this is a general rule in *loukika sabbdhaa*. Even when one reads the newspaper, every item of news that is talked about in the newspaper, is available elsewhere for *prathyaksha pramaanaa*.

Sureswaraacharya is only disputing this general rule being applied by the *poorva meemaamsakaa* to *vaidhika sabdhaa* also. He says: "*aathmaa* cannot be compared to the objects in the sentence '*nadhyaastheerey palaani santhi*', because while *theeram* and *palaani* are available for *prathyaksham*, *aathmaa* is **not** available for any *pramaanam* for objectification. ***Aathmaa aprameya:***" | '*Aathmaa aprameya:*' means '*aathmaa sarva pramaana agochara:*'- 'not available to any instrument of knowledge'.

Why is *aathma* not available for objectification? Sureswaraacharya answers this by giving several reasons.

The first reason he gives is: "All *pramaanaa*-s are dealing with *jada* or *achethana padhaartha*-s. The five sense organs are dealing with *sabda*, *sparsa*, *roopa*, *rasa*, *gandhaa* etc., all belonging to matter only. The physical body, available for sense organs, is also 'matter'. And, the brain, which is available for *prathyakshaa*, is nothing but matter. According to *saasthra*-s, the mind is also born out of matter – *sookshma boothani*. All instruments of knowledge are analyzing / can analyze matter only; science is also dealing only with 'matter'. 'Matter' is *anaathmaa*, whereas 'I', the *aathmaa*, am non-material Consciousness principle. How can that *chethana aathmaa* be *vishayaa* of any *pramaanma*?"

Therefore, he says:

- नित्य अवगति रूपत्वात् - Because of the nature of eternal awareness,

'*Avagathi*' means '*chaithanyam*' or 'awareness'; '*nithya*' mean 'eternal' and '*roopam*' (in this context) means 'nature'.

Consciousness is not Matter; Consciousness is not a part of Matter; Consciousness is not a product of Matter; Consciousness is not a property of Matter. No scientist has yet proved Consciousness is any one of these four. They have not proved that Consciousness is Matter; they have not proved it is a part, product or property of Matter. It is undisputed that Consciousness is a non-material Principle.

All *pramaanaa*-s (apart from *vaidhika sabdhaa*) can deal only with Matter ; *aathmaa* is non-material ; therefore, it is not available for any instrument of knowledge, including the mind. That is why it is said "Even in meditation, do not try to experience *aathmaa* or *Brahman* / *aathma anubhavaa* or *Brahma anubhavaa*."

When an individual works for any new *anubhavaa* and succeeds in getting it, it arrives only as an object of a sense organ. In 'meditation', mind is the instrument of knowledge. If *Brahman* is experienced through a meditating mind, *Brahman* will become an object of experience, which it is not. '*Brahma anubhavaa*' does not exist as an event, because *Brahman* happens to be the Consciousness, who is ever available as "I am"; it is never available as an 'object of experience', at a particular moment.

These are fundamental facts; if they are not clear, the seeker will say: "I have understood *Brahman*; I am waiting for that *anubhavaa*". Unfortunately, hundreds of *Vedhaanthic* students are committing this blunder and eternally waiting for the so-called *Brahma anubhavaa* and consequently postponing *mokshaa*. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya points out that Consciousness is of non-material nature and consequently cannot be revealed by any instrument of knowledge

Then he gives the second reason, another powerful argument:

अन्यमान अनपेक्षणात् - because any *pramaana* is not required,

'Consciousness **cannot** be revealed through any instrument of knowledge' was the first argument. The second argument, equally important, is 'Consciousness **need** not be revealed through any instrument of knowledge'; this is because Consciousness is always revealed as "I am a Conscious being"..... " I am a Conscious being". It is an undisputed fact that, as a conscious being, Consciousness is always available as "I am".... "I am"... "I am"... "I am".

Thus, Consciousness being ever revealed as "I am", it need not be revealed by any other instrument of knowledge.

What is the first argument? Ans: 'Consciousness **cannot** be revealed'. What is the second argument? Ans: It is a very important argument. 'It **need** not be revealed. It is always available'

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, I am a conscious being; that is why I am conscious of all my surroundings. In *svapna avasthaa*, I am a conscious being; that is why I am conscious of the *svapnaa*. In the *sushupthi avasthaa* also, even when the mind is resolved and even when the body is not functioning, I am a conscious being, because of which alone, the 'nothingness' of *sushupthi* is revealed. 'I' am the ever revealed Consciousness. Unfortunately, there is a prevalent wrong notion, that, '*nirvikalpaka samaadhī* is the *thureeya* (fourth) *avasthaa*, during which *avasthaa* alone, the Consciousness is revealed. This is a misconceived notion. Adi Sankara in his *Maneeshaa Panchakam* refers to Consciousness as "*jaagrath svapana sushupthishu sputatharaa yaa samvidh ujjrumbhathe*" – "That which clearly shines forth as a crystal in all the three states of waking, dream and deep sleep"; and, again, in his *Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram* as "*baalyaadhishvapi jaagradhaadhisu thathaa sarvaavasthaasvapi vyaavrutthaasu*" – "that which constantly manifests in all stages of life, like boyhood etc. and also in all states, like waking etc."

When any individual says "I am".." I am", that 'I' is the ever revealed Consciousness. Body gets revealed by Consciousness, now and then; body comes and goes; mind gets revealed by Consciousness ; mind comes and goes ; thoughts get revealed by Consciousness; thoughts come and go. They are all *dhrusyam*, *baudhikam*, *sagunam*, *savikaaram* and *aagamaapaayee*. In contrast, 'I' am the non-arriving, non-departing Conscious principle. This being the fact, why should 'I' use a *pramaanam* to 'prove' myself? In fact, to use a *pramaanam*, 'I' should be there. The 'authenticator' of everything need not be authenticated. Consciousness does not require a *pramaanam*, because, even before the operation of the *pramaanam*, Consciousness is there, desirous of operation.

'*Anya maana*' means '*anya pramaana*'; '*anapekshanaa*' means 'not required'. It might be noted that in the *Lalitha Sahasranaama Sthothram*, the name '*Aprameya*' is immediately followed by the name '*Svapraakaasa*'. '*Nithya avagathi roopathvaath*' indicates the '*svapraakaasa*' nature and '*anyamaana apekshanaath*' indicates the '*aprameya*' nature of *aathmaa*.

Then follows the third argument:

- शब्दादि गुण हीनत्वात् - because of the absence of physical qualities like sound etc.,

Scientists identify every entity by analyzing its physical and chemical properties. The very scientific analysis to identify a new object, is by discovering its unique properties, As is common knowledge, the science of Chemistry has, what is known as a 'Periodic Table', in which, numerous elements, with their properties are tabulated. Over the years, new elements are also being added to the Table. Why is it done? Ans: Because, scientists identify newer and newer elements, by observing unique properties, which differentiate the new entity from all the earlier known entities. It follows from this, that, it is 'unique properties', which identify an object. This is how we use the *pramaanam*. No scientist can ever identify *Brahman/ aathmaa / Consciousness* as a new element, because *Brahman / aathmaa / Consciousness* does not have any physical or chemical properties. All properties belong to micro and macro matter. Consciousness accommodates 'matter'; but, is, itself, not 'matter'.

Even space is 'matter' with certain unique attributes. Consciousness accommodates space and reveals space; but Consciousness itself is non material, without any property. It cannot be identified with the use of any *pramaanaa*. It is free from *sabdhaa, sparsaa, roopaa, rasaa* and *gandhaa*. That is why, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*sabdhaadhi guna heenathvaath*".

Quite often, people come up with an absurd question: "If Consciousness can never be proved by any *pramaanam*, how do I know it is there" ? The question is absurd, because that very question is possible only because of Consciousness. Consciousness need not be proved, because it is self evident / self revealed ; therefore this question should not arise at all. In fact, everything else is proved because of Consciousness. "That because of which everything else is proved, need not be proved at all" is an indisputable maxim.

The statement "*sabdhaadhi guna heenathvaath*" should remind the student of the famous manthraa in Katopanishad (I.iii.15), which runs "asabhdam asparsam aroopam avyayam thathaa arasam nithyam agandhavath cha yath anaadhyam anantham mahatha: param dhruvam nichaaya thanmruthyumukaath pramuchyathe" -"This (Brahman) is soundless, not available for touch, colorless, tasteless, smell-less, without a beginning, endless, free from decay, deathless, changeless and beyond mahath. Having clearly known that (Brahman), one is totally freed from the jaws of death".

(An aside : When a study of advanced texts like *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is taken up by a student, the assumption of the traditional *Aachaaryaa-s* is, that, the student is already thoroughly conversant with the popular *Dasopanishad-s*.

If the student is conversant with the *Upanishad-s* and is able to recollect this *manthraa*, when he hears the statement "*sabdhaadhi guna heenathvaath*", he can effortlessly chant

the *manthraa* to himself, assure himself that his mundane problems are really not his and thus remember 'his' own glory.

"The mundane problems are 'appearing and disappearing'/ 'coming and going'; let me not get disturbed; let me enjoy the *navarasa naatakam*, that this life is. I am only the accomodater and witness of all these happenings. I am not affected by any one of them" would be the joyous conviction of the student, if he assimilates and remembers this *manthraa* and other similar *Upanishadic manthraa-s*.

A diligent seeker should, early in the morning, first invoke *aathmaa*, which is free, before getting into mundane affairs. After invoking *aathmaa* first, he can invoke any of the *pancha anaathmaa* thereafter; then the involvement with *pancha anaathmaa* will not cause any problem. But, if the seeker fails to invoke *aathmaa* first, life will be a 'meaningless, burdensome, boring, struggle', from which, the seeker would want to escape as soon as possible. If he invokes only the *anaathmaa*, life is a tragedy; if, on the other hand, he takes effort to invoke *aathmaa*, life would be entertainment. He would not mind being re-born. In fact, he should let the mind get reborn any number of times, because only through the mind, he can claim '*aham brahma asmI*'. If the mind is lost, *aathmaa* cannot be claimed.

If *mahaa vaakyam* is internalized, life will become the most fantastic *leelaa*; a '*sampoornam jagadeva nanadanavanam*' attitude will result; life will not be cursed.)

Then the fourth argument is presented:

- संशय अनवतारत : - because no doubts can arise about its existence,

One can never have a doubt regarding the existence of *aathmaa*. '*Samasaya*,' means 'doubt'; '*anavathaaratha*:' means 'can never come'.

Why not? Ans: Because *aathmaa* is 'I', the Conscious being. The following situation will make this idea clearer: "During the course of the *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class, a student suddenly remembers a friend who regularly comes to the class, but whose usual seat, he finds, is vacant. Then the student may get the doubt as to whether the friend is absent from the class or whether he has come to the class but is seated somewhere else. This will be a legitimate doubt, that may arise about someone else. But, not about one's own self. One can doubt the presence in the class of anyone else, except oneself. 'Have I come to-day to the class?' is a question which no one will ever ask himself. Enquiry is required only where there is a doubt."

In a similar manner, *aathmaa* can never be doubted; therefore no *pramaanaa* is required, since it is not relevant, in the absence of doubt.

Ironically, this statement may create a different doubt, as follows: "If there is no doubt regarding *aathmaa* and therefore no *aathma vichaara* or self enquiry is required, then why should Sureswaraachaaryaa write this treatise and a serious study of this and similar treatises be made?"

The answer to this doubt will be on the following lines: "There is no doubt about the fact 'I am'; there is no doubt about the fact 'I am a conscious being'; there is no doubt about the fact 'I am an existent being'. In fact, in the term 'conscious being', the word 'conscious' reveals the '*chith*' aspect and the word 'being' reveals the '*sath*' aspect. There is no doubt on the fact that 'I am '*sath chith*'. The doubt is 'what type of Conscious being am I? Am I a limited Conscious being or limitless Conscious being?' The confusion arises on this aspect alone, because along with 'me', the body - mind complex is also available. 'I', the '*sath-chith*' is self evidently revealed; but, along with 'me', the body-mind complex also is revealed. And, people successfully commit the blunder of 'throwing' the limitation of 'matter' – the body-mind complex upon 'me', the non-material Self. Enquiry is only to 'knock off' that wrongly transferred limitation. Enquiry is not to prove the *aathmaa* or to experience *aathmaa*, because *aathmaa* is ever experienced. The seeker is not working for 'my' experience. The, what is he working for? After saying " 'I' am", a diligent seeker should not add any limiting factor such as 'I am a man', 'I am a woman', 'I am a *Brahmir*', 'I am a *kshakthiyaa*', 'I am fifty years old', 'I am miserable' etc. All adjectives are to be removed. They belong to the 'matter'. The adjectives of the 'matter' are wrongly transferred to the non-material 'I'. The seeker should transfer them back to the body-mind complex and remain as *Aanandha Saakshi*. Adi Sankara says this in his *Upadesa Saahasri* (Ch. XVIII verse 3): "*siddhath eva aham ithi asmaath yushmadhdharmo nishidhyathe/ rajjvaam iva ahidheer yukthyaa tathvamithyaadhisaasanai*:"- "Just as the idea of a snake is negated from a rope, everything of the nature of the non-Self is negated from the eternally existing Self implied by the word 'I', on the evidence of the *mahaa vaakyam*-s, such as, 'Thou art That' etc., in which the implied meanings of the words have been ascertained by reasoning and scriptures".

Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* is useful for being what 'I' am, namely, *Aananda*: |

157. Chapter III, Verse 47 and 48 (10-10-2009)

Sureswaraacharya is refuting the objection raised by the *poorva meemaamsakaa*, viz. "mahaa vaakyam is not a *pramaanam* at all, because it is only stating a known fact", which view he had based on his principle, "yathra yathra siddha bodhakathvam thathra thathra *pramaanaanthara gamyathvam*", meaning "whenever a statement is talking about a fact, that fact should have already been known through some other *pramaanam*". The *poorva meemaamsakaa* had cited an example: "as in the case of 'nadhyaa: theerey palaani santhi' "

This was the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* objection, for which the *Aachaaryaa* is giving his answer: "I concede, that, in the case of *loukika / pourusheya vishayaa-s*, 'words' reveal only something known / knowable through other *pramaanam-s*. This is because whenever a human being talks or writes about something, even before he uses the language or words, he had known about it through some other *pramaanam*. Having learnt the fact through some other *pramaanam*, he only transmits it through words. His words do not 'generate' the knowledge; they only 'carry' the knowledge. (On this aspect, words can be likened to the modern 'water pipes' which do not produce water, but, only 'carry' water which has been produced elsewhere.) In the case of *pourusheya vishayaa*, I agree, that, *sabda* is not at all a *pramaanam*; it is only a 'carrier'. But, in the case of *apourusheya vishayaa-s*, the words do generate 'knowledge', since that 'knowledge' cannot be acquired through any other method, simple examples being *svargaa, narakaa, punyam, paapam* etc. The *Vedic* words are not mere 'carriers' of knowledge; they are the very 'producers' of knowledge".

Thus, there is a difference between *loukika granthaa:* and *vaidhika granthaa:* A *vedic granthaa* should never be compared or equated to books authored by humans, on different worldly subjects such as Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy and the like. This is a very important rule. If at all a *Vedic granthaa* is to be compared to or equated to something, it can be compared / equated to the human sense organs. *Vedaa* may verily be looked upon as the sixth sense organ. This is because, just as whatever is revealed by one sense organ can never be contradicted nor confirmed by any one of the other four sense organs, the 'knowledge' revealed by the *Vedaa-s* also can never be confirmed nor contradicted by any other *pramaanam* or method, including modern science.

Science cannot confirm or contradict what the eyes reveal. It cannot confirm or contradict what the ears reveal. Science can, of course, build further, based on the data received from the sense organs and that is what it does. Science does not question the data revealed by the sense organs. Science only works on the data. Science does not question the data received from the sense organs, because science has no method of verifying or negating

that data. Similarly, the entire *Veda* is like a sense organ and it reveals something that is *apourusheya*; it reveals something which is *pramaananthara agamyam*.

That is why the definition of *Veda* is "*prathyakshena anumithyaa vaa yasthu upaayena vidhyathe enam vidhanthi vedena thasmaath vedasya vedasaa*". *Vedaa* is a *pramaanam* which reveals things, which can neither be confirmed nor be contradicted by any other instrument of knowledge, modern or old.

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that *Veda Poorva bhaagaa* also deals with *apourusheya vishayaa-s* and *veda antha baagaha* also deals with *apourusheya vishayaa-s*.

The *apourusheya vishaaya-s* of *veda poorva bhaaghaa* are *paralokaa*, *punarjanmaa*, *punyam*, *paapam* etc. These are some of the super-sensuous topics belonging to *Veda Poorva*, which *vishayaa-s*, science can neither prove nor disprove. *Veda antha baaghaa* deals with *aathmaa*, which *aathmaa* is also not available for any other *pramaanam*. '*Aathmana: aprameyathvaath*', it is '*pramaananthara agamyam*'.

Vedaa is the only *pramaanam* with regard to *aathmaa*, which is not available for any other instrument of knowledge. This is what being said, in verses 47 and 48 .

In the 47th verse, four arguments were given in support of this:

(1) '*nithya avagathi roopathvaath*' – 'because *aathmaa* is *chaithanya roopam*'.

All the worldly *pramaanam-s* can deal only with *jada padhaartha-s*. *Aathmaa* is *chethana*::; therefore, those *pramaanam-s* cannot access *aathmaa*.

(2) '*anyamaana apekshanaath*' – 'because *aathmaa* **need** not be proved by other *pramaanam*'.

Since 'Consciousness' is self-revealed, it does not require proof; on the contrary, to 'prove' anything, we require Consciousness. The 'prover' Consciousness need not be proved / revealed by any other *pramaanam*. '*Svapraakasathvaath anyamaana apekshanaath*'- 'because it is self-revealed, it does not need any other proof'.

(3) '*Sabdhaadhiguna heenathvaath*' – 'because *aathmaa* does not have any of the *pancha gunaa-s* required for sensory operation'.

Sabdhaa is required for ears to operate; *sparsaa* is required for skin to operate and so on. At least one of the *Pancha gunaa-s* is required for the corresponding *jnaanendriyam* to

function. 'Aathmana: sabdhaadhi guna heenathvaath' – 'because aathmaa does not have any of the *pancha gunaa*-s required by the *pancha jnaanendriyaa*-s' - the *pancha jnaaendriyaa*-s will 'come back' without 'accessing' aathmaa. *Manthraa* 1.3 of the *Kenopanishad* may be recollected, in this context. The *manthraa* runs : "Na thathra chakshur gacchathi na vaak gacchathi no mana: na vidmo na vijaaneema: yathaa ethadh anusishyaath" meaning "The eyes do not objectify *Brahman* ; the organ of speech does not ; the mind also does not. We do not know that *Brahman*. We also do not know how *anyone* would reveal this *Brahman*".

(4) 'Samsaya anavathaarata:' – 'because of the absence of any doubt' (regarding the existence of the aathmaa).

Since aathmaa happens to be your 'Self', you will never doubt whether you are there are not. No one doubts the existence of oneself. A *pramaanam* is required only where there is doubt or where there is ignorance. When neither ignorance is there with regard to 'my' existence nor is there a doubt regarding 'my' existence, why do 'I' require a *pramaanam* to prove 'my' *satthaa*? The term 'anavathara:' literally means 'non-arrival'. 'Samsaya anavataarata:' means 'because of non-arrival of doubt' or 'because of absence of doubt'.

The *slokaa* (verse 47) is incomplete; it has to be connected to the next *slokaa*; or, it can be completed, by adding 'Thasmaath aathmaa na prameeyathe' - 'Therefore, aathmaa is not available for any instrument of knowledge'.

Chapter II: Verse 48 –

तृष्णानिष्ठीवनैर्नात्मा प्रत्यक्षाद्यैः प्रमीयते ।

प्रत्यगात्मत्वहेतोश्च स्वार्थत्वादप्रमेयतः ॥ ४८ ॥

....as it is the inmost Self, as it is an end to itself in itself, as it is not an object of knowledge, it is not cognized through ways of knowing, like perception etc., which are all 'products' of desire.

Sureswaraachaaryaa continues with the same topic in this verse also, viz., "Though aathmaa is *siddha vasthu*, you cannot say that it is '*pramaanaanthara gamyam*'. In other words, Sureswaraachaaryaa is 'demolishing' the *poorva meemasakaa's* generalization. What is the *poorva meemasakaa's* generalization? Ans: "Yathra yathra siddhathvam thathra thathra *pramaanaanthara gamyathvam*" meaning "whatever is an already existing entity, that entity must be knowable / must have been known through some *pramaanam* other than *sabdha pramanaam*". This is the *poorva meemasakaa's* principle. Sureswaraachaaryaa is 'demolishing' this principle, by averring "aathmaa is, of course, an already existing entity;

but, that already existing entity called *aathmaa* is **not** knowable through any *pramaanam* other than (*vaidhika*) *sabdha pramaanam*". That is the topic which he is continuing.

He says:

प्रत्यक्षाध्यै :आत्मा न प्रमीयते - *Aathmaa*, the Self, is not perceptible through any *pramaanam* like *prathyakshaa* etc.,

It is an irony that '*aathmaa*', the Self, which is the most intimate thing in the world (the most intimately available thing to me, is 'myself') is not 'knowable' by me, through any *pramaanam*, other than *Veda* or *Sabdha Pramaanam*.

The term '*prathyakshaadhyai:*' means 'through various *pramaanam*-s like *prathyakshaa* etc.:'; and, by the use of '*aadhyai:*', the other *pramaanam*-s indicated are: *anumaanaa*, *upamaana*, *arthaapatthi*, *anupalabdhi* and *loukika sabdhaa*-s (**not** *vaidhika sabdhaa*).

'*Na prameeyathe*' means '*na jnaayathe*' / 'unobjectifiable' / 'incapable of being objectified'. What is the reason?

Sureswaraachaaryaa indicates one of the reasons by a brief, but, pregnant term:

तृष्णा निष्ठीवनै : - which *pramaanam*-s are 'products' of 'desire',

The Aachaaryaa calls the six *pramaanam*-s, viz., *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi*, *anupalabdhi* and *loukika sabdhaa*-s (**not** *vaidhika sabdhaa*), as '*thrusnaa nishteevanaani*'.

This term '*thrusnaa nishteevanai:*' is a peculiar expression, which is an adjective to '*prathyakshaadhyai:*'| The term conveys a perception or insight, unique to this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, not to be found in other *prakaranaa*-s. And, it calls for a detailed explanation.

The word '*nishteevanam*' literally means 'saliva'. It is derived from the Sanskrit root '*shtiv*', meaning 'to spit'. Its abstract noun is '*shteevanam*', meaning 'saliva' or 'spittle'. '*ni*' is *upasargaa*. '*nishteevanam*' means 'that, which is spit out' .

Here, the Aachaaryaa uses this word '*nishteevanam*', in the meaning of 'product', since the saliva, which we spit out, is a product produced by the mouth. The final meaning of '*nishteevanam*', in this context, is '*kaaryam*'/ product.

Sureswaraacharya says that the six *pramaanam*-s, *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi*, *anupalabdhi* and *loukika sabdhaa*-s (**not** *vaidhika sabdhaa*) are 'products', which come to existence at a particular time. If they are products, who is the 'producer'? The *Aachaaryaa* says the 'producer' is '*thrushnaa*', which means 'desire'. These six *pramaanam*-s are products of our '*thrushnaa*', which word means '*kaamaa*' / desire. In effect, he says, '*kaama kaaryam pramaanam*' meaning '*pramaanam*-s are products of desire'.

Now, the questions are (i) how does he say so? and (ii) what is 'desire', in this context?

The following analysis answers these questions :

By whom is a *pramaanam* operated? A *pramaanam* is operated by a *pramaatha*. Who is a *pramaatha*? The knowing individual or the 'knower' individual is called *pramaatha*. And, that knower alone operates a *pramaanam*. Why does the *pramaatha* operate the *pramaanam*? Ans: Because, he **desires** to know a *prameyam*. To consolidate: *Pramaatha* operates a *pramaanam*, only when he desires to know a *prameyam*. Therefore '*prameya pramaa icchaa*' – 'desire for the knowledge of a *prameyam*' is the desire which makes a *pramaanam* come into operation. In other words, '*jignyaasaa*' or 'desire for knowledge' is the condition for the operation of a *pramaanam*. And, if that desire is not there, even though the *pramaanam* exists, the *pramaanam* is not functional. The following mundane example will make this clearer : Assume that the phone rings, when an individual is reading a book . The individual immediately turns his attention away from the book to the phone. In other words, he stops using the *pramaanam* of the 'eye' and starts using the *pramaanam* of the 'ear'. What does this show? Even though the 'ear' (instrument) was already existent, the 'ear' *pramaanam* is brought into operation, only because of the individual's desire to 'listen'. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says "*pramaanam*-s are born because of the 'desire' of *pramaatha*". Before the desire of the *pramaatha*, the **instruments** of *pramaanam* may be there, but they are not *pramaanam*-s, because they are not operated. Again, in the example, as soon as the individual turns his attention from 'reading' to 'listening', even though his eye balls are still there, they cease to be '*pramaanam*', since he has ceased to use them. Hence the conclusion: "*pramaanam*-s are born out of the desire of the *pramaatha*".

Granting this, why does the *Aachaaryaa* say that the *pramaanam*-s born out of desire, such as *prathyakshaa*, do not reveal the Self? It is answered as below:

The above analysis showed, that, even before the birth and function of *pramaanam*, the 'desire to know' exists. Whom does this desire belong to? It belongs to the *pramaatha*.

Therefore, it follows, that, even before the 'arrival' of the *pramaanam*, both the *pramaathaa* and 'his desire to know' exist.

And, not only do they exist, the *pramaathaa* also 'knows' about their existence. When? Even before the operation of the *pramaanam*.

In other words, the *pramaathaa's* existence and his 'desire to know' stand 'revealed', even before he starts operating the *pramaanam*. What does this mean? Ans: 'My' existence is revealed even before the operation of the *pramaanam*. In that case, why do 'I' require the operation of any *pramaanam* for proving 'me', the *pramaathaa*?

To repeat : Even before the operation of the *pramaanam*, 'I' know, that, 'I', the *pramaathaa* am existent, that I have a 'desire to know' and that only because of the 'desire to know', 'I' am going to operate the *pramaanam*. In fact, the very *pramaana* operation is because I am revealed and my 'desire to know' is revealed. Because of that alone, I start using the *pramaanam*. Thus, when even before the arrival and operation of *pramaanam*, *pramaathaa* and the 'desire to know' (termed *jignyaasaa* or *pramithsaa*) are revealed, why should I use any *pramaanam* to prove either myself and / or my 'desire to know'?

When *pramaathaa* itself need not be revealed, what to talk of *saakshi* which is the very Consciousness in the *pramaathaa*? Expressed in Sanskrit: *pramithsaa kaaryabhoothai: / jignyaasaa kaaryabhoothai: / vividishaa kaarya bhoothai: prathyakshaadhyai: pramaathaa eva na prameeyathe | kaimuthika nyaayena kim vakthavyam saakshi pramaanai: na prameeyathe ithi?*

The significant and terse adjective '*thrushnaa nishteevanai:*', encompasses all the above detailed arguments.

Proceeding further to the second line of verse 48:

प्रत्यगात्मत्वहेतोः च - also because that *pramaathaa* or *saakshi* happens to be the innermost Self of mine, which is always available as *aham*,

The *saakshi* is always available as the 'innermost' Self. Why does the *Aachaaryaa* say the 'innermost' Self? The contents of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* should be recollected, in this context.

Every individual has got two types of Self; one is the inner Self; the other is the outer self.

'Consciousness' is the inner Self.

What is the outer self? Ans: Physical body or the '*annamayaa*' forms part of the outer self; '*praanamayaa*' is part of outer self; '*manomayaa*' is part of outer self; '*vijnaana mayaa*' is part of outer self ; '*aanandha mayaa*' is also part of outer self.

Why do we say that '*annamayaa*', '*praana mayaa*' etc., are 'self'? Ans: Because of the simple reason that everyone uses the word 'I' (i) for the physical body, (ii) for the *praanaa*, (iii) for the mind and also (iv) for the intellect.

Whatever is denoted by the word 'I' (*aham*), is called 'self'. '*aham sabdha prathyaya vishayathvam aathmathvam*' is a fundamental definition. For example, when an individual says 'I was born in 1927', it is his body that he is denoting by the word 'I'. Therefore, the body is also called 'self'.

But, why is it called 'outer' self? Ans: Because it is 'removable' / because it 'can be discarded'. When does one 'remove' one's physical body? Ans: During *svapna avasthaa*. The 'dreamer' drops the *jaagrath* physical body on the couch and assumes another physical body in *svapnaa*, which is again 'dropped' in *sushupthi avasthaa*.

The physical body (*anna mayaa*) is removable and therefore it is called 'outer' self. To recap: Body is called 'self' because it is referred to by the word '*aham*' and it is called 'outer' self, because it is removed in *svapnaa* and *sushupthi*. Similarly, *praanamayaa* is also removable; so are *manomayaa*, *vijnaana mayaa* and *aanandha mayaa*. In *sushupthi*, the individual does not have '*aathmathva abhimaanaa*' in any one of them. During *sushupthi*, he does not even say "I am ignorant". Only after he wakes up, when he is in *jaagrath avasthaa*, he says "I **was** ignorant during *sushupthi*"; i.e., during *sushupthi*, he does not have even 'ignorance *abhimaanaa*'. This shows, that, during *sushupthi*, he is '*sarva abhimaana rahitha:*'| All the five *kosaa*-s are constituents of the 'outer' self.

Then, what is the inner or innermost self? Ans: Consciousness is what is 'innermost'. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* uses the adjective '*prathyak*' and refers to it as '***prathyak aathmaa***', meaning 'innermost Self'. And, *prathyak aathmaa* continues through all the three *avasthaa*-s, without interruption. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* starts his *Maneeshaa Panchakam* with a reference to this fact, as "*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa yaa samvidujrumbhathe*" – "That, which clearly shines forth in the waking, dream and deep sleep states". Therefore, 'I' am ever revealed as '*aham*' and, therefore, no *pramaanam* need reveal me.

Reverting to the text,

स्वार्थत्वात् - and since the 'knowledge' is sought for oneself,

This is another unique insight, which the students have to 'meditate' on (In this context, by the word 'meditate', the formal '*dhyaanam*', consisting of 'sitting in *padmaasanam*, with the body kept erect' is not meant. The word is used in the sense of 'deep and concentrated reflection' on the idea conveyed). All the ideas expressed by Sureswaraacharya in these two verses are subtle, but, profound. More and more these concepts become clear to the seeker, more and more will the *mahaa vaakyam* '*aham brahma asmi*' become significant and convincing to him. Therefore, the purpose of all these text books of the great *Aachaaryaa-s* is 'Clarity'. The *prakarana granthaa-s* and *Aachaaryaa-s* do not teach anything new. Their intention is to give clarity and more clarity with regard to the already known ideas given in the *Vedaa-s*.

Sureswaraacharya has used this another profound expression '*svarthathvaath*', which also needs detailed explanation:

When a seeker puts in effort to 'know' something, for what purpose or for whose benefit does he do it? The answer is obvious. One wants to 'know' things for one's own benefit only, just as all 'actions' also are carried out for one's own benefit only. Sage *Yaagnyavalkya* eloquently expresses this in the *Maithreyi Brahmanam* of the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* "*na vaa are sarvasya kaamaaya sarvam priyam bhavathi aathmanasthu kaamaaya sarvam priyam bhavathi*" meaning "It is not for the sake of all, my dear, that all is loved, but for one's own sake that it is loved".

This is true even of an individual who claims loftily "I work for others". If closely questioned as to why he should 'work for others', the reply will mostly be "I find joy in it". He works for others, because he enjoys it. The moment work becomes a burden, he drops it.

This shows, that, whatever we do is for our own benefit. This is called '*svartham*', the term used here, by Sureswaraacharya.

The *Aachaaryaa* implies "Whatever knowledge you acquire through different *pramaanam-s*, is intended by you, to serve your own benefit. If you want to know something for your own benefit, it is obvious, that even before 'knowing', you are available as the seeker of the benefit. What does that mean? You are already 'revealed' even before seeking any knowledge; therefore, you need not be revealed through any particular knowledge. No *pramaanaa* is required to prove the seeker, since, to use a *pramaanaa*, the individual should seek a knowledge, to seek the knowledge he must be there as 'seeker' of that knowledge and the 'seeker' of the knowledge need not be proved through that knowledge.

The seeker of self-knowledge through a '*pramaanam*', need not be proved by the '*pramaanam*'.

Even as one says "I want to know myself", 'I' am revealed. Even before the operation of the *pramaanaa*, 'I' am there.

The conclusion: "*jnaanam svaarthathvaath aham sarva pramaana avishaya:*" – "Since, the very 'seeking of knowledge' is only for 'my' own benefit, which proves 'my' existence, 'I' am not the object of any *pramaanam*'.

Because of all these reasons,

अप्रमेयत : - 'I' am not proved through a '*pramaanam*'.

Because of all these reasons, viz. (1) nithya avagathi roopathvaath (2) anyamaana apekshanaath (3) sabdhaadhi guna heenathvaath (4) samsaya anavathaaratha: (5) prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani thrushnaa nishteevanathvaath (6) prathyagathmathva hetho: and (7) svaarthathvaath, 'I' am not proved through a *pramaanam* - 'aham aprameyatha:'.

"*Aathmaa aprameytha:*" means "*aathmaa* is not available for objectification. It is not available for 'experience' in any particular state. It is not a mysterious thing, 'arising' and 'departing' in meditation". No *pramaanam* in the world **can** study *aathmaa* and no *pramaanam* in the world **need** study *aathmaa*.

"*Aham asmi sadhaabhaavi* " – " 'I' am always available". The only problem is, that, this knowledge happens to be partial. We are not lacking knowledge; but, we are lacking 'complete' knowledge. I know 'I am'; but I do not know that I am limitless. Because of ignorance, I superimpose limitations on 'me'. *Vedhaantha* is only scraping off / rubbing off these superimposed limitations . So, the seeker should continue with *Vedhaanthic* study (*sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani*), until he is able to say "I am", without adding any limitation, with the conviction, that 'I' means 'Consciousness' and 'am' means 'Existence' and that, everything else is *mithyaa anaathmaa*. All the struggles are meant for this 'understanding' only.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 49:

श्रुतिरपीममर्थं निर्वदति ।

The *sruthi* also says the same thing.

- श्रुति :अपि - The Sruthi also
- निर्वदति - nischayena vadhaathi / very clearly declares
- इमं अर्थ - this same idea.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "I have logically established that `aathmaa is aprameyatha:| This fact is not only logically established ; but, *Upanishad*-s also clearly support this".

One of the *Sruthi* supports that can be quoted, is the popular *manthraa* from the *Brahadhaarananyaka Upanishad* (*Ushastha Brahmanam* III.iv.1 and *Kahola Brahmanam* III.v.1) which refers to *Brahman* / *aathmaa* in the following manner: "*Yadh saakshaath aparokshaath Brahma ya aathmaa sarvaanthara:*" – "The *Brahman* that is immediate and direct – the Self that is within all".

Dayananda Swamiji, very often, says: "If there is one *anubhavaa* for which I need not work, it is *aathma anubhavaa* (since *aathmaa* is ever experienced). *Aathma anubhavaa* being *Brahma anubhavaa*, I need not work for *Brahma anubhavaa* also".

In that case, what is a seeker expected to work for? Ans: He should work for 'removal of limitations' from the ever experienced 'I'.

Addition of 'limitation' is an intellectual mistake, a misconception resulting from intellectual confusions. Since it is a cognitive error, 'removal of limitation' also has to be a cognitive process and not an experiential process.

What we require is neither *aathma anubhavaa* nor *Brahma anubhavaa*; but, an intellectual conclusion, that, the ever available 'I' does not have any physical limitation. The seeker has to gain this knowledge intellectually, by saying "'I' am; but, all my physical limitations belong to the outer self / the physical body and not to 'me'". He has to say this using the *buddhi*. Therefore, this is not a matter of experience; but it is a matter of understanding.

Similarly "*praanic* limitations also belong to *praana maya* and not to 'me'" is a question of understanding; "emotional limitations belong to 'my' mind and not to 'me'" is also a question of understanding. What the seeker requires is not a new *anubhavaa*; what he requires is a new understanding. "*aham aathma eva* " *jnaanam* is required, which is a cognitive process and not an experiential process.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*Sruthi* is teaching this fact" and warns the seeker "Enough of your *samaadhi* and similar *saadhanaa*-s. Listen properly to the *Sruthi* teaching and also

understand it properly. Other than this understanding, nothing is required for *mokshaa*, because you are already a *muktha*: |”

Chapter II: Verse 49 –

दिदुक्षित परिच्छिन परायूपादिसंश्रयात् ।

विपरीतमतो दृष्टया स्वतोबुद्धं न पश्यति ॥ ४९ ॥

This is contrary in nature, to things limited and external, about which ordinary investigation is undertaken. It is self-revealed and hence, through ordinary apprehension, it is not to be revealed.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa is keeping in mind, a *Brahadhaaranyaka vaakyam*, which he will refer to, in the next *slokaa*; keeping that *slokaa* in mind, he is paraphrasing the idea in this *slokaa*. What he says is: “*Aathmaa* is **not** like *anaathmaa*. Therefore, do not imagine or conceive *aathmaa* like any other *anaathmaa* and try to ‘experience’ it, in a mystic state, through a mysterious experience”.

A seeker should not attempt to ‘experience’ *aathmaa* in meditation. He should realize, that, even if he continues his attempt over a long period – even for a few *janmaa*-s, his attempt will be futile. He will never succeed in ‘experiencing’ *aathmaa*. Some mysterious ‘experiences’ might result when the mind is subjected to a lot of pressure, but those ‘experiences’ will not come under ‘*aathma anubhavaad*’.

(Here, Swamiji quoted a claim made by a person to him, that, when that person was once in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, he saw a white light arrive and go round the picture of his ‘*guru*’. Then, it spread further and further, lasting for about 3 to 4 minutes, before disappearing. The person claimed that it was ‘*brahma anubhavaad*’.

Swamiji continued on this incident : “The person might have got the experience. That need not be denied. But, unfortunately, the ‘white light’ that came, is certainly not *Brahmar*’. A *Kenopanishad manthraa* (1-6) specifically warns: “*Yanmanasaa na manuthe yena aahur mano matham / Thadeva Brahma thvam viddhi nedham yadhidham upaasathe*” – “*Brahman* is that very Consciousness which people do not know with the mind, and, by which Consciousness, they say, the mind is known” – Thus you understand. This, which people meditate upon is **not** *Brahmar*’)

Any object of experience is only *anaathmaa* . Any peculiar experience is a mental condition. A mental condition also belongs to *anaathmaa*, because mind also is *anaathmaa*. Any fluctuating mental experience has nothing to do with *aathma anubhavam* or *Brahma anubhavam*.

Then, what is *aathmaa*? 'I', 'the ever witnessing Consciousness was *Brahman*, is *Brahman* and will be *Brahman*, which is always available. Why should anyone 'look for' it?

Therefore, what is the lesson? *Aathmaa* is unlike *anaathmaa*. How?

Anaathmaa has got five features:

- (1) *dhrusyathvam* – being an object of experience
- (2) *baudhikathvam* – made up of matter or material
- (3) *sagunathvam* - endowed with attributes
- (4) *savikaarathvam* - subject to change and
- (5) *aagamaapaaytivam* – subject to 'arrival and 'departure'. The mysterious experiences 'coming and going' are, therefore, *anaathmaa*.

'I', the *aathmaa*, have got the opposite five features, viz.:

- (1) *adhruyathvam* - never to be experienced, as an object. (A seeker, therefore, should never complain '*Brahma anubhavam* never came'. It will never come; it need not come.)
- (2) *abaudhikathvam* - non- material. ('I' am non-material Consciousness', should be the conviction of a diligent seeker)
- (3) *agunathvam* - free from attributes.
- (4) *avikaarathvam* - not subject to change and
- (5) *anaagamaapaayithvam* – not subject to 'arrival' and 'departure'.

'I', the *aathmaa*, is, therefore different from *anaathmaa*.

'I' will not 'come' and 'go'. There is no question of 'my' escaping from this world, even in the name of *videha mukthi*.

'I' am always the *adhishtaanam*. In 'me', the matter and the material world will come and go. *Kaivalyopanishad* (manthraa 19) declares : "Mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathishtitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh brahma advayamasmyaham"- "Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything is resolved in me alone. I am that non-dual Brahman.

Sureswaraacharya wonders: "All these are crystal clear; but, why do you not understand them?"

Reverting to the text, verse 49, '*Dhidhrukshitha parichchina paraag roopaadhi samsrayaath'* is the description of *anaathmaa*, the *dhrusya prapancha*: | The five features of *anaathmaa* mentioned earlier, is presented by Sureswaraachaaryaa in another language.

- दिदुक्षित - Desired to be experienced

This is a beautiful expression, arrived from '*Dhrashtum ishtam'*. It is desiderative form of the root '*dhrus'*, meaning 'that, which is desired to be experienced'. This is an adjective applied by the *Aachaaryaa* to *Anaathmaa*.

From this expression describing *anaathmaa*, what is conveyed by him, is: "You can desire only for the experience of *anaathmaa'*, whereas *aathmaa* is something, which you can never desire for 'experience'. *Aathmaa* is *adhidhrukshitham'*."

Why should you not desire to experience *aathmaa'*? Ans: Because, even before desiring to experience it, *aathmaa* is available as the Consciousness, **which** desires to experience everything.

158. Chapter III, Verse 49 to 51 (24-10-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is answering a 'poorva pakshaa', an objection raised by a group of poorva meemaamsakaa-s, who hold, that, aathmaa need not be revealed by the scriptures.

By applying a false principle, '*yathra yathra siddhathvam thathra thathra pramaanaanthara gamyathvam*', the *poorva meemaamsakaa-s* believe: "Aathmaa is an existent entity; whatever is an existent entity can be revealed by *pramaanam-s*, other than *sruthi*. Therefore, it is not necessary for *sruthi* to reveal the *aathmaa*".

Then, when asked "What is the job of the *sruthi*?", the *poorva meemaamsakaa-s* reply: "The entire *Vedic* scripture is meant to reveal only *karmaa* - in one form or another; either in the form of *kaayika karmaa*, the rituals, or *maanasa karmaa*, viz., *upaasanaa*. *Aathmaa* is not revealed by the scriptures. '*Aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*' – 'Since *Vedaa-s* are meant to specify only actions to be done, their statements which do not inculcate actions are of no significance or value".

'*Aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*' is the most important *poorva meemaamsaa soothraa*, which forcefully asserts that the entire *Veda* is meant to prescribe varieties of action only.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *poorvapakshaa* here. He says: "We concede this theory of yours in the context of *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*. In *karma kaandaa*, *karmaa-s* have to be taught. The very purpose of *karma kaandaa* is 'revealing *karmaa*'. That is why it is called *karma kaandaa*. Therefore, you may apply your pet *soothraa*, '*aamnaayasya kriyaarthathvaath aanarthakyam athadharthaanaam*', in the context of *karma kaandaa*. But, when you come to *jnaana kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s*, you cannot apply that principle. As the very word '*jnaana kaandaa*' shows, it is meant to give us only *jnaanam*; not to commend any action. And, what is the 'knowledge' that it gives? It gives 'knowledge of *aathmaa*'".

The *poorva meemamsakaa* asks: "But, why should *jnaana kaandaa* give us the knowledge of *aathmaa*? *Aathmaa*, being an existent entity, can be known through other methods".

In reply, Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts: "No, *Aathmaa* can never be known by any instrument of knowledge; all the instruments are designed to know only the *anaathmaa*; *anaathmaa* has got five attributes: (1) *dhrusyathvam* – being an object of experience (2) *boudhikathvam* - material in nature (3) *sagunathvam* – endowed with properties (4) *savikaarathvam* – subject to modifications and (5) *aagamaapaayithvam* – subject to arrival and departure. Because of these five attributes, *anaathmaa* can be revealed by the

pramaanam-s other than scriptures – viz., *prathyaksham* , *anumaanam*, *upamaanam* , *arthaapatthi* and *anupalabdhi*. But, none of these five *pramaanam*-s is ever capable of revealing *aathmaa*, since *aathmaa* has none of the above attributes of *anaathmaa*. In contrast to *anaathmaa*, *aathmaa* is (1) *adhrusyam* - not an object of experience (2) *aboudhikam* – not a material entity (3) *nirgunam* – not endowed with properties (4) *nirvikaaram* – not subject to modifications and (5) *nithyam* – not subject to arrival and departure.

"How can a *pramaanam* meant for *anaathmaa*, function in the field of *aathmaa*, when *aathmaa* has none of the attributes of *anaathmaa*, because of which attributes only, the *pramaanam* is able to reveal *anaathmaa*?"

The *Aachaaryaa* continues: "Therefore, *Vedhaanthaa* alone can reveal the nature of *aathmaa*. And, in *Vedhaanthaa* too, the *mahaa vaakyani*. It is *mahaa vaakyam*, which is meant to reveal the nature of *aathmaa*".

And, what is the *anaathmaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* uses a huge compound in the first line of the verse 49 to describe *anaathmaa* and differentiate it from *aathmaa*. He says: "*dhiddhakshitha parichchinna paraag roopaadhi samsrayaath vipareethamatha.*"| The two words '*aathmaa*' and '*anaathmaa*' have to be supplied in conjunction with '*vipareethamatha.*', the message being '*aathmaa* is *vipareetham* to *anaathmaa*' meaning '*aathmaa* is diagonally opposite to *anaathmaa* |

- दिदुक्षित - (Since *anaathmaa* is an) object of experience ,

Mind also will come under *anaathmaa*, since it is also only an object of our experience. Thoughts also will come under *anaathmaa*. They are also objects of experience. Ignorance also will come under *anaathmaa*, since it is also an object of experience. How do we say that? During *sushupthi*, we 'experience' ignorance and, in fact, only ignorance, which, therefore, is solid *anaathmaa*. This ignorance is otherwise called *kaarana sareeram*, which is otherwise called *moolaavidhyaa*. Therefore, the conclusion is: *sthoala sareeram* is an object; *sookshma sareeram* is an object; *kaarana sareeram* is an object. All of them are, therefore, *anaathmaa*. Any *pramaanam*, other than the *sruthi mahaa vaakyani*, is meant to deal with only *anaathmaa*.

- परिच्छिन्न - (since *anaathmaa* is) limited / subject to limitation,

This is the second description of *anaathmaa*. Any *anaathmaa* is subject to limitation – either of '*desa*' (space) or '*kaala*' (time) or '*desa-kaala*' (both space and time).

- पराग् - (since anaathmaa is) external,

Paraag means '*baahyam*'; the external world is *baahyam*; the physical body is also *baahyam*. What about the mind? Is mind external or internal? Our general tendency will be to say that mind is internal ; but, it should be carefully noted, that, from the standpoint of the body, mind is internal; but, from the standpoint of 'I', the observer, mind is also an object away from 'me' or outside of 'me'. Therefore, mind is also a *paraag vasthu* or *baahya vasthu*. It is also *paraag* or *baahya anaathmaa*.

- पराग् - (and since anaathmaa is) endowed with attributes,

'*Roopam*' means 'form' / 'appearance'; '*aadh*' means 'etc.'; '*samsraya*:' literally means 'a resting place' and, in this context, means 'endowed with'. '*Roopaadhi samsraya*:', therefore, means 'endowed with various attributes like form etc.'; in short, it means, '*sagunam*'.

To consolidate, the meaning of the first line of the verse (which is incomplete) is: "Since *anaathmaa* is an object of experience, is limited, is 'external' and is endowed with attributes",

This *anaathmaa* can be revealed by an instrument of knowledge other than *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*.

What about *aathmaa*?

- अत) :आत्मन (:विपरीतं - that, which is other than this anaathmaa, and which is of the opposite nature, viz.,

'*atha*:' means 'other than'; '*anaathmana*:' is supplied and '*atha: anaathmana*:' means 'other than this *anaathmaa*'; '*vipareetham*' means 'opposite', '*atha: vipareetham*', therefore, implies the *aathmaa* / the 'observer' / the *saakshi*.

What is the proof that the *saakshi* is existing? Ans: The very fact that *anaathmaa* is observed / the very observation of the *anaathmaa* is the proof for the existence of the 'Observer of *anaathmaa*'. The very observation of *anaathmaa* / that the world is observed / that the body is observed / that the mind is observed / that the thoughts are observed / that the silence is observed, **every** 'observation' proves the presence of *saakshi*, the 'observer'.

And, therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

- स्वतोबुद्धं - the ever-evident (saakshi),

'*svathobuddham*' means 'ever-evident' ; the *saakshi* is ever-evident as the observer of *anaathmaa* . But, there is a problem. And, what is that problem? Ans: *Saaksh/s existence* is evident but *saaksh/s nature* is not known. The seeker knows that there is a *saakshi*, but, does not know whether that *saakshi* is finite or infinite; does not know whether the *saakshi* is *sagunam* or *nirgunam*.

The existence of the *saakshi* itself is evident; but the nature of the *saakshi* is not evident; and, to know the nature of the *saakshi*, the seeker cannot use the worldly *pramaanam*-s. He has to use the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* alone.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

दृष्ट्या न पश्यति - (the seeker) does not comprehend through *loukika ramaanam*.

In this context, 'dhrushti' means 'loukika pramaanam' or 'loukika pramaana janya jnaanam'. The nature of the *saakshi* cannot be known through 'loukika pramaanam' or 'loukika pramaana janya jnaanam'.

Existence of '*saakshi*' is evident; but, we have to know the **nature** of the *saakshi*, only through the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* is very, very important - **not** to reveal the *saakshi* but to reveal the **nature** of the *saakshi*. **This distinction is very important**. *Saakshi* need not be revealed, because it is evident as 'observer' of everything, but, the nature of the *saakshi* has to be revealed by *mahaa vaakyam* alone.

Chapter III: Verse 50 –

न्यायसिद्धमतो वक्ति दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारमात्मनः ।

न पश्येत्प्रत्यगात्मानं प्रमाणं श्रुतिरादरात् ॥ ५० ॥

The authoritative *Sruthi* declares with keen interest what is eminently logical, when it says 'You cannot see your inner Self, the seer of everything'.

Here, Sureswaraacharya says, that, this unique fact is mentioned by the *Upanishad* also.

What is the unique fact? Ans : "Consciousness / *saakshi* is evident to all the people; but, the nature of the *saakshi* is not knowable through any *pramaanam* other than *Sruthi*". 'Existence' is different from 'nature'. To express in another language: "Consciousness is evident to all; but, the nature of Consciousness is not evident to all ; it is not knowable through any *pramaanam* other than *sruthi*".

Saasthraa-s reveal five features of Consciousness, viz.,

1. Consciousness is not a part, product or property of the body;
2. Consciousness is an independent entity which pervades and enlivens the body;
3. Consciousness is not limited by the boundaries of the body;
4. Consciousness continues to survive / exist even after the destruction of the body; and,
5. The surviving Consciousness is not accessible because of the absence of the body medium.

All these five facts about Consciousness are known to the seeker only through and because of *saasthraa*-s. No other instrument of knowledge, including scientific experiments, can reveal these facts. That is why Consciousness is a mystery even to sciences like neurology etc.

The scientists do not even know which branch of science Consciousness should fall under, because, no branch of science is able to understand the nature of Consciousness. The *Upanishad* itself clearly declares this fact, that, facts about Consciousness are known to the seeker only through *saasthraa*-s.

- अतः श्रुतिः प्रमाणं वक्ति - The Sruthi pramaanam itself declares
- न्यायसिद्धं - this fact which is made very evident by the reasoning given in the previous slokaa.

What was the fact made evident in the previous *slokaa*? Ans: "*Pramaanam*-s can reveal *anaathmaa* / matter; they cannot reveal *aathmaa* / Consciousness". Sureswaraacharya calls this fact as '*nyaaya siddham*' – 'a fact established by reasoning'. What was the reasoning? "*Aathmaa* does not have any one of the five features of *anaathmaa*, by which features only, *pramaanam*-s reveal *anaathmaa*".

And, where does the *sruthi* declare this fact? Sureswaraacharya refers to the very often quoted *Brahadhaaranyaka Vaakyam* of the 2nd *manthraa* of the 4th *Brahmanam* of the 3rd Chapter of the *Upanishad* (III.iv.2).

Part of this *manthraa* (B.U. III. iv. 2) runs: " Na dhruhter dhrashtaaram pasye:, na sruthersrothaaram srunyaath , na mathermanthaaram manveethaa:, na vijnyaather vijnyaathaaram vijaaneeyaa:" meaning "You cannot see that which is the witness of vision; you cannot hear that which is the hearer of hearing; you cannot know by thought, that which is the thinker of thought; you cannot know that which is the knower of knowledge".

Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to that *manthraa* here. In the term '*dhrushter dhrashtaaram*', the word '*dhrushti:*' means a thought / a *vrutthi:* / a *dharsana vrutthi:*, a thought because of which, one sees the external forms and colours.

Similarly, '*sruthi:*' (in this *manthraa*) means '*sravana vrutthi:*'; '*sravana vrutthi:*' means a thought which experiences sound and similarly '*graana vrutthi:*' would mean a thought which experiences smell.

The *Upanishad* says, that, thoughts are, thus, perceivers of the external world. And, the thoughts themselves are 'arising and departing'. When '*dharsana vrutthi:*' arises, the external forms are known. When '*dharsana vrutthi:*' goes away, forms and colours also go away. Likewise, when '*sravana vrutthi:*' comes, sounds are known and when '*sravana vrutthi:*' goes away, sounds also go away. The thoughts are 'arriving and departing'. Each thought is 'seeing' / perceiving an external object.

The *Upanishad* further says: "Thoughts are 'seeing' the world, by the five functions of the five sense organs – namely, by sight, by hearing, by smell, by taste and by touch ; but, the thoughts themselves are, in turn, 'seen' by an 'observer', who is also aware of the 'arriving and departing' thoughts."

The *Upanishad* refers to that 'Observer' as 'the seer of the seeing thought' - '*dhrushter dhrashtaad*', 'hearer of the hearing thought' - '*sruther srothaad*', 'thinker of the thinking thought' - '*mather manthaa*' and 'knower of the knowledge' - '*vignyaather vignyaathaad*'.

The *Upanishad* proceeds: "Thus, there is a seer of the seeing thought, hearing thought, smelling thought, tasting thought and touching thought. Five types of thoughts are there and there is one witness *saakshi* / the observer *saakshi*. But, the *saakshi* itself cannot be objectified / revealed / illumined by any one of the thoughts. The seer of the seeing thought cannot be seen by the seeing thought. The seer of the hearing thought cannot be heard by the hearing thought. The seer of the smelling thought cannot be smelt by the smelling thought. Thoughts are revealed by the *saakshi*, but *saakshi* cannot be revealed by thoughts".

Thoughts are revealed by the *saakshi*; but, the *saakshi* cannot be objectified by the thoughts. All the *pramaanam-s* are capable of generating thoughts only. And, thoughts are useless in revealing the nature of *saakshi*.

This is a wonderful development of an important fact, by the *Brahadhaarnyaka Upanishad*, which should be properly grasped by the student.

To repeat, for clarity: All the *pramaanam*-s are capable of generating thoughts. When one uses the eyes, what do the eyes do? Ans: They generate a thought, which thought sees the object in front. Likewise, when one operates the ears, the ears generate a thought in the mind and that thought reveals the sound.

Thus, all *pramaanam*-s are capable of generating thoughts and the thoughts reveal the objects. But, the thoughts can never reveal the *saakshi*, because the thoughts themselves are revealed by the *saakshi* only.

What applies to the 'thoughts' applies to the mind also. Mind is revealed by the *saakshi* but the *saakshi* itself is not revealed by the mind. No *pramaanam*, no physical body, no mind and no thought can reveal the *saakshi*, because they are all revealed by the *saakshi* only.

If one wants to know the nature of *saakshi*, one cannot employ the *pramaanam*-s or the mind. One has to use *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* alone, to know the nature of the *saakshi*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says (quoting from the *Upanishad*):

- न पश्येत् - One can never know, through a thought,
- आत्मनः द्रष्टारं - the seer of one's own thought / the 'saakshi',

'*aathmana:*' means 'one's own' (*aathmaa* does not refer to the *sacchidhaanaanda aathmaa*, in this context); '*dhrushti:*', in this context, means 'thought'; '*dhrashtaa*' means 'seer'. What is the seer of one's own thought? Ans: '*Aathma:*', the '*saakshi*'; the '*saakshi*' is the 'seer of one's own thought'.

One can never know the seer of one's own thought, viz., the *saakshi*, through a thought. And, by extension, through a *pramaanam*. You can never know the '*saakshi*' with the help of any thought or with the help of any *pramaanam*, which is the generator of the thought, because the thought itself is objectified only by the *saakshi*.

And, what is that *saakshi* called?

- प्रत्यक् आत्मानं - which is the inner Self.

'*Prathyak aathma:*' is adjective to '*dhrashtaa*', in this sentence. The final meaning of the statement is "One can never know the *saakshi*, the *prathyak aathmaa*, which is the knower of the thought, with the help of any thought or with the help of any *pramaanam*, which is

the generator of thoughts only". Therefore, if you want to know the nature of *saakshi*, you have to take the help of *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* only.

- (इति श्रुतिः प्रमाणं) आदरात् (वक्ति) - Thus (that *saakshi* can never be known by worldly *pramaanam*-s) declares the *sruthi pramaanam* with keen interest.

'*Pramaanam sruthi:*' (in the verse) should be read as '*sruthi: pramaanam*'. And, the '*sruthi: pramaanam*' referred to, here, is the *Brahadhaaranyaka Sruthi Pramaanam*. '*aadhara:*' means 'respect' / 'care' / 'desire' / 'keen interest'.

Therefore, the student should remember, that, whenever one is experiencing one's own mind, that experience is taking place because of the glory of *saakshi* ; *saakshi* alone with the help of its own Consciousness , the original *Chith*, is revealing the mind. Mind is revealed by the *chith saakshi* only.

This fact needs to be repeatedly highlighted, because, quite often, there is a doubt in the mind of the student - a very, very subtle doubt, as to whether the 'mind' is known by '*chith*' or '*chidhaabhaasaad*'. If a question "Is the mind known by '*chith*' or by '*chidhaabhaasaad*'?" is asked, the general tendency is to answer "mind is known by '*chidhaabhaasaad*' ". This perspective is erroneous. The student should know, that, the mind is known / revealed only by the '*chith*'. Of course, the student can happily say that the external world is known by the *chidhaabhaasaa*, which is in the mind; but, the mind is known only by '*chith*'.

World is known by *chidhaabhaasa* in the mind; the mind is known by the *chith*. This distinction must be clear. Therefore, whenever I am experiencing the world, I am experiencing the glory of *chidhaabhaasaa* and whenever I am experiencing the mind, I am experiencing the glory of *chith* alone. And, also, when I say "I perceive the world", the word 'I' means the '*chidhaabhaasaad*', and whenever I say "I know the mind", the word 'I' means the '*chith*' only.

The following example will make the distinction very clear:

"Assume, that, on a full-moon night, there are no clouds and there is a bright moon. Because of the bright moon, the earth is clearly illumined / revealed. I ask a question 'What is the earth illumined by?' The answer is simple, viz., 'The earth is illumined by moonlight'. Suppose, I ask the next question 'What is the moon illumined by?' and suppose, someone replies 'The moon is also illumined by the moonlight'. Is the answer right or wrong? Though there is a tendency to give this reply 'moon is illumined / revealed by the moonlight', this answer is wrong, since it will mean 'moon is self-luminous'. But, it is common knowledge that moon is not self-luminous and, that, moon gets its illumination from sunlight.

"Whenever you are experiencing the moon, you are experiencing the glory of sunlight, because of which sunlight only, there is moonlight. When you are experiencing the bright earth on a full-moon light, you are, of course, experiencing the glory of moonlight and you can boldly say 'I am experiencing the glory of moonlight'; whereas, when you are looking at the moon and experiencing the moon, you are experiencing the glory of sunlight, because the moon is revealed by sun. When the sun illumines the moon, moonlight is formed and that moonlight illumines the earth.

"In the context of the triad of (i) the *saakshi* (ii) the mind and (iii) the perceived world, the *saakshi* is similar to the sun in the example, the mind is similar to the moon in the example and the perceived world is similar to the 'earth' in the example. Whenever you are experiencing your mind, you are experiencing the glory of '*chith*', the '*saakshi*'; you should not say 'I am experiencing the glory of *chidhaabhaasaa*'. I am the *saakshi chith*, whenever I am experiencing the mind. 'Mind experience' is 'experiencing the glory of *saakshi*'. And, whenever I talk about the external world, the experience of the external world is because of '*chidhaabhaasaa*'".

To recap: When am I experiencing the *saakshi*? Ans: Whenever I am experiencing the mind, I am the *saakshi*, who is the 'objectifier' of the mind. Having objectified the mind as the *saakshi*, thereafter, I join the mind and experience the world. By experiencing the world, I am experiencing the glory of '*chidhaabhaasaa*' and by experiencing the mind, I am experiencing the glory of '*chith*'. 'Mind experience' is '*chith* experience'; 'world experience' is '*chidhaabhaasaa*' experience. In the example given above, 'moon experience' is 'sunlight experience'; 'earth experience' is 'moonlight experience'

Unfortunately, *chith* and *chidhaabhaasaa* are often mixed up, resulting in confusions. What Sureswaraachaaryaa says is: "As the experiencer of the mind, *chith-saakshi* is always available ; it is only the nature of the *chith*, whether it is *paricchinnam* or *aparicchinnam* etc., which is not known. For knowing the nature of *chith*, *mahaa vaakyam* is required".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 51:

अनुमानाविषयत्वेऽन्यदपि कारणमुच्यते ।

I shall now give the reason for *aathmaa* / *saakshi* not being an object of inference also:

The central topic of this portion must be clearly understood. The central theme is: "All the *pramaanam*-s generate thoughts; and thoughts are meant to reveal *anaathmaa*. Therefore,

all the *pramaanam*-s can talk about *anaathmaa* only. If one wants to know about *chith*, one has to resort only to *mahaa vaakyam*".

The term 'all the *pramaanam*-s', in the above statement refer to the five *pramaanam*-s other than *sruthi*, viz., *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi* and *anupalabdhi*. The *Brahadhaaranyaka Manthraa* quoted by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the previous verse, categorically stated that *prathyaksha pramaanam* cannot reveal the dimension of *saakshi* / the measurements of *saakshi*.

Now in this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say that *anumaana pramaanam* also cannot reveal the dimensions / measurements of the *saakshi*.

- अनुमान अविषयत्वे - With regard to the inability of *anumaana pramaanam* to reveal *aathmaa*,

What does this 'inability of *anumaanaa* to reveal *aathmaa*' mean? Ans: It means "Anumaanam cannot reveal the **dimensions** (**not** the existence) of *aathmaa*". The existence of *aathmaa* need **not** be revealed, because, in the form of mind-experience, *chaithanyam* is **always evident**. Nothing / nobody need ever reveal 'existence' of *aathmaa*. But, what about the 'nature' / dimensions of *aathmaa*? Only *mahaa vaakyam* can reveal 'nature' / dimensions of *aathmaa*. *Anumaanam* also cannot reveal that. With regard to this fact,

- अन्यदपि कारणं उच्यते - reason is given (to show that *anumaanam* cannot help).

All these discussions ultimately establish the glory of *mahaa vaakyam*. A perceptive student would find his respect for *mahaa vaakyam* multiply many times, when he listens to these arguments of the *Aachaaryaa*. He would also realize how disturbed Sureswaraachaaryaa must have been, by the *poorva meemaamsaka's* remark on the *mahaa vaakyam*, "*Siddha bodhaka vaakyathvaath mahaa vaakyam artha vaadham*" - "Since the *mahaa vaakyam* only talks of an already known existing entity viz., the *aathmaa*, the *vaakyam* is meaningless / useless". Because of his intense emotion, which can be imagined by a discerning student, the *Aachaaryaa* is going on and on, on this topic, all his sayings meant for establishing the glory of *mahaa vaakyam*.

There is no other method except *mahaa vaakyam*, by which you will know the fact "*aham Brahma asmi*". Meditation also is totally ruled out as a means to self-knowledge. 'Meditation' is nothing but generation of thoughts in the mind or cessation of thoughts; i.e., in meditation, the practitioner does only one of two things (i) either stop all the thoughts or (ii) produce and dwell on a thought. Either he remains totally thoughtless or concentrates on a

specific thought. Obviously, 'thoughtlessness' cannot generate a new knowledge. And, when thoughts also cannot reveal the dimensions of *aathmaa*, how can meditation help in achieving 'self-knowledge'? Dayananda Swamiji jocularly remarks on this: "Either you are quietly ignorant or you are agitatedly ignorant".

Therefore, it should be remembered, that, meditation, by itself, can never do anything with regard to acquiring knowledge - any type of knowledge. *After* gaining the knowledge of the Self, from *mahaa vaakyam*, meditation in the form of *manana-nidhidyaasanaani* can be used, but, that too, only to 'internalize' the knowledge already gained through *mahaa vaakyam*.

No new knowledge can be generated by meditation, because meditation is not even a *pramaanam*. Even if it is considered a *pramaanam*, it can only reveal one or another *anaathmaa*. During meditation, one may get a mystic experience, which experience will reveal a mystic *anaathmaa* only.

Many seekers are not clear about these limitations of meditation. They wrongly think that, *aathma jnaanam* / realization 'comes' in meditation. Sureswaraacharya is struggling to knock off that misconception. Clear understanding of *mahaa vaakyam* **is** realization. Other than that, **no** other realization is possible. Therefore, all these *sloka-s* should boost the value of *mahaa vaakyam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* gives the reason to show that *anumaanam* cannot help, in the verse.

Chapter III: Verse 51 –

प्रत्यक्षस्य पराक्त्वान्न संबन्धग्रहणं यतः।

आत्मनोऽतोऽनुमित्यास्यानुभवो न कथंचन ॥ ५१ ॥

Perception is directed to external objects. It is in perception, that the connection between 'ground' and 'consequence', necessary for inference is to be established. Therefore, in relation to the Self, such connection cannot be grasped. Therefore, no experience of Self can be acquired through inference.

Anumaanam cannot help in the field of *aathma jnaanam*. *Anumaanam* means 'logical reasoning'. And, in the word *anumaanam*, all the modern experimental sciences are included, because all forms of modern science are using only the method of *anumaana* in their experimentations.

How do we say that? What is that method of *anumaanaa*, used by science? Ans: The first step is to collect data with the help of *prathyaksha pramaanam*, using advanced gadgets or

instruments like microscope, telescope etc. Of course, the microscopes and telescopes are getting more and more refined. Based on that data, the scientists are only 'projecting' some other conclusions.

If a question "During scientific experimentations, do the *pramaanam*-s collect data from *aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*?" is raised, the inevitable answer will be that all data are collected only from *anaathmaa* - either micro - *anaathmaa* or macro- *anaathmaa*. For instance, the science of Astronomy deals with the macro, through telescopes ; the sciences of microbiology or quantum physics deal with atoms and the like, through microscopes. But, all of them are collecting data only from *anaathmaa* and through *anaathmaa*; and, whatever conclusion are arrived at, based on that data, will also be dealing with *anaathmaa* only. *Anaathmaa* data will give more knowledge about *anaathmaa* only.

Therefore, even if billions of newer and newer books are written, dealing with either the internal world of mind, neurons etc., or with the stars and galaxies, none of them will ever 'touch' *aathmaa*. When can modern science be expected to know about *aathmaa* ? Never. It will never be possible. The scientists can conduct their studies to know more and more about *anaathmaa*, through *prathyakshaa* and *anumaanaa*; but, if they want to know *aathmaa*, even the scientists have to resort to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* only.

At the same time, a discerning *Vedhaanthin* will never condemn science, because life requires *anaathma jnaanam* also; life requires *aathma jnaanam* also. Science is required for *anaathma jnaanam* and *mahaa vaakyam* is required for *aathma jnaanam*. An intelligent person would, therefore, use both science and *Vedhaantha*. Unfortunately, quite a few spiritual people condemn science, without realizing that they are committing a blunder. Science and scientific experiments are very, very important since they are making life more and more wonderful. Even a modern *Vedhaanthic* class, where large crowds are addressed by the teacher, is possible only because of modern science, which has made available the 'amplifiers'. If the electrical power fails during a class and the modern UPS is also not functional, even the *Vedhaanthic* class, in its present form, will have to be called off, for want of the 'amplifying system'.

Aparaa vidhyaa is also, therefore, important. But, what *Vedhaantha* stresses is that one's life will be 'complete' or the purpose of one's life will be fulfilled only when *aathma jnaanam* is acquired. An individual with only *anaathma jnaanam* / *aparaa vidhyaa* and indifferent to *aathma jnaanam* will be eternally in the triangular format of *jeeva, jagath* and *Isvara*, with its consequent *samsaarivam*. Only 'understanding' and 'assimilating' *mahaa vaakyam* will lead to the '*aathma-anaathma*' binary format.

159. Chapter III, Verses 51 to 53 (31-10-2009)

In these verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* views, on the *mahaa vaakyaa-s*. The *poorva meemaamsakaa's* views are: "mahaa vakyam does not have any role to play at all; mahaa vaakyam is not at all relevant; mahaa vaakyam is totally unimportant".

These are the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* contentions. Sureswaraachaaryaa will have to counter these views, because the entire '*Naishkarmya Siddhi*' text is an analysis of *mahaa vaakyam* only and if *mahaa vaakyam* is irrelevant, *mahaavaakya vichaaraa* will become irrelevant and the very '*Naishkarmya Siddhi*' text will also become irrelevant. Therefore, if only to establish the validity of the '*Naishkarmya Siddhi*' text, Sureswaraachaaryaa has to refute the *poorva meemaamsakaa's* views.

In that process, Sureswaraachaaryaa said: "There is something called *aathmaa / saakshi*; we are desirous of knowing the nature of that *aathmaa / saakshi*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is the only *pramaanam*, which can and which does reveal the nature of *aathmaa / saakshi* or its oneness with *Brahman*. No worldly *pramaanam* can ever do that. We require a *pramaanam* for any knowledge; and, in the context of knowing the nature of *aathmaa*, that crucial role can be taken only by the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*".

As a first step of establishing this crucial role of the *mahaa vaakyam*, Sureswaraachaarya asserted that *aathmaa* cannot be revealed by *prathyaksha pramaanam*. This is because, *prathyakshaa* is turned extrovert, whereas *Aathma* is the inner Reality. Also, *prathyakshaa* can reveal only *anaathmaa /* material in nature, since *anaathmaa* has different attributes, because of which attributes only, *prathyaksha pramaanam* is able to do its function of 'revealing'. Whereas, *Aathmaa* is devoid of any attribute.

Now, in the 51st *slokaa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*anumaana pramaanam* also cannot reveal the *aathmaa*".

Why cannot *anumaanam* reveal the *aathmaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* gives a technical explanation for that, based on the *nyaayaa* or *tharkaa* approach, an interesting and nice approach, discussed below:

What is '*anumaanam*'? It is translated as 'inference'. A well-known example given for 'inference', is 'inference of fire based on perception of smoke'. On seeing smoke emanating from the top of a hill, the 'seer' is able to infer the existence of fire on the hill, even if he does not see the fire, the source of the smoke. But, how does he infer the existence of fire?

Tharka saasthraa thoroughly analyses this question. If an individual has to infer fire, he should have one particular knowledge. What is that knowledge? Ans : He has to know "Wherever there is smoke, there **is** fire". He has to know this invariable relationship between smoke and fire. This invariable relationship is called '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha:*', where, the word '*vyaapya*' is the technical term for the 'perceived factor' and the word '*vyaapaka*' is the technical term for the 'non-perceived factor'. And, the knowledge is called '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*' or simply '*vyaapthi jnaanam*'.

In all contexts of 'inference', '*Vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*' means 'knowledge of the invariable relationship between *vyaapya* and *vyaapaka*'.

In the above example of 'inference of fire', smoke is the '*vyaapya*' / the 'perceived factor' and fire is the '*vyaapaka*' / the 'non-perceived factor'.

Now, '*Vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha:*' was translated above, as 'the **invariable** relationship between the perceived and the non-perceived factors'. But, why is the adjective 'invariable' used for 'relationship'? To explain this, going back to the example, if smoke and fire are not **always** together, no 'inference' of fire can be made by the mere 'perception' of smoke. If an individual has to 'infer' fire from smoke, he must be certain that wherever there is smoke, there has to be fire, without any exception. This 'certainty' / 'definiteness' is denoted by the word 'invariable'. If the 'definiteness' is not there, the perceiver of the smoke can only make a guess "there may be fire"; but, not firmly conclude "there **is** fire". If he has to boldly conclude "there is fire", the 'definite relationship', viz., 'wherever there is smoke, there definitely is fire' must be there. This definite relationship between the perceived smoke and the non-perceived fire, is called '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha:*' or simply '*vyaapthi*'. This '*vyaapthi jnaanam*' is a necessary knowledge required for inferring fire, in the example. To consolidate, in brief: "Inference' or '*anumaanam*' requires '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*' or '*vyaapthi jnaanam*'.

Then, the next question raised in the *tharka saasthraa*, is: "How do I get this *vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*?"; in other words, "How do I know the *vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha*?"

For that, the *thaarkikaa*-s give the explanation as follows: "Earlier, I have seen perceptually, the co-existence of fire with the smoke several times. *Prathyakshatha:* i.e. through *prathyaksha pramaanam*, I have observed the co-existence of fire with smoke. Not once; but, several times. By repeated perceptual observation, I have come to know of the un-failing *sambhandha* / relationship between the smoke and the fire; i.e., I got this knowledge of the un-failing / non-variable relationship between fire and smoke, by *prathyaksha pramaanam*. This non-variable *sambhandha* is called '*vyaapya vyaapaka*'

sambhandha:' | I got the knowledge of this non-variable *sambhandha* not through *anumaana pramaanaa* but through *prathyaksha pramaanaa*. In other words, initially, the *prathyaksha pramaanaa* was in operation, through which, later, I acquired '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*'. In the example, the '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha*' is between smoke and fire".

Now, moving over to the 'inferential context', the *thaarkikaa* explains: "In the 'inferential context', I am seeing only the '*vyaapyam*' part; I am not seeing the '*vyaapakam*' part. But, what type of '*vyaapakam*'? Ans: A '*vyaapakam*' which I have experienced before, first through *prathyakshaa* and later, endowed with '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam*', acquired through repeated perceptions or observations. During *prathyakshaa* and during '*vyaapthi jnaanam*', I have experienced both '*vyaapyam*' and '*vyaapakam*' together; and, now, in the 'inferential' context, I am experiencing only the '*vyaapyam*' and not the '*vyaapakam*'. But, the '*vyaapaka*' which was experienced earlier, during '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaana kaalam*', can now be 'inferred' through perception of the '*vyaapyam*' alone, with the aid of the '*vyaapthi jnaanam*'. Expressing the same, in a slightly different manner: 'during *vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha kaalam*, I have experienced *vyaapaka* and I am inferring that experienced *vyaapaka* now'".

In the example given, the perceiver of the smoke has objectified fire earlier and therefore, he is able to 'infer' the non-perceived fire from the perceived smoke.

From all these detailed explanations, it should be very clear that, **only** what has been experienced before, is inferable later i.e. an entity which can be objectified **alone** is an inferable entity.

The following purely hypothetical situation will make this clearer, viz. "if a particular individual who had never experienced fire in his life, is subjected to the experience of smoke alone, he will not be able to 'infer' fire". Such an individual, who has never 'objectified' fire, even if he had experienced smoke, can never 'infer' fire at any time.

To consolidate in simple English, without going through the technical *tharkaa* jargon, it can be stated "Whatever is perceptible **alone** can be inferred".

All the above detailed reasoning is implied by Sureswaraacharya, when he succinctly says (in verse 51): "A *saakshi* which is never objectified at any time – either through *prathyakshaa* or during '*vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha grahana kaalam*' – can never be known through *anumaanaa*". This is the significance of his using the term '*sambhandha grahanam*'

'Sambhandha grahanam' means 'vyaapthi jnaana kaale prathyaksha pramaanena vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandhasya grahanam' | Only where such a 'grahanam' is possible, anumaanaa pramaanam can 'reveal' anything. In other words, (as seen before) only where a 'vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha jnaanam' or 'vyaapthi jnaanam' is possible, anumaana pramaanam can help reveal anything.

Reverting to the text:

- प्रत्यक्षस्य पराक्त्वात् - Since prathyaksham can deal with only external anaathmaa, which can only be objectified,
- न संबन्धग्रहणं - aathmaa is never available for vyaapya vyaapaka sambhandha grahanam / vyaapthi jnaanam , through prathyaksha pramaanam;
- यतः अतः - because of this reason
- अस्य आत्मनः अनुभवः - the knowledge ('aparoksha jnaanam') of the nature of aathmaa
- अनुमित्या कथंचन न (संभवति) - is at no time possible through anumaanam.

In this context, a fundamental 'rule of knowledge' is to be noted. While enumerating the six *pramaanaa-s*, including *loukika sabdhaa* as a *pramaanaa* (leaving the *Vedaa-s* aside), we enumerate *prathyakshaa* as the first *pramaanaa*, the others, viz., *anumaanaa* , *upamaanaa*, *arthaapaththi*, *anupalabdhi* and *loukika sabdha pramaanaa*, following *prathyakshaa*. By enumerating the six *pramaanaa-s* in this order, we are communicating a very significant principle. That principle is: "The later five *pramaanaa-s* can work **only** where the first *pramaanaa* can work". If there is an object which is beyond the scope of the first *pramaanaa*, viz., *prathyakshaa*, then, automatically, the object is beyond the scope of the other five *pramaanaa-s* also. This is an interesting fact to be clearly noted by the student.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 52:

एवमयं प्रमातृप्रमाणप्रमेयव्यवहारः सर्व एव पराचीनविषय एव न प्रतीचीनं आत्मानमवगाहयितुमलम् । एवं च सत्यनेनैव यथोक्तोऽर्थोऽवसातुं शक्यत इत्याह ।

Thus, this whole world of the 'knower', 'knowing' and 'the object of knowing' falls within the external world and so it cannot fathom the inner reality of the Self. This being so, it (the Self) can be approached only in the manner specified by us:

Sureswaraachaaryaa is concluding the refutation of *poorva meemamsakaa*, to establish the relevance of *mahaa vaakyaa*. Here, he declares, that, *aathmaa* can never be known by the

conventional *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-vyavahaaraa*, because all these knowing processes are directed outwards; in other words, they are 'matter-centric'. All our conventional knowing processes are 'matter-centric' and are never 'consciousness-centric'; therefore, all conventional knowing processes including all the modern scientific experimentation, can all deal only with matter; they can never access Consciousness, to know the nature of Consciousness.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says: (a very, very important conclusion):

अयं प्रमातृ प्रमाण प्रमेय व्यवहारः सर्वः - All these knowing processes,

'*Pramaathru pramaana prameya vyavahaara:*' means '*jnaana vyavahaara:*' or 'knowing processes'. We divide all our processes, into two ; one is 'doing' process and the other is 'knowing' process. In 'doing' process, knowledge does not take place; in 'knowing' process, action does not take place.

When the *karmendriyaa-s* are used, it is a 'doing' process; during that process, no new 'knowledge' takes place. To understand this statement, as a simple example, a situation of an individual taking a soap and involved in washing one object after another, may be imagined. The continuous washing action of the individual is obviously a 'doing' process. He may continue this 'washing' action for a length of time; but, even if he continues this 'doing' process for decades or even *janmaa-s*, no new knowledge takes place.

During 'doing' process, 'knowledge' does not take place and during 'knowing' process, 'action' does not take place. Therefore, conventionally, all the processes are broadly classified into the two - (1) 'doing process', called '*karma vyavahaaraa*' and (2) the 'knowing process' or '*jnaana vyavahaaraa*'.

'*Vyavahaara:*, in this context (in the *sambhandha gadhyam* portion under study), means *jnaana vyavahaara:*, indicated by the use of the term, '*pramaathru pramaana prameya*', since, all the 'knowing processes' done by humanity, consist of a *pramaathaa*, a *pramaanaa* and a *prameyaa*. '*Pramaathaa*' means 'mind'. '*Pramaanaa*', in this context, means the 'thought generated by all the six conventional *pramaanaa-s*'; in other words, '*pramaana vrutthi:*' is the translation of the word '*pramaanaa*', in this context. '*Pramaathaa*' is the mind or '*mana:*' and '*pramaanam*' is '*manovrutthi:*'; and, '*prameyaa*' means the object. | All the knowing processes consist of (1) 'mind' (2) 'thought' and (3) the 'object'.

'*Ayam pramaathru pramaana prameya vyavahaara: sarva:*' means 'all these knowing processes consisting of the *thriputi* – mind, thought and object'.

Why is the *Achaaryaa* using the prefix '*ayam*' ('these'), before the word '*vyavahaara*'? Ans: Because we are always involved in '*jnaana vyavahaaraa*' throughout the day, when we are not in '*karma vyavahaaraa*'. The word '*ayam*', implies 'which we are generally engaged in'. Even during simple actions, such as 'reading a newspaper in the morning', 'watching the television' or 'switching on the cell phone to find out the missed calls', we are involved in '*jnaana vyavaharaa*'.

And, Sureswaraacharyaa avers "None of our worldly 'knowing' processes deals with *Saakshi*. We have no way of knowing the *saakshi*, in any of these *vyavahaaraa-s*". The *Achaaryaa* uses the word '*sarva*', to emphasize this view.

पराचीनविषय : एव - deal only with the external world;

They deal with the 'material' body or the 'material' mind or the 'material' world. Or, in short, with the material *anaathmaa*; they do not 'touch' the *aathma*, even by mistake.

Dayananda Swamiji jocularly, but meaningfully, remarks: "You can never 'stumble' upon *aathmaa*".

An interesting fact, is, that, many scientific discoveries are 'stumbled-upon' discoveries. In fact, a book has been published, dealing exclusively with 'stumbled-upon' discoveries. What does 'stumbled-upon' discovery mean? Ans: The scientist or researcher engages himself on the search for a particular object or fact; and, during his search for that particular fact / object, he arrives at something else by sheer accident. Such a discovery is called 'stumbled-upon' discovery.

Dayananda Swamiji asks the question: "Would any scientist, at anytime, 'stumble upon', '*aham brahma asmi* in this manner?" And, avers, that, all 'stumbled-upon' discoveries also can deal only with *anaathmaa*. A scientist or researcher may go after one *anaathmaa* and inadvertently may stumble upon a new discovery, but dealing with only another *anaathmaa*. He may repeatedly stumble upon new discoveries, but, all dealing with only *anaathmaa*.

Deliberate discoveries also will deal with *anaathmaa*; 'stumbled-upon' discoveries also will deal with *anaathmaa* only. But, '*aathma*', nobody can 'stumble upon'.

That is why, it is said, that, through intuition also, *aathmaa* cannot be known. Neither through *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa-s*, nor through intuition, *aathmaa* can ever be 'stumbled upon'. There is a prevailing thought, among some people, that, *rishis* 'discovered' *aathmaa* through intuition. This is an erroneous thought. Intuition also can reveal only *anaathmaa*; *aathmaa* cannot be known through intuition also.

How then, can, *aathmaa* be known ? Ans: (Punning on the word) 'In Tuition' (study) alone *aathmaa* can be known. What tuition? Ans: The seeker has to go through *mahaa vaakyaa* tuition. He cannot 'stumble' upon '*aham Brahma asmi*'.

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa also conveys, by his declaration "*sarva: pramaathru pramaanaa prameyavyavahaara: eva paraacheena vishaya: eva (bhavathi)*" - "all those knowing processes which use the *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani* or intuition are within the field of *anaathmaa* only". '*Paraacheena:*' means 'external', and, 'external' , in this context, means '*anaathmaa*'.

- न अलम् - (None of them) is capable of 'alam' means 'capable of' ; 'na alam' means 'not capable of'.
- अवगाहयितुं - revealing (the nature of) 'avagaahanam' literally means 'to fathom' and, in this context, means 'revealing';
- आत्मानं - that saakshi chaithanyam aathmaa ,

Why not? Because,

प्रतीचीनं - which aathmaa is not an external object, but, is eternally, the internal Subject / Observer (never the 'observed') .

None of the worldly 'knowing' processes can ever fathom the nature of Consciousness. That is the reason why Consciousness will be an eternal mystery to all materialistic sciences. Consciousness will be known only through one source, the *mahaa vaakyam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* alone can reveal the nature of Consciousness. As what? Ans: As the all-pervading 'Existence' principle.

A doubt may arise. The student might ask "If *mahaa vaakyam* alone can reveal Consciousness, then why is it that the *Vedaantha* is voluminous, containing many other statements? *Vedaantha* should be the single sentence '*thathvamas*' only". The answer is "Yes, It is true, that, '*thathvamas*' alone is *Vedaantha*. But, all the other parts of what is referred to as *Vedaantha* portions, are essential for understanding this '*thathvamas*'. '*Anyonthara aathmaa, praanamaya:, manomaya:*' etc. are all necessary props to understand the *mahaa vaakyam*".

But, it is *Mahaa vaakyam* alone which will tell the seeker that (1) Consciousness is not a part, product or property of matter (2) Consciousness is an independent principle (3)

Consciousness lends life to matter, inclusive of the mind (4) Consciousness survives even after the destruction of all matter and (5) the surviving Consciousness is not accessible for transaction, not because it is not there, but because the mediums of transactions are resolved. *Mahaa vaakyam* alone can reveal these unique natures of Consciousness to the seeker.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says '*sarva: vyavahaara: avagaayithum na alam*', stressing that, '*pramaanam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyam* cannot reveal',

The unobservable 'observer' cannot be known through observing instruments. *Sruthi* teaches "Do not try to observe '*aathmaa*'; instead, **claim** "I, the Observer, am the *aathmaa*, limitless Existence".

The seeker should learn to claim this, through the help of *mahaa vaakyam*. After listening to *mahaa vaakyam*, he should not ask the question "how to prove Consciousness?", because, once he asks the question "how to prove Consciousness?", it shows, that, he wants to use an instrument to prove it and the moment he attempts to use an instrument to prove it, he is dealing with *anaathmaa* / *paraacheena*. The *saakshi chaithanyam aathmaa* is not something to be 'proved', by any instrument of knowledge; after listening to *mahaa vaakyam* it is to be '**claimed**'. The very attempt to 'prove' it, is the negation of *aathmaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya continues:

- एवं च सति - This being so,
- अनेन एव - by this much understanding (that *aathmaa* cannot be known through *pramaanam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyam*),
- यथोक्तः अर्थः - the idea that I want to convey / I am struggling to convey
- अवसातुं शक्यते - can be clearly arrived at.

The *Aacharya* says "By this much reasoning, the idea that I want to convey is clear". The student might wonder 'what is the idea?'

Sureswaraacharya says:

- इति आह - I shall tell you.

He says: "I will reiterate the idea that I have been telling you all the time". The 'reiteration' follows in the *sloka*.

Chapter III: Verse 52 –

प्रमाणव्यवहारोऽयं सर्व एव पराग्यत : ।

सुविचार्याप्यतोऽनेन युष्मध्येव दिद्भक्षते ॥५२॥

As this entire mechanism of knowledge relates to the external world, however far we may examine, the ordinary modes of knowledge are only for gaining knowledge of external objects.

It is our common experience, that, when an important letter or an essay is written, if the writer is anxious that his reader should take specific note of his most important message, he uses either italics or a colour highlighter to mark that important message. Likewise, having talked of several topics, Sureswaraachaarya, desires to 'highlight' his important message. In the place of the italics or the highlighter, he re-states, for emphasis, that important message, which he had already given.

What is that idea that Sureswaraachaarya is highlighting, the idea that he has already talked about repeatedly? What is that image? Ans: "*Pramaanam*-s other than the *mahaa vaakyam* can never reveal the nature of *aathmaa*; therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* becomes extremely important. Do not ignore it". To create an imagery: "The *poorva pakshin* is about to throw away the *mahaa vaakyam* into the garbage can and Sureswaraachaaryaa rushes to snatch and retrieve it from the *poorva pakshin*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

अयं सर्वः प्रमाण व्यवहारः - All the other conventional knowing processes

पराग् एव)भवति(- deal with only matter / anaathmaa .

This is the point repeatedly highlighted by the *Aachaaryaa*, to be registered deeply; the deeper the student registers this message, the more value will he attach to the *mahaa vaakyam*.

This can be understood more clearly by imagining the following situation: "An individual is afflicted by a serious ailment. He tries different systems of medical treatment, none of which cures or remedies his ailment. In desperation, he turns to God. Even though he had always been a believer in God, his devotion becomes more intense, when he finds that all the other doors are closed for him and even the doctors tell him, that prayer is the only solution".

In a similar manner, a seeker might have always held the *mahaa vaakyam* in high esteem. But, when he learns through Sureswaraachaaryaa and other *Advaithic Aachaaryaa-s*, that all routes other than *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, are futile in his endeavour to 'know' *aathmaa*, his respect for the *mahaa vaakyam* will multiply many times. The 'other routes' include meditation also.

There are quite some people who wrongly think, that, the *saadhanaa* of meditation, through intuition, will reveal '*aham brahma asmi*'. They believe that, the repeated question 'Who am I?', in meditation, will reveal '*aham brahma asmi*' and that, *Saasthra vichaaraa* is not required. This line of thinking is erroneous. It will lead the misguided seeker, only to drop the *saasthraa-s* and try to find out, through meditation, what is the source of *ahamkaaraa* or the answer to the question 'Who am I?'; he will sit in meditation and ask himself repeatedly "from where does *aham* come?", with the fond hope, that, when he keeps on asking this question, one day, the *ahamkaaraa* will 'fall' and the real 'I' arrive, declaring '*aham Brahma asmi*.' The mistake of such people is that, they think, that, other than *mahaa vaakyam* there is an alternative method, viz., meditation, for the realization '*aham brahma asmi*'; therefore, they have very little respect for *saasthraa*. They deliberately discourage *saasthra vichaaraa* and encourage independent 'who am I?' enquiry, sitting in meditation. Some of them even negate *saasthraa*.

But, Sureswaraachaaryaa and other *Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaa-s* firmly believe and point out, that such independent enquiry will not lead anywhere.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is, therefore, anxious that all those unfortunate people should first understand the futility of that 'independent' enquiry and then only, they will recognize the utility of *mahaa vaakyam*. Then alone they will not throw *mahaa vaakyam* away and instead, will resort to an enquiry / *vichaaraa* into *mahaa vaakyam*, which enquiry is very, very important. That is why, once again, he stresses, in the first sentence of the verse '*Ayam sarva pramaanam vyavahaara: paraag eva*', forcefully conveying this important teaching, that, 'all *pramaanam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyam*, including meditation and intuition deal with *anaathmaa* only'.

- यतः अतः - Therefore,
- सुविचार्या अपि - even after thorough enquiry (into the nature of *pramaanam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyam*),

On a thorough enquiry of the nature of the other *pramaanam-s* (not *mahaa vaakyam*), the student will arrive at this conclusion, viz., that, "any *pramaanam* other than *mahaa vaakyam*, relates only to the external world or *anaathmaa*" He can enquire into the nature of

the 'who am I? enquiry' also, by asking the question 'what else do I arrive at, by this enquiry?'

In this context, Swamiji recalled a conversation he had with one of his visitors, wherein, the visitor said that he practiced this 'who am I?' enquiry for 12 years and after this long practice, was able to become thoughtless; and, confessed, that having arrived at this thoughtlessness or silence of the mind, he did not know what to do next or how to proceed further.

Swamiji pointed out "This is only natural. This visitor had come to a dead end. His silent mind cannot be a *pramaanam*, to tell him that even that 'silence' is known / revealed by *chaitanyam* only. When he is experiencing the silence, he is experiencing the *saakshi*. But, his silent mind will not teach him that fact; nor the fact, that, that *saakshi* is limitless Existence. Silent mind can never teach that the Consciousness in that silence, is the all-pervading Existence; the silent mind cannot teach that, because the silent mind does not know".

To teach that ignorant mind, a *guru* must instruct the mind "In that silence which you are experiencing, is the Awareness, because of which only, the silence itself is revealed. Also, that Awareness is the all-pervading Existence". This teaching can be given only by a live *guru* or by the *saasthraa-s*.

Guru and *saasthraa-s* are, therefore, very important for a sincere seeker, who cannot afford to ignore either, by quoting the example of *Ramana Maharishi*. The *Maharishi* also should have received the teaching from an *Aachaaryaa* in his *poorva janmaa*. Therefore, dismissing *saasthraa*, quoting *Ramana Maharishi* as an example, is an unfortunate, unintelligent approach.

- अनेन - (you will know, that) by this conventional 'knowing' processes,
- दिद्रुक्षते - one can desire to know
- युषमदि एव - only *anaathmaa*.

Through all *pramaanam-s*, other than *mahaa vaakyam*, one can hope to know only *anaathmaa*; if one wants to know *aathmaa*, one has to come to the *mahaa vaakyam*.

A very disturbing state of affairs, is that some people have scant regard for *saasthraa-s*, disparagingly remarking in Tamil, "ஸாஸ்திரக் குப்பையை எல்லாம் தூக்கிப் போடு". Without flinching, they use the word 'garbage' for *saasthraa-s*. There are people, even among believers, who have not understood the importance of *saasthraa* and call it

'garbage'. Sureswaraachaaryaa admonishes such people: "Do not say that; *saasthraa* alone can reveal the *aathmaa*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 53:

यस्माल्लौकिकप्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणानधिगम्योऽहं ब्रह्मास्मीति वाक्यार्थस्तस्मात् ।

Because the import of 'I am Brahman' cannot be apprehended through ordinary modes of knowing, it follows:

In this *sambhandha gadhyam*, Sureswaraachaaryaa begins with "Since *loukika pramaanaa*-s cannot reveal the nature of *aathmaa*". This incomplete *sambhandha gadhyam* will be completed in the following *slokaa*.

- यस्मात् - Since ,
- 'अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि' इति वाक्यार्थः - the message of the mahaa vaakyam 'aham brahma asmi'
- अनधिगम्यः - can never be grasped,
- प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाणात् - through worldly pramaanaa-s, such as prathyakshaa, anumaanaa, arthaapatthi etc., (including intuition and independent 'Who am I?' enquiry),

(Here, Swamiji confesses that (i) intuition and (ii) independent 'who am I' enquiry', are his intentional additions, since he finds that the misconception that they could reveal the nature of *aathmaa* / *Brahman* is widely prevalent and also spreading and he is anxious to remove the misconception.)

- तस्मात् - therefore,

Therefore, what is the lesson? Ans: Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say "*Mahaa vaakyam* is important". He wants to conclude "Therefore, the seeker should understand the relevance of *mahaa vaakyam* and resort to the *mahaa vaakyam* enquiry earnestly". This is the final part of negating the *poorva meemaamsakaa*.

The students might wonder "We have already accepted the relevance or importance of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Why does the *Aachaaryaa* repeatedly stress this point?". The students should remember that this repeated stress of the *Aachaaryaa* is mainly for the *poorva*

meemaamsakaa, who had argued that *mahaa vaakyam* is superfluous and not required at all.

But, even among regular *Vedhaanthic* students, there may be a few, without a firm conviction of the importance of *mahaa vaakyam*, because they think of the example of *Ramana Maharishi*. Such people might think and argue that, even without *saasthra vichaaraa*, this knowledge can be attained, as in the case of *Ramana Maharishi*. But, they should understand that, according to *saasthraa-s*, the view is, even the knowledge of great souls like *Ramana Maharishi* has been attained only because of their *poorva janma mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, which knowledge continues in their present *janmaa-s*. And, such *maharishi-s* are exceptions ; and exceptions cannot be quoted as examples, for the obvious reason that they are exceptions.

Wrongly quoting exception as a rule, some people vehemently argue that, *saasthra vichaaraa* is not relevant. Keeping those people in mind, Sureswaraacharya repeatedly highlights the incapability of worldly *pramaanam-s* for revealing the nature of *aathmaa* and the consequent importance of *mahaa vaakyam*.

Chapter III: Verse 53 –

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां निरस्याप्राणतो यते : ।

वीक्षापत्रस्य कोऽस्मीति तदसीति श्रुतिर्जगौ ॥५३ ॥

To the ascetic enquirer, who, after rejecting every phenomenon up to the vital breath as non-Self, asks 'Who am I?', the *sruthi* furnishes the answer 'You are *That*'.

Mahaa vaakyam is extremely relevant for the unique seeker, 'unique', because he must have discovered three facts even before approaching *mahaa vaakyam*. All the three facts are extremely important and only that seeker alone, who has grasped the three facts, will know the value of *mahaa vaakyam*. To re-quote the example given earlier, similar to a seriously sick person, whom all systems of medicine have failed to cure and who rushes to God as the ultimate resort, this 'unique' seeker, has suffered the *samsaaraa* sickness, has realized that nothing in the world has helped him out of his *samsaaraa* and therefore, approaches *mahaa vaakyam*. But, before making the approach, he must have discovered three important facts.

The first important fact is, that, he must have discovered the existence of the *saakshi*, as 'I', different from the body-mind complex / as 'I', the Observer of the body-mind complex. He must know, that, there is a *saakshi* existent. And, he must have segregated that *saakshi* through *anvaya vyathirkhaa* analysis.

He must know the existence of the *saakshi* as distinct from the *pramaathaa*, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* method.

Who or what is the *pramaathaa*, the 'knower'? Ans: During *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*, 'I' am existing as a *pramaathaa* / as a 'knower', enjoying the 'knower' status, associated with the mind.

Whereas, in *sushupthi avasthaa*, 'I' dissociate with the mind; therefore, 'I' drop the knower status; and I am still existing but, without the 'knower-hood'. The knower-hood-less 'I', obtaining in *sushupthi*, is called *saakshi*.

'I' am always existent as *saakshi* who gets knower-hood in *jaagrath avasthaa* and who drops knower-hood in the *sushupthi avasthaa*. In other words, knower-hood is my incidental nature and *saakshi*-hood is my intrinsic nature.

Saakshi-hood is my intrinsic nature; knower-hood 'comes' when 'I' get associated with the mind; as a consequence, 'I' become of the knower of the world. When I dissociate from the mind, 'I' drop my knower-hood and the world is not known. Therefore knower-hood is an incidental status of mine; when I shed my knower-hood also, I exist as the *saakshi*.

Thus, the existence of 'I' as the *saakshi*, must be the first fact that should be known to the advanced seeker. He should know: "'I' am *saakshi* with incidental knower-hood, 'coming' and 'going'. When knower-hood comes, I know the world; knower-hood goes and I do not know the world".

160. Chapter III, Verses 53 to 54 (07-11-2009)

Sureswaraacharya points out that the message of mahaa vaakyam can be clearly understood, only when the seeker has gone through certain fundamental steps. Even the relevance and role of mahaa vaakyam will be clear to the seeker, only when he is aware of those important principles. What are these principles? They are as follow:

The first principle: *Mahaa vaakyam* is saying "*thadh thvam as!*"; i.e., it is communicating some information about the listener-student, by saying "*thvam thadh as!*". In this, '*Thvam*' (you) is the subject and '*thadh*' ('that') is the predicate.

A rule of communication is, that, in a sentence used for communication, the subject is already known to the listener and the predicate alone is the new information given to him. For instance, when a speaker says "Everest is 29, 000 ft. high", he is assuming that the listener already knows what Everest is. And, the information that the speaker wants to give, is, not what Everest is; but, only about the height of Everest. In this sentence, "Everest is 29000 ft. high", '*Everest*' is the subject. And, that subject must already be known to the listener. If the listener does not know what Everest is, the predicate / the information becomes useless and the sentence does not communicate anything. Any sentence, therefore, must contain a known subject, if the sentence is to make any sense. Alternately, in situations where both the subject and the predicate are already known to the listener, the sentence becomes superfluous. To revert to the example, if the listener already knows Everest and also knows it is 29000 ft. high, the subject is known to him and the predicate also is known to him. In that case, the sentence becomes redundant and irrelevant.

The listener must know Everest; but must not know its height. Only then the sentence makes a purposeful communication. The speaker will be talking about the unknown height of the known Everest. (The known subject is called *uddhesyam* and the unknown predicate is called *vidheyam*).

Similarly, in the *mahaa vaakyam* "*thvam thadh as!*" also, the assumption is, that, '*thvam*', the subject, is already known. What is unknown is the predicate '*thadh*'.

To make this assumption true, before starting the analysis of the *mahaa vaakyaa*, the enquiry into and understanding of the Subject of the *mahaa vaakyaa*, viz., '*thvam*', must have been completed by the seeker. In other words, '*thvam padha vicharaa*' must take place **before** '*mahaa vaakya vicharaa*', because '*thvam padhaa*' is the Subject of the *mahaa vaakyam*. And, it is '*thadh*', the unknown thing, which the *sruthi* wants to reveal through the *mahaa vaakyam*. The seeker who has completed the '*thvam padha vicharaa*' is

the ideal candidate to make the fullest use of *mahaa vaakyam*, because, *mahaa vaakyam* is giving information with regard to the '*thvam padha*', which is the Subject of the *vaakyam*, already known through the '*thvam padha vichaara*'.

The '*thvam padha vichaara*' can be done with the help of the *saasthraa* or even without the help of the *saasthraa*. Sometimes, we make use of the *saasthraa* to do *thvam padha vichaara*; but, the *thvam padha vichaara* part can be completed by a student even without the help of *saasthraa*.

In this treatise, *Naishkarmya Siddhi* also, Sureswaraacharya's contention is, that, *thvam padha vichaara* can be done even without the help of *saasthraa*, by applying two methods (i) *dhruk dhruasya vivekaa* and (ii) *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, which together constitute *anvaya vyathirekhaa*. Using these two methods, even without the help of *saasthraa*, the seeker can arrive at '*thvam padha lakshyaartha*', namely, *saakshi*.

Thus, the first principle is, that, the student should have already gone through '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*', consisting of '*dhruk dhruasya vivekaa*' and '*avasthaathraya vivekaa*' and, should know "I am the *saakshi*". This is the first information a seeker should have, before using *mahaa vaakyam*.

To consolidate: What is the first principle? Ans: Through *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, (*anvaya vyathirekhaa* = *dhruk dhruasya vivekaa* + *avasthaathraya vivekaa*), what the seeker should know is: "I am the *saakshi* of the *avasthaa thrayam*".

He should have arrived at the conviction "I am the witness Consciousness, which is 'my' essential nature. In the *jaagrath avasthaa*, 'I' am aware of the world around 'me'. This 'knowing' or 'experiencing' gives 'me', what is called the *pramaathaa* status. But, my *pramaathaa* status, as the 'knower' of the world, is only an incidental status, obtaining only in *jaagrath avasthaa*. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, 'I' am 'putting on' one type of *pramaathaa* status, as 'knower of the *jaagrath* world'. Likewise, in *svapna avasthaa*, 'I' get another type of *pramaathaa* status, as 'knower of the dream world'. But, both the *jaagrath pramaathaa* and *svapna pramaathaa* statuses are only incidental statuses, which 'I' 'put on', during the respective *avasthaa*-s. In *sushupti avasthaa*, 'I' 'put off' both '*pramaatha*' statuses. What is available, all the time, in all the *avasthaa*-s, is 'my' essential nature, the witness Consciousness. 'I' am, **always**, the *saakshi*, with temporary *pramaathaa* statuses, 'put on' and 'put off'. The core nature of 'me' is *saakshi chaithanyam*".

This conviction / knowledge is called '*saamaanya jnaanam*', which the seeker should already have, before venturing into *mahaa vaakya vichaara*.

(Incidentally, these are all facts, not covered by any other text on *Advaita*. These are unique principles which Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting in *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.)

The second information that the seeker should be aware of is: "I am existing as *saakshi*, but I do not have any *visesha jnaanam* of *saakshi*. I have the *saamanya jnaanam*, that, 'I am *saakshi* of *avasthaa thrayam*; I know that *saakshi*-hood is my core nature. But, I do not have any *visesha jnaanam* about the nature of that *saakshi*".

What is the *visesha jnaanam*? Ans: That, 'I am the jagath adhishtaanam Brahman, which is paaramaarthika sathyam.

"That I am *paaramaarthikam Brahman*, the *jagath adhishtaanam*" is the predicate or the *visesha jnaanam*, which *mahaa vaakyam* will give later. Before the employment of *mahaa vaakyam*, the seeker only knows "I am *saakshi*"; and, does not know "I am the *jagadhadhishtaanam paaramaarthikam Brahman*". But, when the seeker approaches *mahaa vaakyam*, he should be aware of this fact, viz., that, he is ignorant of his *viseshaa* status.

To recap the discussion so far: Information no. 1 is "*saamanya jnaanam asthi*" and Information no. 2 is "*visesha jnaanam naasthi*". A *Vedhaanthic* student must clearly have both these informations, even before employing *mahaa vaakyam*.

Then, the third principle: "The student must also know that he can never acquire the *visesha jnaanam* about the *saakshi-chaithanyam*, from any of the conventional *pramaanam*-s, namely *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa*, *arthaapatthi*, *anupalabdhi* and *loukika sabdhaa*.

"He should also have realized that even *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, *dhruk dhruya vivekaa* and *avasthaathraya vivekaa* can give him only the *saamaanya jnaanam*, viz., "*aham saakshi asmi*"; but, they cannot give him *visesha jnaanam*; and, that, therefore, he needs a non-conventional *pramaanam* for acquisition of the *visesha jnaanam*, regarding 'me', the *saakshi*".

Having dismissed both the *jaagrath pramaathaa* status and the *svapna pramaathaa* status, as incidental, and having understood 'my' core nature as *saakshi* by *avasthaa thraya vivekaa*, i.e., having raised his level from *ahamkaaraa* to *saakshi*, which only is called *saamaanya jnaanam*, and also having realized that he cannot acquire *visesha jnaanam* through conventional *pramaanam*-s, the seeker now looks for a non-conventional *pramaanam* to give him that *visesha jnaanam* about *saakshi*.

What is that visesha jnaanam and, what is that non-conventional pramaanam? Ans: The visesha jnaanam is "The Saakshi 'I' is the jagath adhishtaanam Brahman, 'from whom indeed, all beings are born' (yatho vai imaani boothaani jaayanthe – Thaitheeya Upanishad – Bhrgu Valli – manthraa 1)"; in other words, visesha jnaanam is "'I' am no different from the jagath adhishtaanam Brahman and from 'me' alone, the universe is born". And, the non-conventional pramaanam, which gives this visesha jnaanam, is the sruthi mahaa vaakyam.

The *sruthi* declares "*thvam thadh as'* | By the word '*thvam*', it refers to "'you', the *saakshi*", which the seeker already knows. This *saamanya jnaanam* he already has. *Sruthi* tells him "I want to give a new information about that 'you', through the *mahaa vaakyam*"; and, that new information is "'you' are *jagadh adhishtaanam Brahman*".

This new knowledge, which is given through the *mahaa vaakyam*, the non-conventional *pramaanam*, cannot even be verified through conventional *pramaanaam-s*, since they are all capable of dealing only with worldly objects.

And, after receiving this information, making the *ahamkaaraa* a neighbor, the seeker has to only change his mind-set to "'I', am the *saakshi Brahman*", (Swamiji makes use of the word 'neighbour' to imply that, just as one has the tendency to view a neighbour's problems objectively, without getting too involved, the informed seeker will view his own personal problems also objectively.)

'Neighbourising' the *ahamkaaraa*, the seeker has to change his mind-set to "'I' am the *saakshi Brahman*". This is 'arriving at the binary format'. (The 'binary format' is also a term specially coined by Swamiji and used by him to stress, that, the student should consider everything else other than the Self, as *anaathmaa*.)

Thus, before applying *mahaa vaakyam*, the student must have gone through three steps.

The first step is acquisition of '*saamanya jnaanam*', namely, "'I' am *saakshi* - not *ahamkaaraa*".

The second step is the realization "I do not have *visesha jnaanam* of that *saakshi*" i.e. the seeker should know that he does not 'know' the *viseshaa* status of *saakshi*.

The third step is the realization "I can gather this *visesha jnaanam* only through *mahaa vaakyam*".

Meditation can never give that *visesha jnaanam*. In meditation, 'I' can remain as *saakshi*, shedding my *pramaathaa* status; but, I cannot know that, 'I', the *saakshi*, am '*jagadh*

adhishtaanam Brahmar'. Why cannot I know this, in meditation? Ans: Because there is no *pramaanam* available in meditation, to know that the 'saakshi 'I' am 'sarva aadhaaram Brahmar'. In meditation, there is neither any conventional *pramaanam* nor any non-conventional *pramaanam*. Thus, without any *pramaanam* in meditation, the most, that the seeker can look to achieve in meditation, is 'remaining as *saaksh'*. And, 'remaining as *saaksh'* is **not** 'ultimate knowledge'.

In this context, some facts about *Yoga Saasthraa* are relevant. *Yoga Saasthraa* defines *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* as 'thadhaa dhrashtu: svaroope avasthaanam'; i.e. it says "In *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, you are abiding in *svaroopam* / in your essential *saakshi* nature". No doubt, this stage is wonderful; but, the seeker has to advance to the next more wonderful stage, namely, to know that, this *saakshi 'I'* is '*nirgunam advaitham Brahmar'*, which is never possible through *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*.

Yoga Saasthraa teaches *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, in which the practitioner can abide as *saakshi*, but can never gain *jeevaathma-paramaathma-eiykya jnaanam*, because 'dhrashtu: svaroope avasthaanam' only means 'in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, I will abide as *saakshi*'. But, *Yoga saasthraa* does not talk about *jeevathma-paramaathma-eiykyam*, to give the knowledge "that *saakshi* is Brahman".

Vedhaanthaa, therefore, hastens to point out "Remaining in *samaadhi* is not the culmination of spiritual progress. It is not the same as *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiyka jnaanam*, **which** is the culmination. You may, of course, practice *samaadhi* for making the mind quiet, learning to abide as *saakshi*. It is a wonderful preliminary discipline that a *Vedhaanthic* seeker can practice; but he should not make the mistake of considering it as the culmination. The perspective that *samaadhi* is the culmination of *Vedhaanthic* study is a wrong perspective. In fact, *Vedhaanthaa* starts after *samaadhi*. Through, *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, you learn to claim "I am the silent witness'; but, after knowing that fact, through *mahaa vaakyam*, you should proceed to know that this '*saakshi aham'* am '*jagadh adhishtaanam*'. For a seeker, who has *saamaanya jnaanam* and who desires *visesha jnaanam*, *mahaa vaakyam* is most relevant. It is not useless *artha vaadham*". This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa is stressing in this verse

- यत्ते : - To the sanyaasi seeker,

Sankaraachaaryaa and Sureswaraachaaryaa are champions of *sanyaasaa*. In their teachings, very often, they insist upon *sanyaasa aaasramaa* as a necessary pre-requisite, for acquisition of *jnaanam*. Only now and then, they concede "if it is not possible also, it is acceptable". But, wherever opportunity arises, they strongly recommend *sanyaasa aaasramaa* as ideal for acquisition of *jnaanam*. Their reasoning is obvious. Non-*sanyaasin*-s are always pre-occupied

with possessions, obligations, relationships and transactions, while a *sanyaasi* is free of the pre-occupation. But, it *is* possible for a *viveki* non-*sanyaasi*, to develop a sense of detachment from possessions and relationships, even while performing his duties diligently as a non-*sanyaasi*. This attitude is termed '*aanthara sanyaasam*'. The word '*yathe:*', can, therefore, be interpreted as 'to the seeker, who has succeeded in cultivating *aanthara sanyaasam*'.

- निरस्य आप्राणतः - who, after rejecting everything up to *kaarana sareeram* or *aanandha maya kosaa*, as *anaathmaa*,

The compound word '*nirasyaapraanatha:*', in the verse, should be split as '*nirasya*' + '*apraanatha:*', meaning 'rejecting everything up to *kaarana sareeram*'.

The word '*praanaa*', in this context, is a technical word to convey '*aanandha maya kosaa*' or '*kaarana sareeram*'. How is that interpretation possible, when '*praanaa*' can, literally, mean only *praana maya kosaa*? The answer, in detail, is as follows: In *sushupthi avasthaa*, everything else, except the *praanaa*, stops functioning. The *karmendriya*-s are resolved; the *jnaanendriya*-s are resolved; the *antha: karanam*, consisting of *mana:*, *buddhi*, *chittham* and *ahamkaaraa*, is also resolved. The world, has, of course, resolved. After the resolution of everything else, '*praanaa*' is the only thing that is still functioning. "The *praanaa* fire alone is burning" points out the *Prasnopanishad* (IV.2 and IV.3) – "*Thena tharhi esha purusha: na srnothi, na pasyathi, na jigrathi, na rasayathe, na sprusathe, na abhivadathe, na aadhatthe, na aanandayathe, na visrujathe, na iyaayathe svapithi ithi aachakshathe | Praanaa agnaya: eva ethasmin pure jaagrath*" – "Hence this (sleeping) person does not then hear, does not see, does not smell, does not taste, does not touch, does not speak, does not grasp, does not enjoy, does not eject, does not move. People say 'he is sleeping'. It is the fires (i.e. the functions resembling fire) of *Pranaa* that really keep awake in this city of the body." During *sushupthi*, all the functions are resolved; *praanaa* alone is awake. That means *sushupthi avasthaa* can be represented as *praanaa*.

And, a person in *sushupthi avasthaa*, is in *kaarana sareeram* or *aanandha maya kosaa*. Therefore, quite often, the word '*pranaa*' is used as an indicator of *kaarana sareeram* or *aanandha maya kosaa*, *Chaandoghya Upanishad* (Ch. VI) being another instance.

- आलुरुरुिंप् – by using *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic consisting of *dhruk dhruya vivekaa* and *avasthaathraya vivekaa*,

An intelligent student through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise, consisting of *dhruk dhruya vivekaa* and *avasthaathraya vivekaa* and, if so inclined, by practicing *samaadhi* also, rejects /

negates / eliminates everything, the *pancha anaathmaa* consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind and also all the *pancha kosaa-s*, up to *aanandha maya kosaa*, and learns to abide as *saakshi*.

Yoga saasthraa can be practiced at this stage, to learn to withdraw from all the sensory operations and to abide as *saakshi*. But, as pointed out earlier, it is not *Veda anthaa*. *Samaadhi* and 'abiding as *saakshi*' are only preparations for *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

By the application of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic and *yoga abhyaasaa*, the seeker acquires the *saamaanya jnaanam`aham saakshi asmi*. But, he is yet to acquire the *visesha jnaanam`aham Brahma asmi*, for which purpose, he needs *mahaa vaakyam*.

Advaita philosophy recognizes the usefulness of Yoga Saasthraa for the saamaanya jnaanam of 'thvam padhaa' in the mahaa vaakyam. But, it also firmly holds, that, Yoga Saasthraa can never give 'thvam-padha-thadh-padha-aiykya-jnaanam'- only mahaa vaakyam can.

From another perspective, *Yoga Saasthraa* need not be considered as the sole proponent of *samaadhi abhyaasaa*. Other scriptures also talk about *samaadhi abhyaasaa*. For instance, *Katopanishad* prescribes *samaadhi abhyaasaa* as an useful *saadhanaa*. *Manthraa* 13 – Sec. 3 – Chapter I of *Katopanishad* runs: "Yacchedh vaang manasee praagnya: thad yaccheth jnaane aathmani jnaanam aathmani mahathi niyaccheth thadh yaccheth saanthe aathmani" – "The discriminative one should resolve the speech into the mind. He should resolve that mind into the intellect. He should resolve the intellect into *mahath*. He should resolve that *mahath* into the tranquil *aathmaad*"; and, follows this up with a later *manthraa* (*Manthraa* 11 – Sec. 3 – Chapter II) running "thaam yogam ithi manyanthe sthiraam indriya dhaaranaam apramatthasthadhaa bhavathi yogo hi prabhavaapyayau" – "They consider the steady poise of the sense organs to be *Yoga*. One should be alert at that time, because *Yoga* is subject to rise and fall".

Lord Krishna also recommends *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, in the 6th chapter of *Bhagavadh Githaa*. *Advaita* does recognize *samaadhi abhyaasaa* as an useful *saadhanaa* (but, not the end in itself).

When the seeker learns to abide as *saakshi*, the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz. "'I', the *saakshi am Brahma*" will give him that *visesha jnaanam*.

ॐ - questions

'*vaakshaapannasya*' is adjective to '*yathe:*'| Now, the seeker, after learning to abide as *saakshi*, is not satisfied with that skill. He has, now, got a new curiosity, as to the nature of that *saakshi*. He contemplates : " 'I' am the *saakshi* alright. But, is the *saakshi sagunam* or *nirgunam*? Is it *paricchinnam* or *aparicchinnam*? Is it *jagadh adhishtitham* or *jagadh aadhaaram* ? What is its nature? I am unable to know, because it is not available for 'objectification'. I can abide as *saakshi*; but, I can never objectify *saakshi*. If I cannot objectify the *saakshi*, how will I know its attributes? I know *saakshi*'s existence; but, I do not know its nature. I am anxious for this *visesha jnaanam* of *saakshi*" etc.

Such a seeker, who has got *saamaanya jnaanam* and is eager for *visesha jnaanam* – i.e., '*saamaanya jnaanavaan, visesha jnaana icchu:*' - is referred to, here, as *veekshaapanna:*, which is a loaded expression.

'*Veekshaad*, here, means '*visesha jnaanam*', which is '*saakshi brahma eiykya jnaanam*'. And, '*aapanna:*' means 'one eager to gain (that knowledge)' / the seeker.

What is the doubt that this seeker has? Ans: He wonders: "I know I am the *saakshi* but, I do not know what the nature of that *saakshi* is, because, in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, I **am** able to abide as *saakshi* , but I am not able to objectify that *saakshi*. I know I am *chaithanyam*; but, I do not know whether that *chaithanyam* is finite or infinite; I do not know whether that *chaithanyam* is one or two or many".

According to *Yoga saasthraa*, *chaithanyam*-s are many. Diligent *Yoga saasthraa* practitioners are able to go to *nirvikalpaka samadhi* and abide as *chaithanyam*; but, they never come know that, *chaithanyam* is *ekam*. In *Yoga* philosophy, there are many *chaithanyam*-s and interestingly, according to *Yoga* philosophy, **each** *chaithanyam* is all-pervading. It should be very clearly understood and noted that, in *nirvikalpaka saamdhi*, the seeker may abide as *chaithanyam* ; but, can never know whether *chaithanyam* is *ekam* or *anekam* or whether *chaithanyam* is *praathibhaasikam* or *vyaavahaarikam* or *paaramaarthikam*. *Samaadhi* will never throw light on these aspects. *Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can teach that *chaithanyam* is *paaramaarthika sathyam* and *ekam*.

In *Yoga Saasthraa*, *paaramaarthika sathyam* is not there. So also in *Saamkyaa* and *Vaisheshikaa* philosophies. Why so ? Ans: Because, they all missed *mahaa vaakyam*.

Reverting to the text, *veekshaapanna: yathi:* / the seeker who wants to know, asks:

- क : अस्मि' इति - 'who is the saakshi- I?',

When the curious, prepared student, thus, asks "Is that *saakshi*, which 'I' am, one or many? Is it *sathyam* or *mithyaa*?",

- श्रुति : जगौ - the mahaa vaakyam reveals
- 'तद् असि 'इति - that 'you are that adhishtaanam Brahman'.

The word '*sruthi*:', here, refers to *mahaa vaakyam* and '*jagau*' means 'reveals'.

The *mahaa vaakyam* says: "The *saakshi* is not just a limited consciousness located in your mind; but, it is the infinite Consciousness, **in which**, time and space are located". Instantaneously, on hearing the *mahaa vaakyam*, the student has to gather, "'I', the *saakshi*, am *Brahman*". The prepared student *can* gather this knowledge instantaneously, since, he has already dismissed *ahamkaaraa* / *pramaathaa* as *mithyaa*.

Once, thus, "'I', the *saakshi* am *Brahman*" is claimed by the seeker, when he further hears the *sruthi* statement "*aanandho Brahmethi vijaanaath*" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhrugu valli – manthraa 6*) meaning "He (*jnaani*) concludes that *aanandha* is *Brahman*", the seeker will never look to see whether *ahamkaaraa* is happy or unhappy. *Ahamkaaraa* will have ups and downs, more often 'down' and complaining. But, when the seeker is listening to *mahaa vaakyam*, he has already dismissed *ahamkaaraa* along with *avasthaathrayam* and as a *saakshi*, when the *sruthi* says '*aham aanandhasvaroopaa*:', it is a matter to be claimed instantaneously.

Thereafter, if and when *ahamkaaraa* experiences joy, the seeker will attribute that 'joy' neither to *pramaathaa* nor to *pramaanam* nor to *prameyam*; but, will attribute that joy as the reflection of 'me', the *saakshi aanandhaa*. Thus, liberation is instantaneous for the prepared student. This is the thesis of Sureswaraacharya.

To repeat a warning to the diligent student: Meditation is not after *mahaa vaakyam*; nor is it for 'liberation'. Meditation and *samaadhi abhyaasaa* are before *mahaa vaakyam*, to acquire *samaanya jnaanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* gives instantaneous liberation, at the time of *sravanam*. And, the *nidhidhyaasanam* thereafter, is, **also** not for liberation; *nidhidhyaasanam* is to only remove the habit of expecting liberation. Liberation is claimed at the very time of *mahaa vaakyam sravanam*.

Samabhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 54:

सोऽयमन्वयव्यतिरेकन्याय एतावानेव यदवसानो वाक्यार्थस्तदभिजस्याहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्याविर्भवति ।

The rational discrimination stretches only up to this point. As it culminates here, there manifests the import of the proposition 'I am *Brahman*', to one who has followed it.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say that *mahaa vaakyam* gives liberation at the time of *sravanam* itself, provided the student has completed *thvam padha vichaaraa* through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* and has 'neighbourized' *ahamkaaraa*; i.e. the student has already moved *ahamkaaraa* to *anaathmaa* list. He has learnt to abide as *saakshi*, by practicing *upaasanaa* or *yoga*. He has done this preparation through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise. Therefore, he says:

- तद् अभिज्ञस्य - To the one, who has got *saamaanya jnaanam* of the *saakshi*, viz., that " 'I' am the *saakshi* " ,

'*thadh abhignya:*' means '*saakshi saamaanya jnaanavaan'* / the one who has thoroughly acquired the realization " 'I' am *saaksh'* .

In the 6th chapter (verse 24) of the *Bhagavadh Githaa*, Lord Krishna says "*sanai: sanai: upamedh budhyaa dhruthigruheethayaa aathmasamstham mana: kruthvaa na kinchidhapi chinthayeth'* – "One should withdraw the mind gradually by the intellect which should be endowed with will. Having made the mind abide in the Self, one should not think of anything else". The Lord exhorts : "Gradually learn to see the body as *anaathmaa*, mind as *anaathmaa* and thought as *anaathmaa* ; learn to distance yourself from the *pancha kosaa-s* and learn to abide as the *saakshi chaithanyam*. May you practice this."

That aspirant who has achieved this knowledge and who is able to look at himself spontaneously as '*saaksh'*, is called here, '*thadh abhignya:*'| And, how did he become *thadh abhignya:* / *saamanaya jnaanavaan*? Ans: Through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* method / by applying the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic.

Applying *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic is part of '*thvam padha vichaaraa*' and not part of '*mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*'. But, the *anvaya vyathirekha nyaayaa* and acquisition of *saamaanya jnaanam* should not be taken casually by a diligent seeker. They are both very crucial. Without that preparation, the seeker is bound to fail in understanding *Vedhaantha*. This fact is highlighted by the *Aachaaryaa* here.

- अन्वयव्यतिरेकन्यायः एतावानेव - through *anvaya vyathirekha nyaaya:* , which is so significant, '*ethavaan'* means 'so significant'
- यद् अवसानः - that its immediate consequence is

- वाक्यार्थः - 'eiykya jnaanam' of mahaa vaakyam,
- आविर्भवति - arises the conviction
- 'अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि' इति - that " 'I' am Brahman".

The consequence of *saamaanya jnaanam* is 'instantaneous claiming of *visesha jnaanam*'. Conversely, without *saamaanya jnaanam*, the *visesha jnaanam* is not possible, because, without *saamaanya jnaanam*, *ahamkaaraa* does not get 'neighbourised'. For a seeker without *saamaanya jnaanam*, *ahamkaaraa* is not 'neighbour'; but, *saakshi* is 'neighbour'. He continues as *ahamkaaraa*. Since *saakshi* is 'neighbourised' by him as some distant object, *saakshi brahma eiykyam* is of no consequence to him; it has no significance at all for him.

The gist is: If *anvaya vyathirekha* has been done properly, the seeker learns to abide as *saakshi* and if he has learnt that, the immediate consequence is, that, the *mahaa vaakyam* is meaningful at the time of *sravanam* itself.

The *Vedhaanthic aachaaryaa-s* cite the *dhrushtaantha* of the story of the '*dhasama purusha:*', to emphasize this. When a *guru* and his nine disciples crossed a flooded river, the *guru* asked one of the disciples to check whether everyone had crossed over safely. The disciple, rather dull-witted, counted all the other nine people except himself, and was asking the question "Who is that 10th person, who is missing?". The *guru* told the disciple "you count once again", to make the disciple realize that the other nine are '*different from him*'. So, the counting of the nine is important; only then, the nine will be dismissed by the disciple as 'not me' as *anaathmaa*. Similarly, at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, the *sthoora sareeram* should have been dismissed as *anaathmaa*; the *sookshma sareeram* should have been dismissed as *anaathmaa*; the *kaarana sareeram* should have been dismissed and so also the *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam*, the *prameyam* etc. Just as in the story, the disciple's search was over, after the nine others were removed, and the teacher pointed out 'you are that 10th person', in reply to the disciple's query 'who is the 10th?', the *saamaanya jnaanavaan* student's 'search' also is instantaneously completed on *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

If, on the other hand, the *saamaanya jnaanavaan* student does not appreciate the relevance of *mahaa vaakyam*, and instead, looks for '*brahma anubhavaa*' in meditation, he will be laboring under a misconception and will only fail in his efforts, since there is no such thing as *brahma anubhavaa* at all. 'Searching for *brahma anubhavaa*' is equivalent to 'trying to objectify *Brahmar*'. But, '*Brahmar*' is not an 'object'. 'Claiming 'I' am *Brahmar*' is alone figuratively called '*Brahma anubhavaa*'. And, at the very moment of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, the *saamaanya jnaanavaan* seeker can claim "'I' am *Brahmar*", can 'claim' his freedom and can 'claim' *mokshaa* also. He will get the conviction "'I' **am** the *saakshi*

chaithanyam Brahman, which is free all the time; *vaasanaa-s*, *mana:* etc. are all *mithyaa*; they have nothing to do with my *mokshaa*".

161. Chapter III, Verses 54 and 55 (14-11-2009)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 54:

सोऽयमन्वयव्यतिरेकन्याय एतावानेव यदवसानो वाक्यार्थः तदभिज्ञस्य अहंब्रह्मास्मीत्याविर्भवति ।
द्रष्टृद्रुश्यविभागेनागमापायिसाक्षिविभागेन च श्रुत्यभ्युपगमतः संक्षिप्योच्यते ।

The rational discrimination stretches only up to this point. As it culminates here, there manifests the import of the proposition 'I am *Brahman*', to one who has followed it. The distinction between the Self and the non-Self on the grounds, that one is the seer and the other is the 'seen' and that one is subject to origin and disappearance and the other is the witness thereof, is briefly presented here in accordance with the *sruthi* /

In these portions, we are going through a significant part of mahaa vaakyaa vichaaraa.

In the *mahaa vaakyam`thadh thvam asl,`thvam`* is the subject and *`thad`* is the predicate.

As already seen, a rule of communication is: "The subject in a sentence, known as *`uddhesyam`*, must already be known to the listener. *`Yathra yathra uddhesyathvam thathra thathra anuvaadhathvam`* is the principle, meaning 'whichever serves as the subject of a sentence, that subject is only the restatement of an already known thing'.

And, with regard to that known subject, an unknown information is given by the sentence. That unknown information is called predicate".

In short, the subject part of a sentence has to be known to the listener / reader and the predicate part of the sentence has to be unknown. Only then, the sentence is meaningful and purposeful.

With regard to the *mahaa vaakyam*, if we ask the questions (1) what is the subject, which is already known? (2) and, what is the predicate which is newly revealed?, we come to know, that, in *`thath thvam asl,`thvam`* is the subject.

How do we say that *`thvam`* is the subject of the *mahaa vaakyam* and not *`thath`*? Ans: That is known by the verb. The verb *`asl`* is *`madhyama purusha:.`* (in English, in 'second person'). Therefore, the subject also must be *madhyama purusha: /* in the second person. In Sanskrit grammar *`thvam`* is *`madhyama purusha:.`* and *`thath`* is not. Since the verb *`asl`* is *`madhyama purusha:.`* and, between the two words *`thvam`* and *`thath`*, *`thvam`* alone is

madhyama purusha:, 'thvam' alone has to be the subject. And, it follows, therefore, that, 'that' must be the predicate and the new revelation of *mahaa vaakyam*.

This means, that, when the *Upanishad* is employing the *mahaa vaakyam*, the *Upanishad* assumes that the student knows the subject, i.e., 'thvam', as "I", the *saakshi* ". And, therefore, before listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, the student must have 'prepared' himself sufficiently, by knowing the real meaning of 'thvam'. The real or target meaning of 'thvam' should be understood as 'saakshi'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says this preparation is to be done by *anvaya vyathirekhaa vichaaraa*. *Anvaya vyathirekha* gives the seeker, the knowledge 'aham saakshi asmI'.

This knowledge, viz., "I am saakshi" is called *saamaanya jnaanam*. The seeker must have this *saamaanya jnaanam*, before he takes to *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

And, on *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, the seeker gets to know "I, the saakshi, am jagadh aadhaaram paaramaarthikam Brahman", which knowledge is termed *visesha jnaanam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, in addition, asserts, that, this *visesha jnaanam* can be obtained **only** through *mahaa vaakyam*.

In essence: "Acquisition of *saamaanya jnaanam* is achieved through *anvaya vyathirekaa* and acquisition of *visesha jnaanam* is achieved through *mahaa vaakyam*".

In this context, it is worthwhile to recollect a few discussions of the earlier sessions. It was said that the *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, talked about in the *Yoga Saasthraa*, is also useful for gaining *saamaanya jnaanam*, similar to the *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise. But, two important principles should be very clearly understood, even as this 'usefulness' of *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is recognized.

The first important principle: *Samaadhi abhyaasaa* is useful only for *saamaanya jnaanam* ; but, can never help in gaining *visesha jnaanam*. *Visesha jnaanam* can be gained only through *mahaa vaakyam*.

The second important principle: While it is conceded that *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is useful in gaining *saamaanya jnaanam*, *Vedhaanthin-s* never say that *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is absolutely necessary for gaining *saamaanya jnaanam*, since *saamaanya jnaanam* can be gained merely through *anvaya vyathirekaa vichaaraa*. From the *Vedhaanthin's* point of view, therefore, *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is not compulsory for a seeker.

Since *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is thus optional, Sureswaraacharya does not talk about *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, in this portion. It does not mean, that, he is totally against *samaadhi abhyaasaa* or *Yoga Saasthraa*.

Since *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is useful in the context of gaining *saamaanya jnaanam*, those seekers who want to, *can* practice *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, as an option. But, *Vedhaanthic aacharyaas* will never say that every seeker must necessarily go through *samaadhi abhyaasaa*, since *saamaanya jnaanam* can be gained through *anvaya vyathirekaa vichaaraa*, and also, since it is their firm view, that, while *samaadhi abhyaasaa* is useful for gaining *saamaanya jnaanam*, it is totally ineffective with regard to *visesha jnaanam*. On such reasoning, *Vedhaanthic aacharyaas* specify *Anvaya vyathirekaa* as compulsory for a seeker.

The *aacharyaas* hold that *Anvaya vyathirekhaa* is compulsory for *saamaanya jnaanam* since only after *saamaanya jnaanam*, *mahaa vaakyam* will be effective in gaining *visesha jnaanam*.

In the same manner as the other *aacharyaas*, Sureswaraacharya also says, in this introduction, that, *anvaya vyathireka* exercise is compulsory; it is the clinching determinant factor and is a pre-requisite for *mahaa vaakyam* to be effective. *Anvaya vyathirkaa* is pre-requisite as a provider of *saamaanya jnaanam*, so that *mahaa vaakyam* can effectively give *visesha jnaanam*.

Since, the first sentence in this *sambhandha gadhyam* is a tricky sentence, for easier understanding, it can be split into two portions, as (i) *soyam anvaya vyathireka nyaaya: ethaavaaneva yadhavasaana: vaakyaaartha: (bhavathi)* and (ii) *thadhibignyasya aham brahma asmi ithi (vaakyaaartha:) aavirbhavathi |*

- सोयं अन्वयव्यतिरेक न्यायः - This *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise, discussed in the earlier chapter and being discussed now,

The use of the term '*soyam*', split as '*sa: + ayam*' is significant, indicating that this is not a new topic being talked about by the *Aacharyaas*. By '*Sa:*' the *Aacharyaas* reminds the student "I have been 'drilling' this exercise earlier, in the second chapter"; and, by '*ayam*', implies "I am 'drilling' the exercise in the third chapter also ; I am continuing to 'drill' it even now also". To indicate this, he says '*soyam*', '*sa:*', meaning '*dvitheeya adhyaaye uktha:*' and '*ayam*' meaning '*thrutheeya adhyaaye uchyamaana:*'| But, why does the *Aacharyaas* resort to this 'drilling'? Ans: Because, the exercise is crucial for the *mahaa vaakyam* to function.

- एतावानेव - is so extremely important,

What is the extent of the importance?

- यद् अवसान : वाक्यार्थ) : भवति(- that, the exercise is a pre-requisite factor for mahaa vaakya sravanam.

First portion of the text sentence can be stopped here, supplying the verb `bhavathf`.

'yadh' refers to *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise; `avasaana:' means 'a pre-requisite factor'; a sub-commentator writes: "avasaana: is (grammatically) *karana vyuthpaathi* ; *avaseeyathe mahaa vaakya: yena, sa: avasaana:"* | Without going into the grammatical details, a simple translation of `yadhavasaana: (bhavathi)' will be "it is a pre-requisite factor"; *anvaya vyathirekh nyaaya:* is a pre-requisite factor. For what? Ans: `vaakyaaartha:', meaning 'for understanding the *vaakya arthaa* message' viz., the `vishesha jnaanam' message, viz., "'I am jagadh adhishtaanam". This *vishesha jnaanam* "'I am jagadh adhishtaanam" is the *vaakyaaartha:* |

Many *Vedhaanthic* students say "I am able to grasp, that 'I' am *saakshi* but, I do not have the courage to say I am *jagadh adhishtaanam*". But, they should understand, that, it is the *vishesha jnaanam*, viz., "'I am the support of the universe" which is compulsory for *mokshaa*. The mere knowledge "'I am *saakshf*" will not give *mokshaa*; the conviction "'I am *jagadh adhishtaanam Brahman*" alone will give *mokshaa*. The *Aachaaryaa* will be stressing on these aspects, later in the text.

To continue with the text (the second portion of the sentence):

- तद् अभिज्ञस्य - For the thus prepared student who has received the *saamaanya jnaanam* "'I am *saakshf*", through *anvaya vyathirekhaa*

The *Aachaaryaa* uses the term `abhignya:', to refer to that seeker who has gone through *anvaya vyathireka vichaaraa* and has gained the *saamaanya jnaanam* `aham saakshi asmi' i.e., who has arrived at the firm convictions : (1) "'I' am not *pramaathaa*; 'I' am *saakshi* (2) 'I' am not *chidhaabhaasaa*; 'I' am the `chith' (3) *chidhaabhaasaa* comes when the mind is active; *chidhaabhaasaa* goes away when the mind is passive; mind comes and goes; *chidhabhaasaa* comes and goes; I always remain as the *chith saakshf*" etc. By the term `abhignya:', he means `saamaanya jnaanavaar'.

In this context, it may be noted, that, the state of *'sushupthi'* helps 'me' to remain as, 'I', the *saakshi*; the state of *samaadhi* also is helpful in remaining as *saakshi*. *Sushupthi* is natural *samaadhi* and *samaadhi* is artificial *sushupthi*. The result in both, is, that, 'I' abide as *saakshi*. In understanding *Vedhaanthaa*, both states are, therefore, useful for this purpose.

To such a 'saamaanya jnaanavaan',

अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि 'इति) वाक्यार्थः - the knowledge conveyed by the mahaa vaakyam, that, " 'I' am the jagad adhishtaanam paaramaarthika sathyam Brahman"

आविर्भवति - arises easily.

In front of this knowledge (*visesha jnaanam*), the whole world including the *pancha anaathmaa* is only *mithyaa nama roopaa*, 'dancing' in 'me', the *paaramaarthikam Brahman*.

After thus talking about the importance of *anvaya vyathirekaa* exercise, the *Aachaaryaa* proceeds to say, in the second sentence of this introduction, that, this *anvaya vyathirekaa* consists of *dhruk dhurusya vivekaa* and *avasthaathraya vivekaa* :|

द्रष्टृदृश्य विभागेन - Through the distinction of one as 'seer' and the other as 'seen'

'dhrashtru dhurusya vibhaaghaa' is another name for 'dhruk-dhurusya-vivekaa'. 'vibhaaghaa' means 'vivekaa'. 'Dhruk-dhurusya-vivekaa' is one component of *anvaya vyathirekaa*.

There is a second component also. What is that second component? It follows:

- आगमापायि साक्षि विभागेन च - and through the distinction that one is subject to origin and disappearance and the other is the witness thereof,

'*aagamaapaayi*' literally means 'whatever comes and goes'. Another word for '*aagamaapaayi*' is '*saakshyam*', which means 'the witnessed object'. The word '*saakshi*' means 'the Witness'. Therefore, '*aagamaapaayi saakshi vibhaaghaa*' means '*saakshya saakshi vibhaaghaa*'. This '*saakshya saakshi vibhaaghaa*' alone is otherwise called '*avasthaathraya vivekaa*'.

Why is '*saakshya saakshi vibhaaghaa*' called '*avasthaathraya vivekaa*'? The explanation is as follows: In jaagrath and svapna avasthaa-s, the *saakshya thriputi*, consisting of the *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* and the *prameyam* is there; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, the *thriputi* totally resolves. But, 'I' remain. This indicates that 'I' am none of the *thriputi*. From this perspective, as already mentioned, *sushupthi* is a very important experience, as far as

Vedhaanthaa is concerned. Sushupthi is very helpful for 'me' to claim that 'I' am the remainder 'saakshi', even after removal of the pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi, otherwise called saakshyam. This 'claim' / conviction is called 'avasthaa thraya vivekaa'.

Thus, 'dhruk-dhrusya-vivekaa' is one component of 'anvaya vyathi rekaa' and 'avasthaa thraya vivekaa' is another component.

Sureswaraachaaryaa has already discussed all these earlier; but, he wants to re-emphasize them here, because of their importance. So, he says:

- संक्षिप्य उच्यते - I will briefly present

Why does the *Aachaaryaa* say 'briefly'? Ans: Because, he has discussed the topic several times in the 2nd chapter and several times in the third chapter also. But, '*anvaya vyathirekha vichaaraa*' being a compulsory exercise for a *Vedhaanthic* seeker, he summarizes the idea once again.

On what does the *Aachaaryaa* base his ideas? The *Aachaaryaa* points out:

- श्रुत्भ्युपगमतः - the 'anvaya vyathirekhaa' accepted by sruthi .

"Since it is accepted by *Sruthi*, I will summarize this '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*' " says the *Aachaaryaa*.

Chapter III: Verse 54 –

- दृश्यत्वात् घटवत् देहो देहवत् च इन्द्रियाण्यपि ।
- मनश्चेन्द्रियवत् ज्ञेयं मनोवन्निश्चयादिमत् ॥ ५४ ॥

As it is an object of perception, the body is like the jar (in being other than the Self). The senses are like the body in this respect. The mind is like the senses. The intellect, the determinative inner sense, is like the mind.

This is a beautiful verse which summarizes '*dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*', otherwise called '*nethi nethi vivekaa*'.

The idea behind '*dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*' can be presented in English, as follows: "Whatever I experience, I am **not**; whatever I experience is *anaathmaa saakshyam*; 'I', the Experiencer, am *saakshi*'.

•
Unfortunately, even after listening to this explanation, there is a tendency to ask the absurd question "How do I experience *Saakshi*?" The student should remember the important principle: "Whatever I experience is *saakshyam*, while 'I', the Experiencer, am *saakshi*; and, the 'experiencer' *saakshi* is never an object of experience".

•
This is the principle viz., "whatever I experience, I am **not**; whatever I experience is *anaathmaa saakshyam*", which the student should apply, as the means of the '*dhruk dhrusya viveka*'. He should ask himself: "Do I experience 'this'?" and, if the answer is "Yes", he should decide "Therefore, I am not 'this'".

And, where does the student start the analysis?

•
Sureswaraacharya says "start with the pot", the simple reason being, that, during the *Aachaaryaa*'s period, pots were very commonly used in almost every worldly transaction (to think of it, even in music, as an accompaniment to the main musician). Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* starts with '*ghata*.' being '*saakshyam*' or '*dhrusyam*' and, therefore, '*anaathmaa*'.

•)घट : अनात्मा दृश्यत्वात् (- (A pot, being an 'object of experience / perception ', is *anaathmaa* / not Self).

This is the first step. What is the second step?

• देह : दृश्यत्वात् घटवत्) अनात्मा(- The body is *anaathmaa*, being an object of experience, similar to the pot.

Pot is made of clay; the body is also made up of very, very fine clay. From earth, the body comes; to earth, this body goes. **மண்ணிலிருந்து வந்து மண்ணுக்கே போகும்.**

What is the next 'object' considered?

• इन्द्रियाणि अपि देहवत् (अनात्मा दृश्यत्वात्) - The sense organs also are *anaathmaa*, since they are also objects of experience, like the body.

When the *Aachaaryaa* talked about the physical body, he gave the example of a pot. Now, when he talks about sense organs, he gives the example of the physical body.

But, how do we say that 'sense organs' are '*dhrusyam*? Ans: Naturally because, one will always know whether one's sense organs are functioning or not. A mundane example of

this, is when spectacles are prescribed for defective vision, the eye-specialist, after placing the lenses in position, asks the patient "Are you now able to see better?" The patient replies either in the negative or in the affirmative. Such experiences show that 'I' am able to see whether my sense organs are functioning or not. 'I' am the 'seer' of the seeing and non-seeing eyes and the functioning and non-functioning sense organs. Therefore, 'I' am different from them. And, therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*indriyaani api (anaathmaa dhrusyathvaath) dehavath*".

What is the next one?

मनः च इन्द्रियवत् अनात्मा ज्ञेयं - It should be known that the mind is also *anaathmaa*, like the sense organs. '

Then, what about *buddhi*?

निश्चयादिमत् मनोवत् अनात्मा ज्ञेयं - It should be known that intellect also is *anaathmaa*, like the mind.

'*Nischaayaadhimath*' means '*buddhi*.' or '*vijnaana maya kosa*.' | '*Nischayam*' means 'conviction' and '*aadh*' mean 'etc.' Discrimination, conviction etc. are the functions of the *buddhi*; therefore, the term '*nischaayaadhimath*' refers to *buddhi*.

The word '*jnyeyam*' is borrowed here from the earlier example and the word '*anaathmaa*' is supplied. The reason, viz., '*dhrusyathvaath*' meaning 'being an object of experience', given in the context of the pot, should be added to all the others also, viz., the physical body, the sense organs, the mind and the intellect.

When the intellect or *buddhi* is talked about, the *Aachaaryaa* gives 'mind' as the example, as '*nischayaadhithamath manovath (jnyeyam)*'. Of course, 'pot' also can be given as an example; Sureswaraachaaryaa chooses to take 'mind' as example, when he talks of intellect.

'*Buddhi*' is also a '*dhrusyam*' - an object of experience. How can you say this? Ans: Again, a simple example will explain this. If a student is asked "Do you understand this text, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*", he would either reply "Yes, I understand" or "No, I do not understand". What is the process, before he gives the reply? He 'looks' into his intellect or '*buddhi*' and then gives his reply, since, both the 'understanding' and 'non-understanding' are faculties of the '*buddhi*'. Thus, the student is able to 'objectify' both the understanding '*buddhi*' and the non-understanding '*buddhi*' and report to the teacher. In fact, when the student replies "I understand", the real meaning of his reply is "I am aware of my

understanding *buddhi* and similarly, when the student replies "I do not understand", the real meaning of his reply is "I am aware of my non-understanding *buddhi*". This reasoning shows that '*buddhi*' is an object of awareness or experience.

In this verse, four *kosaa*-s have been talked about. The '*dhruk dhrusya vicharaa*' and '*dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*' will take the seeker up to four *kosaa*-s.

The fifth *kosaa* is *aanandha maya kosaa*. Negation of the fifth *kosaa* cannot be done in the waking stage. For the objectification of fifth *kosaa*, the seeker should go to either *samaadhi* or to *sushupthi*. In *samaadhi*, he can objectify 'silence'. That silence is *aanandha maya kosaa*. In *sushupthi*, he can objectify 'ignorance', which is *aanandha maya kosaa*. In *sushupthi*, ignorance is *aanandha maya kosaa* and in *samaadhi*, the blankness is *aanandha maya kosaa*. The seeker should understand both of them as *anaathmaa*, because, they are also 'objects of experience'.

After understanding this, viz., that the 'ignorance in *sushupthi*' is '*aanandha maya kosaa* object' and the 'silence in *samaadhi*' or 'blankness in *samaadhi*' is '*aanandha maya kosaa* object', the seeker should use *anvaya vyathirekaa* method. How does one use *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, in this context? 'Silence' comes in *samaadhi* and the 'silence' goes away when the practitioner wakes up from *samaadhi*. In a like manner, 'ignorance' comes in *sushupthi* and goes away when the sleeper wakes up. If the seeker practices *samaadhi*, that *samaadhi anubhavaa* must be utilized in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, for *anvaya vyathirekaa* reasoning. Alternately, he can use *sushupthi anubhavaa* for *anvaya vyathirekaa*. Thus, both *samaadhi* and *sushupthi* are only 'datum' for doing *anvaya vyathireka*. They are not ends in themselves. This will be said now. In *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, we will deal with the *aanandha maya kosaa*.

To re-cap: Through *dhruk-dhrusya-vivekaa*, the seeker eliminates four *kosaa*-s. The '*dhruk-dhrusya-vivekaa*' is one component of *anvaya vyathirekaa*. Hereafter, we go to *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, the second component, to negate the *aanandha maya kosaa* or *kaarana sareeram*. To negate *kaarana sareeram* also, the seeker has to take effort (in the form of *vicharaa*), because, even in *samaadhi* and *sushupthi*, a person does not negate *kaarana sareeram*, but, remains in *kaarana sareeram*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 55 :

तथा सकलकार्यकारण आगमापायिविभाग साक्षित्वेन अपि ।

The Self is the witness of distinctions which arise and pass away and which consist of the causes and effects.

To once again recap the total picture of our current analysis : At this juncture, our aim is *saamaanya jnaanam*. With that purpose in mind, we are doing *anvaya vyathireka vichaaraa*. As part of *anvaya vyathireka vichaaraa*, *dhruk-dhrusya-vichaaraa* was done and has been completed with verse 54. Having completed the first component of *anvaya vyathirekaa*, we are proceeding towards the second component, *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, otherwise called *saakshya-saakshi-vivekaa*, otherwise called *aagamaapayi-saakshi-vivekaa*.

- साक्षित्वेन - As the *avasthaathraya saakshi*,

As the *avasthaathraya saakshi*, we have to know ourselves. As what?

- आगमापयिविभाग - different from *saakshya prapanchaa*, which is subject to arrival and departure,

'*Vibhaagha*', in this context, means 'different' or 'distinct'. '*Aagamaapayivibhaagha*' is a compound word meaning 'different from that, which is subject to arrival and departure'. In this context, the term '*aagamaapay*' refers to the *saakshya prapanchaa*, which is subject to arrival and departure.

Through *avasthaathrayam*, I get to know that 'I' am the *saakshi*, who is different from the *saakshya prapancham*, which is subject to arrival and departure.

What does the *prapanchaa* consist of? The *Aachaaryaa* elaborates:

Sakala kaarya kaarana - and which *saakshya prapanchaa* consists of the *vyashti sareerathrayam* and the *samashti prapancha thrayam*,

'*Kaaryam*' means '*kaarya sareeram*', which denotes '*sthoola sareeram*' and '*sookshma sareeram*'. '*Kaaranam*' means '*kaarana sareeram*'. '*Kaarya kaarana*', therefore, means '*sareerathrayam*'. And, by the use of the term '*sakala*', the *Aachaaryaa* does not stop with the *sareera thrayam*, but includes the '*prapancha thrayam*' and the *thriputi* - 'knower-known-knowing process' also. The *kaarya-kaarana prapanchaa*, the *sareerathrayam*, the *thriputi* are all subject to arrival and departure. As the *Maandookya Upanishad* points out, '*viswaad*' and '*viraat*', '*thyjasaa*' and '*hiranyagarbhaad*', '*praagnyaa* and (even) *Isvaraad*' are all *aagamaapaayi*. All of them are *saakshyam* and 'I' am the *saakshi*. How does the student know this? Ans: By studying *avasthaathrayam*.

The seeker has to arrive at these conclusions by *avasthaathraya vichaaraa*. All of them 'arrive' in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*; all of them 'resolve' in *sushupthi*. Therefore, 'I' am not one of the *thriputi*; 'I' am *thriputi vilakshana*:/

The sentence of the *gadhyam* is incomplete. It can to be completed by adding:

-)आत्मा ज्ञातव्यः) - (one has to know oneself as the *avasthaathraya saakshi*.)

That is explained in the *slokaa*.

Chapter III: Verse 54 –

- प्रागसध्याति पश्चात्सत्सच्च यायादसत्तथा ।
- अनात्माभिजनं तत्स्याद्विपरीतः स्वयं दृशिः ॥

What is the non-existent before, acquires being afterwards and what is existent passes into non-being afterwards. This is the geneology of the non-self. But, the witnessing Consciousness is quite unlike this, in its intrinsic nature.

Here, *avasthaathraya vivekaa* is condensed beautifully, without naming that it is *avasthaathraya vivekaa*. When we study the three states of experience, we discover a fantastic fact, namely, that everything in the creation is subject to arrival and departure, while 'I' alone continue to be there as the constant factor, as the Witness of the arriving and departing factors. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, *sareerathrayam* comes and along with that, the world also arrives; in *sushupthi*, only *karana sareeram* remains; the world and the *sthoola-sookshma- sareeraani* resolve.

Even *Isvara* as *Kaaranam*, is acceptable only as long as the *jagadh kaaryam* is there. To elaborate on this statement: *Isvara* is considered to be *Jagadh kaaranam*. When is there 'relevance', for any *kaaranam*? Only as long as *kaaryam* is there. When the whole *kaaryam* is negated, the *kaaranam* also will get automatically negated. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, *sareerathrayam* and the universe 'arrive'. So, *Isvara* also arrives in *jaagrath avasthaa*, as the Creator of the universe; in *sushupthi avasthaa*, universe *naasthi*; therefore, Creator *api naasthi*. That is why, in *sushupthi*, you are neither a *bakthaa* nor an *abakthaa*. *Thathra maatha amaatha bhavathi; pithaa apithaa bhavathi*. When all of them are dismissed, where is the question of *bakthaa-Bhagavaan* duality in *sushupthi* or *samaadhi*? In contrast, 'I' am *kaarya-kaarana-vilakshana*: / Therefore, 'my' glory is, even after the dismissal of *bakthaa-bhagavaan* duality, 'I' continue to exist, as a witness of the *advaita avasthaa*. *Sushupthi* is *advaita avasthaa*; *samaadhi* is also *advaita avasthaa*. *Samaadhi* is *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* ; *sushupthi* is also *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*. In *advaita / nirvikalpaka avasthaa-s*, *bakthaa* is gone; *Bhagavaan* is gone. But, 'I', as the *saakshi*, remain.

-)यद् (प्राक् असत् - Duality (for example, bakthaa-Bhagavaan distinction) or the pramaathru-pramaana-prameya- thriputi, which was absent / non-existent in the previous state of sushupthi or samaadhi,

The word 'Yadh' is supplied, to denote 'duality' in any form, or 'thriputi'. In which state is thriputi absent? Ans: In *sushupthi* or *samaadhi avasthaa*. The word 'praak', therefore, refers to *sushupthi* or *samaadhi avasthaa*

- पश्चात् सत् याति - becomes existent when one wakes up to *jaagrath avasthaa* or moves to *svapna avasthaa* from *sushupthi*.

'Paschaath' means 'jaagrath avasthaayaam' or 'svapna avasthaayaam'. In both jaagrath and svapna states, thriputi arises. Not only thriputi ; even 'time' and 'space' arise only in jaagrath and svapna.

In *sushupthi kaala: api naasthi* . Time is also non-existent during deep sleep. This is shown by the fact, that people have to set an alarm, if they want to wake up from sleep, at a particular time. Even if somebody wants to complain of having overslept, the complaint cannot be made in *sushupthi avasthaa*, but only when the individual wakes up i.e. in *jaagrath avasthaa*. But, the glory is, even during the absence of 'Time', 'I' am there, as Witness, because, after waking up, he says "I overslept", i.e. 'I' am 'kaala abhaava: saakshi' - 'witness of absence of Time also'.

The first statement in the verse is, thus: " *Yadh praak asath, thadh paschaath sath yaath'* meaning "That which was non-existent in *sushupthi* or *samaadhi avasthaa*, attains existence later, in *jaagrath* and *svapna avasthaa-s*". In this first sentence, 'Praak' means '*sushupthi* / *samaadhi avasthaayaam*' and 'paschaath' means '*jaagrath svapna avasthaayaam*' | '*sath yaath'* means 'arrives' or 'becomes existent'. The first sentence is completed thus.

The second sentence:

- तथा - In the same way,
-)इदानीं (सत् - whichever is existent as 'duality' or 'thriputi' now (in jaagrath)
-)पश्चात् (असत् यायात् - will again become non-existent later (during deep sleep).

The words '*idhaaneem*' and '*paschaath'* are supplied. Therefore, what is the sentence? "*Yadh idhaaneem sath bhavathi, thadh paschaath asath yaayaath'* | '*Yaayaath'* means 'will

become'. In the previous sleep, the `thriputi` was absent. In the future sleep also , it will be again absent.

`Thriputi` will come; `thriputi` will go. This means `my` own *pramaathaa* status is subject to arrival and departure. In *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*, I put on *pramaathaa* status and in *sushupthi*, I drop *pramaathaa* status. This, in turn, means that `I` am not a *pramaathaa* intrinsically. All designations as husband, wife etc. and all problems, financial constraints etc. are all only for the *pramaathaa* and not for the *saakshi*. One suffers all the problems, only when one puts on the `vesham` of `pramaathaa`; and when one removes that `vesham`, one is `apramaathaa` / *saakshi*. As *saakshi*, one does not suffer any problems. That is the reason, why in *sushupthi*, one is *anaandhasvaroopa*:|

In *sushupthi* any individual is happy. What is the proof? *Swami Vidhyaaranaya* answers this. In his *Panchadasee* (CH. XVI) he says: "In *sushupthi*, you are *aanadhasvaroopa*:| Your experience itself is proof for this. If you are not convinced by your experience, but, look for `logic` to prove this statement, I will give you the `logic`. Everybody loves to go to sleep. If, in *sushupthi*, I am *dhu:khasvaroopa*:, will I love to go to sleep?"

On the other hand, the *pramaathaa* status is a burden; the *pramaathaa* status results in responsibilities of getting up, going to work, facing mundane problems etc. Putting on *pramaathaa* status alone is *baaram*. Fortunately, that happens to be an incidental status. That is very clear through *avasthaathraya vivekaa*.

Therefore, what is the conclusion?

- तद् - That `thriputi` or `kaarya-kaarana prapanchaa`
- अनात्मा अभिजनं स्यात् - comes under *anaathmaa* category.

`Thadh` refers to `kaarya-kaarana jagath` or `thriputi jagath` and is the `subject` of the sentence. `Abhijanam` means class / category / *jaathi*: / species etc. `Anaathma abhijanam` which means `anaathmaa category`, is `subjective complement`. `Syaath` is the verb of the sentence.

Thus, the meaning of third sentence in the verse is: "This *pramaathru pramaana-prameya-thriputi* comes under *anaathmaa* category".

And, what about `I`, the *Aathmaa*? The fourth quarter, the most important sentence in the verse, answers this:

-
- दृशि : स्वयं विपरीत) : स्यात्(- 'I', the saakshi, am totally different.

'Dhrusi:' means 'saakshi' or 'aathma'. 'Vipareetha: syaath' means 'is diagonally opposite'. The fourth sentence, therefore, means "'I', the saakshi, am the diagonally opposite of the saakshya prapancha: (talked about in the earlier sentence).

Therefore, 'I' will have features diagonally opposite to whatever features, the saakshya prapanchaa has. If saakshya prapanchaa, regularly and unfailingly creates sorrow, as is only known too well, what is 'my' nature? Ans: "'I' am aanandhasvaroopa." |

162. Chapter III, Verses 55 and 56 (21-11-2009)

Sureswaraachaarya is pointing out, that, like any other sentence, mahaa vaakyam is also a sentence, which has got a subject, as well as a predicate.

In any sentence, the subject has to be already known to the listener and with regard to the already-known subject, a new information is given by the sentence, through the predicate. An example was given in an earlier session. When the statement "Everest is 29, 000 ft. high" is made, the speaker is giving the unknown information of the height, with regard to Everest, which is already known to the listener, as a peak in the *Himalayaas*. If the listener does not even know what Everest is, obviously, this information on the height of Everest, will not be of any use at all. Alternately, if the listener knows both what Everest is and also its height, the sentence will become redundant *and* therefore, useless.

This shows that every purposeful sentence consists of a known factor, as well as an unknown factor. The known factor is called subject / *uddhisyaamaanam* and the unknown factor is called the predicate / *vidheeyamaanam*. Thus, in any sentence, *amsa dhvayam – uddhisyaamaana amsa:* and *vidheeyamaanam amsa:* - is involved. In the case of the *mahaa vaakyam* also, the *Upanishad* wants to give a new information regarding an already known factor, through the *vaakyam*. The known factor is '*thvam*', the '*saakshi*', which is predicated by the *mahaa vaakyam*, as '*that*', the *Brahman*. The '*thvam*' component is '*saakshi*', the '*jeevaathma thathvam*'. The '*that*' component is *Brahman*, the '*Paramaathma thathvam*'.

Thus, when the *Upanishad* is equating '*saakshi*' to '*Brahman*', the *Upanishad* assumes that the '*saakshi*' component is already known to the student / that, the '*saakshi*' component is '*uddhisyaamaanam*'. As pointed out in the example of Everest and its height, if the *saakshi* itself is a factor unknown to the student, the predicative of *Brahmathvam* will be of no relevance at all. Therefore, before using the *Upanishad mahaa vaakyam*, the *thvam amsaa* / the *saakshi amsaa* should have been already analyzed and known by the student.

The analysis / enquiry is necessary because of the reason, that, even this fact, viz., "'I' am the *saakshi*" is not an already or naturally known fact. The *Vedhaanthic* student has to work for this knowledge also, to understand "'I' am not a *pramaathaa* / a knowing principle, but 'I' am *saakshi*, the Witness principle". And, this part of enquiry must have been completed already, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa*; i.e., the *Vedhaanthic* student must complete *saakshi vichaaraa* initially, before coming to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. This statement should be carefully understood. It does not say that, the *saakshi vichaaraa* should be completed *before* coming to *Vedhaanthee*. It says "*after* coming to *Vedhaanthee* and *before* entering *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*".

The student should have completed the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* enquiry and through that, should have come to know that his *pramaathaa* status is only incidental. "I am the ego, 'knower principle' " is only an incidental cloak, like a doctor's or a cook's apron. Similar to a surgeon putting on a cloak before he starts the surgery, one puts on the '*pramaathaad*' cloak when one wakes up from sleep.

'I' 'put on' the '*pramaathaad*' status in the *jaagrath avasthaa*. For what purpose? Ans: It is because 'I' need the *pramaathaa ahamkaaraa* overcoat for transactional purposes. But, '*pramaathaad*' is only an overcoat; it is **not** 'my' intrinsic nature. Sureswaraachaarya himself, later in the text, uses the expression '*kanchukam*' to describe *pramaathaa*. '*Kanchukam*' means 'overcoat' or 'cloak'

This '*saakshi*' realization is achieved through '*anvaya vyathirekha vicharaad*', translated as 'variable - non-variable enquiry'. This enquiry consists of two parts, '*dhruk-dhrusya vivekaad*' and '*avasthaathraya vivekaad*'. The *Aachaaryaa* first talked about the '*dhruk-dhrusya vicharaad*', the first part of *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, through which the student will know that, the entire *prameya prapanchaa* is only *anaathmaa* and *aagamaapaayee*. '*Aagamaapaayee*' means 'the arriving – departing one'. Thereafter, the *Aachaaryaa* talked about the '*avasthaathraya vivekaad*', the second part of '*anvaya vyathirekaad*'. Through the '*avsthaathraya vicharaad*', the student gets to know that even the *thriputi* is only incidental. All the three constituents of *thriputi*, the *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* and the *prameyam* are present, when one is in *jaagrath avasthaa*. These three are present in *svapnaa avasthaa* also. But, when I go to *sushupthi*, *thriputi* goes away. Only 'I' remain as the *thriputi-saakshi*.

The '*thriputi*' also comes under what is termed as '*saakshyam*' and, in contrast, 'I' am '*saakshi*'. The '*thriputi saakshyam*' is '*aagamaapaayee*'. Again, in contrast, 'I', the '*thriputi saakshi*', am '*anaagamaapaayee*', 'the non-arriving and non-departing'.

It is this *saakshi* 'I' alone (not the *pramaathaa* 'I') which is equated to the '*nirgunam advaitam jagath adhishtaanam Brahmar*', through the *mahaa vaakyam*. While listening to *mahaa vaakyam*, the student should recollect his '*saakshi svaroopam*' and when the guru says '*thath thvam asi*', the student should not equate '*pramaathaad*' to *Brahman*, because *pramaathaa* is only an incidental cloak; the *guru* is equating 'you', the *saakshi*, which obtains in *sushupthi avasthaa*, as the 'non-arriving non-departing Witness Consciousness' to the '*nirgunam advaitam jagath adhishtaanam Brahmar*'.

Of course, the student can listen to this *mahaa vaakyam* equation only in the *jaagrath avasthaa* (not in *sushupthi*) and, therefore, as a *pramaathaa*. But, at the time of listening, as mentioned above, he should recollect his *saakshi svaroopam* which obtains in *sushupthi*

avasthaa, through the *pramaathaa* cloak, which he has put on for the transactions in the *jaagrath avasthaa*. To recollect 'my' 'saakshI' nature, 'I' use the *pramaathaa* cloak or *kanchukam*. 'I' recollect my *saakshi svaroopam* and 'I' have to claim "that *saakshi* is *Brahman*".

Thus, *pramaathruthvam* is an incidental instrument or status, which I am putting on, for *Vedhaantha sravanam* also. As *saakshi*, I cannot listen to *Vedhaantha*; only through the medium of *pramaathaa* status, I can listen. This is somewhat similar to elderly people putting on their denture before their meals. An individual who has lost all his teeth, can exist without denture also; but, when he starts eating, he needs to put on the denture. Likewise, 'I' exist as *saakshi*, without the *pramaathaa* denture ; but, for *mahaa vaakyam sravanam* I should put on the *pramaathaa* denture and listen to the *vaakyam*. But, at the same time, I should not make the mistake of taking the *pramaathaa* denture as *Brahman*. The *pramaathaa* 'denture' is only a temporary status.

All these discussions show that a *Vedhaanthic* student should do 'saakshi pramathru vicharaad' before coming to *mahaa vaakyam*. And, that *vicharaa* is what Sureswaraachaarya did, in the 55th *slokaa*, which was completed in the previous session. He pointed out that *thriputi* will come and go, by saying "(yadh) praak asath, (thadh) paschaath sath yaathi; thathaa (yadh idhaaneem) sath, thadh paschaath asath yaayaath" – "thriputi which was non-existent during *sushupthi*, acquires existence during *jaagrath* and again becomes non-existent when going back to *sushupthi*". As mentioned in the earlier session, the word 'yadh' is supplied, for completing the two sentences, the word indicating 'thriputi'. The *Aachaaryaa* followed this up by stating "*dhrusi: svayam vipareetha:*" – "*chaithanya saakshi* is the exact opposite of *thriputi* – i.e. it is not subject to arrival and departure / it is *anaagamaapaayee*"

And, again as pointed out earlier, even to say, "'I', the *saakshi*, am *vipareetha:*", I should put on the *pramaathaa* cloak. I do not require the *pramaathaa* status to 'be' a *saakshi*; but, to 'claim' my *saakshi* nature, I require *pramaathaa* status. To sleep, I do not require *pramaathaa* status; but, to claim "I slept well", I require the *pramaathaa* status.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 56 :

तत्र घटादीनां दृश्यानां अनात्मत्वं द्रष्टात्मपूर्वकं प्रत्यक्षेण एव प्रमाणेन उपलभ्य अनात्मनश्च असाधारणान् धर्मान् अवधार्य तैः दृश्यत्वागमापायादिभिः धर्मैः शरीरेन्द्रियमनोनिश्चयादिवृत्तीः अनात्मतया व्युदस्य अहंवृत्तिमतोऽपि दृश्यत्वविशेषात् द्रष्टृपूर्वकत्वं अवसीयते । तदेतदाह ।

By perception itself, it is ascertained that external objects like a jar are other than the Self, being objects of perception and that they presuppose the seeing Self. By these examples, the distinguishing characteristics of the non-Self are

discerned. These characteristics like objectivity and subjection to origin and cessation are found in the body, the senses, the mind and the intellect. From this fact, it is determined that they are other than the Self. Even the ego shares the attribute of being objective and hence it is also classed as the non-Self and that it also presupposes the transcendent Witness is made out. This is pointed out now:

Here, Sureswarachaaryaa answers a possible doubt of the student, viz. "Why do we require to employ *anvaya vyathirekaa* in two stages ? You say that, I am expected to do the *dhruk-dhrusya- vivekaa*, in the first stage ; and, in the second stage, I am to do *avasthaathraya vivekaa*. Why do I require the *anvaya vyathirekaa* practice in two stages?"

The *Aachaaryaa* gives the reason as: "In the first *anvaya vyathirekaa* i.e. *dhruk-dhrusya- vivekaa*, the aspirant is in *jaagrath avasthaa*; and, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, he can dismiss all the *prameya prapanchaa* as an object 'arriving and departing'; but, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, he will continue to have the *pramaathaa* status. His *pramaathaa* status will go away only in *sushupthi avasthaa*. In other words, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, when he is doing *anvaya vyathirekaa*, in the form of *dhruk-dhrusya-vivekaa*, he can dismiss only the *prameya prapanchaa*. He will not be able to dismiss his *pramaathaa* status.

"This means that, through the first stage of *anvaya vyathirekaa*, the maximum that the student can arrive at, is the conclusion "I am a *pramaathaa* and the *prameya prapanchaa* is *aagamaapaayee*". Remaining in *jaagrath avasthaa*, he can never know the fact, that, the *pramaathaa* is also subject to arrival and departure, because, throughout *jaagrath avasthaa*, the *pramaathaa* cloak is put on.

"To repeat: Through first stage of *anvaya vyathirekaa*, he will dismiss the entire external world, including family, as *anaathmaa*; he can achieve this part. But, it is only partial *anaathmaa* that is dismissed in *dhruk-dhrusya- vivekaa*. Total *anaathmaa* is not dismissed".

"To realize that the *pramaathaa* status is also *aagamaapaayee*, the student has to do *avasthaa thraya vichaaraa*, through which only, he will know that his *pramaathaa* status also will go away in *sushupthi*, and, further, that, what will *never* go away, is his *saakshi svaroopam*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- तत्र - In the *anvaya vyathirekaa* procedure, through the first stage of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* called *dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*,

- उपलभ्य - having clearly discerned,
'*upalabhya*' means 'having clearly discerned / understood / *jnaathvaa*'
- प्रत्यक्षेण प्रमाणेन एव - by mere perception,
- दृश्यानां घटादीनां अनात्मत्वं - the objective / *anaathmaa* status of externally perceived objects like a pot,

'Pot' is only an example. The entire external world is '*dhrusyam*'. And, who am I? Ans: I am the '*dhruk*'. It should be carefully noted, that, though the answer given is '*dhruk*', in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, the word '*dhruk*' refers to '*pramaathaa*' only. At this time, '*pramaathaa*' is not negated. I only know that I am not a 'pot' or a similar object. But, I am not able to say I am not the mind. The external world is negated and with some mental effort, the negation of the body is also achieved, through the first stage of *anvaya vyathirekhaa*. But, negation of mind does not take place.

- द्रष्टृत्मपूर्वकं - and also the pre-existence of the *pramaathaa* (by consequent inference),

The 'consequent inference' is explained as follows: By mere perception, I know that the pot is an object – a *prameyam*. Whereas, mind, the *pramaathaa*, is not available for perception. At the same time, when I know anything as object or '*prameyam*', I also know that every '*prameyam*' presupposes a '*pramaathaa*'; i.e., every time I note a '*prameyam*', I understand the existence of the *pramaathaa*, though the *pramaathaa* itself is not objectified. Even though *pramaathaa* is not 'seen' as an object, it is 'discerned' as the Subject. An example will make this clear. When the eyes are perceiving people or objects around, the 'perceiver' knows that he has a pair of eyes, though he cannot and does not see his own eyes. But, he recognizes that the very perception of the people or objects, presupposes the presence of the eyes, even though the eyes themselves are not perceived by him. Similarly, recognition of '*prameyam*' presupposes '*pramaathaa*', even though *pramaathaa* itself is not one of the *prameyam*-s. I 'discern' / 'infer' the existence of the '*pramaathaa*'. I know I have a 'mind', though, I do not 'see' the mind as one of the objects.

This fact is conveyed by the *Aachaaryaa*, by the use of '*poorvakam*', in the term '*dhrashtraathmakapoorvakam*'. Here, '*dhrastraathmaa*' refers to '*pramaathaa*'. I am a *pramaathaa*, because of which / whom, the whole world is objectified. '*Poorvakam*' means 'pre-requisite'. '*Pramaathaa*' is a pre-requisite for the experience of *prameyam*. 'Eyes' were given as example earlier. One more example can be given - the camera, which is a pre-requisite for every photograph. When one sees a photograph, even though one does not see the camera in the photograph, camera is 'known' through inference or pre-supposition.

Likewise, *pramaathaa* is not 'objectified' but it is 'discerned' / 'inferred', in the perception of every *prameyam*.

This is stage no. 1. And, thereafter what do we do? After studying *prameya* pot, what is the next stage that the student has to go through?

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "*Anaathmana: cha asaadhaaranaan dharmaan avadhaarya*"- "You have to notice the unique features of the *prameyam*, which is *anaathmaa*." Later, we have to extend it to *saakshya prapanchaa*. But, at this stage, we are to notice the unique features of the *prameya prapanchaa*. The beauty / significance of each point / stage, we will know, only when we go to the *saakshi*. Here, the picture is incomplete. The *Aachaaryaa* is proceeding step by step. The total picture is not clear now. That will become clear at the end.

So, what is the second stage? Ans: The student should notice the features of the '*anaathmaa*' objects (like the pot), perceived by him.

What are the features of a pot? Ans: The features are five in number. They are (1) '*dhrusyathvam*' – 'it is an object of knowledge' (2) '*baudhikathvam*' – 'it is a material product' (3) '*sagunathvam*' – 'it is endowed with attributes' (4) '*savikaarathvam*' – 'it is subject to modification' and (5) '*aagamaapaayithvam*' – 'it is subject to arrival and departure'.

The student should first notice / recognize all these five unique features in the pot, so that he can apply them later, to his mind also. They have to be applied to the mind ultimately, but, the student should first learn to apply them to the pot. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- अवधार्य - and having ascertained
- अनात्मन :असाधारणान् धर्मान् च - the unique features also of the perceived *anaathmaa* objects,

The term '*asaadhaaranaan dharmaan*' refers to the five features detailed above. What is the next step of the student, after ascertaining the five *anaathmaa* features?

- तै : दृश्यत्व आगमापायादिभि : धर्मैः - with the help of those same five features consisting of *dhrusyathvam*, *aagamaapaayithvam* etc.,

Sureswaraachaaryaa mentions only '*dhrusyathvam*' and '*aagamaapaayithvam*', out of the five features. The other three features are indicated by the use of the word '*aadhi*' meaning 'etc.'

What should the student do, using the features? Ans : He should extend them to the body, the sense organs, the mind and the intellect.

- अनात्मतया व्युदस्य - negating as anaathmaa
- शरीर इन्द्रिय मनोनिश्चयादिवृत्तीः - the body, the sense organs, the mind and the intellect

'*Sareeram*' refers to the physical body or the '*anaamaya kosaa*'. "Just as I am not a pot, I am not the physical body also" should be the student's conclusion, based on these five features of the body *anaathmaa*.

Next, this is applied to the 'sense organs' also. The sense organs are available / functioning, only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*. When one goes to '*sushupthi*', similar to one removing dentures or spectacles or wig, the sense organs are also set aside. What is the proof? The awareness of the world is not there, in *sushupthi*. Therefore, the *indriyaa*-s are also *dhrusyam*, *baudhikam*, *sagunam*, *savikaaram* and *aagamaapaayee*. 'Sense organs' are part of the *praana maya kosaa*.

Then, this has to be extended to the mind or the *manomaya kosaa*.

In fact, the student can practice elaborate '*Vedhaanthic* meditation' on these lines. He should start with the pot, bringing in into 'meditation' and notice the five features in it. Then, he should bring the physical body into 'meditation' and see the same five features in the physical body ; follow it up with 'meditation' of the sense organs and the same five features in them and then bring the mind itself into the 'meditation' and notice the five features in the mind also. As even as he sees / notices the five features, he remains as the observer of the '*anaathmaa*' features, claiming himself as 'different' from them - body, sense organs and mind – all.

Finally, the student should extend it to the *vijnaana maya kosaa* also, denoted by the word '*nischaya*'.

The term '*vrutthee*:' refers to 'these four viz., body, sense organs, mind and intellect', as a group. '*Anaathmathayaa vyudhasya*' means 'negating / dismissing (them all) as *anaathmaa*'.

Once all these four *kosaas* have been dismissed as *anaathmaa*, the student has to apply an important logic. What is that? The logic / reasoning is on the following lines: "Only when I operate through the mind, I get the status of a *pramaathaa*. And, when the *anaathmaa* is set aside, as in sleep or in *samaadhi*, when I do not function through the mind, then my *pramaathaa* status is also gone. This shows that I am not *pramaathaa* intrinsically or essentially; that, the *pramaathaa* status is only a variable status, similar to a denture (given as example earlier). After removing the *pramaathaa* 'denture', when I remain in *sushupthi*, do 'I' exist or not? Ans: There can be no doubt at all regarding 'my' existence in *sushupthi*, proved by the simple logic, that if I cease to exist during *sushupthi*, I will never desire to go to sleep, because, naturally, I do not want to die. But, I do desire sleep. Therefore, I can be sure, that, I do exist in *sushupthi* also; and, what must be 'my' status in *sushupthi*? The *saakshi* must be my status".

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

- अहंवृत्तिमतः अपि - the *pramaathaa* status also

'*ahamvrutthimaan'* means '*pramaathaa*'. It is a title for the '*pramaathaa*'. Why is '*pramaathaa*' called '*ahamvrutthimaan*'? Ans: *Pramaathaa* is the one, who entertains the thoughts such as 'I am an individual', 'I am a seer / hearer / smeller taster / male/ female / *Brahmana* / *Kshathriyaa* / *Vaisyaa* / *Brahmachari* / *grihasthaal* / *Vaanaprasthaa* / *sanyaas* / etc. All such thoughts belong to *pramaathaa*, the *ahamkaaraa*. Any individuality that is claimed belongs to *pramaathaa*.

Even the claim "I am a *bhakthaa*" belongs to *ahamkaaraa* only. In *sushupthi*, when you are not a *pramaathaa*, you are not even a *bhakthaa*. Even the claim "I am a *Vishnu-bhakthaa*" and the vehement refutation "I am not a *Siva-bhakthaa*" (i.e., even *Vishnu-siva bedha*) can be made only when there is the ego *pramaathaa*. Therefore, in *sushupthi*, even *Bhagavaan*, as an object of worship, is gone. It may sound blasphemous, but, how can even that *Bhagavaan* be the ultimate reality? What is 'capable of getting dismissed' cannot be the ultimate reality.

That is why *Kenopanishad* said "*na idham yadhitham upaasathe*" (I.5) – "This deity which people meditate upon, is not *Brahman*". What a devotee worships as *Vishnu* or *Siva* can also exist, only when the devotee puts on the *pramaathaa* cloak. When the *pramaathaa* cloak is gone, even that deity is gone. Even being a *Vishnubhakthaa* or *Sivabhakthaa* is only an incidental *guna* of the *saguna ahamkaaraa*. That status also is resolved in the *sushupthi avasthaa*.

- दृश्यत्व विशेषात् - having the attribute of being objective,

'*Dhrusyathvam*' means 'nature of being temporarily experienced'.

The *pramaathaa* / *ahamkaaraa* status is also only temporarily experienced during *jaagrath avasthaa*. The status 'arrives' in *jaagrath avasthaa*, while, in *sushupthi*, the status is 'dissolved'. But, it should be carefully noted, that, when it is said that there is no *ahamkaaraa* status in *sushupthi*, it does not mean that '*ahamkaaraa*' is totally destroyed in *sushupthi*. If it is totally destroyed, the sleeper will never wake up again. The term 'dissolved' only indicates that '*ahamkaaraa*' is not in an active form; that, it continues in potential form or in a dormant condition. But, that 'dissolved' condition of *ahamkaaraa* is also illumined by the *saakshi* only. Ironically, even to say that the *ahamkaaraa* was dissolved during *sushupthi*, the sleeper has to come to the 'waking' state. In other words, to say that the *ahamkaaraa* was in a dissolved condition during *sushupthi*, the *ahamkaaraa* has to be activated. Active *ahamkaaraa* alone can talk about the passive condition of *ahamkaaraa*, which was revealed by *saakshi*. And, both the facts, viz., "*ahamkaaraa* was in passive condition during *sushupthi*" and "*ahamkaaraa* is now in active condition, during *jaagrath*" are revealed only by the 'revealer' *saakshi*. If the 'arrival' and 'departure' of *ahamkaaraa* are to be revealed, you require an ever-present 'revealer', which is the *saakshi*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says :

- द्रष्टृपूर्वकत्वं अवसीयते - the presence of a 'revealer' *Saakshi*, which reveals the active *ahamkaaraa* in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and the passive *ahamkaaraa* in *sushupthi* should be arrived at.

The verb '*avaseeyathe*' means 'arrived at / ascertained'; and, conveys the message that the inevitable presence of a revealer *saakshi* which illumines the active *ahamkaaraa* in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and which reveals the passive *ahamkaaraa* in *sushupthi* has to be accepted.

When *Vedhanthaa* says '*thath thvam asi*', it does not say *pramaathaa* is *Brahman*; it does not say the body is *Brahman*; it does not say that the mind is *Brahman*; it does not even say *chidhabhaasaa* is *Brahman*. Even *chidhabhaasaa* is temporary, when the mind is there; and, when the mind is resolved, *chidhabhaasaa* is also resolved. By the word '*thvam*', *Vedhanthaa* talks about the *Chith*, because of which, the *chidhaabhaasaa* is temporarily formed in the temporary matter.

And, the very presence of *chidhabhaasaa* presupposes a *Chith*, because 'reflected Consciousness' requires Original Consciousness. An example can be given: "If I see my

reflected face in the mirror, what does it presuppose?" Ans: The very perception of the reflected face is the proof for the original face.

Likewise, the very presence of *chidhaabhaasaa* in the mind presupposes the *Chith* and it is that *Chith* which is equated to *Brahman* later.

The essence of this compound *sambhandha gadhyam* sentence can be consolidated, in simpler language, as follows:

"In the *anvaya vyatirekaa* procedure, in the first stage of *anvaya vyatirekhaa* called *dhruk dhrusya vichaaraa* (1) the aspirant first physically perceives external objects like a pot and discerns their objective / *anaathmaa* status; (2) by consequent inference, he should discern the pre-existence of the *pramaathaa*; (3) then, the aspirant should observe and note the unique five features of the perceived *anaathmaa* objects, which are *dhrusyathvam*, *baudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*; and (4) finally, noting the presence of these same five features, in the physical body, in the sense organs, in the mind and also in the intellect, he should negate them all also, as *anaathmaa*.

"Moving on to the second stage of *anvaya vyatirekhaa*, namely, *avasthaathraya vichaaraa*, he should realize that, the *pramaathaa* status also is only 'objective' and *aagamaapaayee*. As a consequence of this realization, the eternal presence of a 'revealer' *Saakshi*, which reveals the active *ahamkaaraa* in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* and the passive *ahamkaaraa* in *sushupthi*, should be ascertained by him".

•

- तद् एतद् आह - That is being said in the following verse.

Chapter III: Verse 56 –

घटादयो यथा लिङ्गं स्युः परंपरयाहमः।

दृश्यत्वादहप्येवं लिङ्गं स्याद्द्रष्टात्मनः ॥ ५६ ॥

Just as the objects like a jar become ultimately inferential clues to the ego through the several links leading up to the latter, even the ego, being an object of experience, becomes an inferential clue to the witnessing Self.

What Sureswaraachaaryaa says here (this has been talked about earlier), in simple form, is:

"Mind is serving both as an object and an instrument. In the *jaagrath avasthaa*, mind is an instrument and the world is an object. At that time, since I am obsessed with the world as an object and the mind is serving as instrument, I do not take the mind as an object at all. An instrument is always associated with the user i.e. it always joins the Subject. And, since

mind is serving as instrument in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, I see the world as object, but include the mind in 'me', as the Subject. And, once mind is included in 'me' as the Subject, I am called a *pramaathaa* and the world is called *prameyam*. I am the *pramaathaa* and, in this stage, mind has been included in the Subject. In the first stage, the *Vedhaanthic guru* asks the student to see the world as the object, and even though in that perception, mind has quietly joined the subject, the *Vedhaanthic guru* does not mind it. His approach is: 'First negate the world; we will talk about the mind later'.

"Thereafter, in the second stage, the *guru* tells the student "You have looked upon the world as object and you have looked upon your mind as yourself, the Subject. When you say I am happy / unhappy / disturbed etc., you have included the mind in yourself. Now, you have to ask yourself the question 'Is the mind the Subject or an object?'. For this purpose, you have to go to *avasthaathraya vichaaraa* or *svapna-sushupthi-vichaaraa*. This analysis of *svapnaa* and *sushupthi* is done to understand the mind also as an object. We saw that, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, world becomes an object and the mind joins the Subject. But, when you analyze the *svapnaa avasthaa*, mind also becomes an object, for the simple reason, that, in *svapnaa*, the entire world that I experience, is my own mind only. When I say I experience the dream, dream is nothing but thoughts only ; when I say 'I experience the dream,' I am experiencing the thoughts. This means that I am clearly objectifying the mind in *svapnaa*. I understand my mind also as an object.

"And, when I push the mind away from 'me', as an object, obviously, 'I', as the Subject, exclude the mind. When the mind is excluded from 'I' and considered as an 'object', 'I' am no more called a *pramaathaa*.

"To repeat for clarity: 'I' am named *pramaathaa* only when the mind joins me as instrument. When the mind is excluded as an object, I am no more called a *pramaathaa*; I am called the *saakshi*"

A simple example (which has also been given in earlier contexts) will make this clearer - the example of the spectacles. When the owner of the spectacles takes out the spectacles from its case and merely looks at the spectacles in his hands, the spectacles is only an 'object' and is not included in 'me', the observer. But, when one puts on the spectacles to have a view of other objects, the spectacles has joined 'me' as the Subject, while whatever else is viewed with the assistance of the spectacles is 'object'. The spectacles, thus, can play two-fold role – instrument and object. Likewise, Mind can play two-fold role – instrument and object. When the mind is your instrument, you are *pramaathaa*; when the mind is an object, you are *saakshi*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says:

- यथा - Just as
- घटादयः - objects like a pot etc.,
- परंपरया - gradually / step by step,
- लिङ्गं स्युः - serve as clues
- अहम् - to understand myself as the *pramaathaa*,

'*ahama*.' means '*pramaathu*.' . The pot serves as a clue to understand myself as a 'subject with the *pramaathaa* cloak'. I can understand myself as the Subject with regard to the pot, which is an object of knowledge.

- दृश्यत्वात् - because they are 'objects' of perception,

Every object presupposes the subject (this was already discussed earlier).

And, just as the *pramaathaa* subject is 'discerned' based on the perception of *prameyam*,

- एवं - in the same manner / similarly / likewise
- अहं अपि - the *ahamkaaraa* / mind also
-)दृश्यत्वात्(- when it becomes an object,

When the pot is an object, 'I' become the subject *Pramaathaa* and when the mind or *pramaathaa* is an object, then, that mind becomes the indicator of a different subject. What type of subject? Not *pramaathaa* subject; but, a different subject. What type of subject is it? A *saakshi* subject. Therefore the *Aachaaryaa* says :

- लिङ्गं स्यात् - becomes a clue
- द्रष्टुः आत्मनः - to the *saakshi aathmaa*.

When *ahamkaaraa* itself becomes an object, then that *ahamkaaraa* object becomes a clue to prove the presence of the 'objectifier' of *ahamkaaraa* ; and, who is that 'objectifier'? Ans: the *saakshi aathmaa*.

When pot is object, *ahamkaaraa* is subject; when *ahamkaaraa* is object, *saakshi* is the subject. That *saakshi* alone is revealed as *Brahman*. Before coming to the *mahaa vaakyam*,

the aspirant should have come to the level of *saakshi*. If as *ahamkaaraa*, he listens to *mahaa vaakyam*, when the *guru* says "you are *aanandhasvaroopa:*", with all mundane problems as *ahamkaaraa*, he will certainly be not convinced. He will consider the statement as a cruel joke. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says that the *ahamkaaraa* cloak has to be set aside before employing *mahaa vaakyaa*; it is then, that, the *mahaa vaakyaa* will be the most meaningful statement, which gives liberation instantaneously. The *Aachaaryaa*, further, wants to say "no *samaadhi* is required for this. '*Sravana kaale eva*' ('at the very instant of listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*'), you can claim '*aham Brahma asmI*' and realize your liberation".

163. Chapter III, Verses 56 and 57 (28-11-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is pointing out that mahaa vaakyam will work, as it should, only when the thvam padhaartha is clearly discerned as saakshi. This thvam padhaartha vivekaa or arrival at the saakshi, is achieved by the anvaya vyathirekha method of analysis.

The *anvaya vyathirekhaa* analysis consists of a series of reasoning, which series the *Aachaaryaa* had already presented in verses 54 to 56.

In verse 54, he said : "First, you 'objectify' (i.e., observe the features of) an external object like a pot ; then, by comparing the *anaathmaa* features of the pot, to the same *anaathmaa* features in the physical body, you discern the body also as an 'object' of experience; by the same process, from the body, you discern the sense organs also, as 'objects'; and, from the sense organs, to the mind and its intellect, as 'objects'. Of course, at this stage, the mind has to serve as the 'Subject', or '*dhruk*', with all the others as '*dhrusyam-s*' ". This 'travel from the external object to the mind' is the first segment of the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* analysis, called '*dhruk dhrusya vicharaad*'.

In the second segment of analysis, known as *avasthaathraya vicharaa* or *saakshi saakshya vicharaa*, the student should discern that the *dhruk / pramaathaa* mind itself is *aagamaapaayee* – subject to arrival and departure, from the well known fact, that, it is available only in the *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaa* and goes away in the *sushupthi avasthaa* . In contrast, the Consciousness 'I' is available in all the three *avasthaa-s*, as Witness or the *saakshi* of the three *avasthaa-s*.

Thus, going through the two segments of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* analysis, first, we come to the mind from the external objects and later, we come to the *saakshi* from the mind. When the external world is the object, mind is the Subject; when the mind becomes the object, *saakshi* becomes the Subject.

Sureswaraachaaryaa consolidated his teachings on the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* process, in verse no. 56. In the first line, he said: "*ghataadhaya: yathaa lingam syu: paramparayaa ahama:*" – " Just as the objects like a pot, become clues to the *ahamkaaraa*, step by step". The word '*paramparaad*' in the *slokaa*, refers to the series of arguments given in verse 54, i.e., '*paramparayaa*' means 'through the series of reasoning'. Keeping the pot or any external object as the beginning stage, the student has to gradually arrive at the mind as the Subject-cum-object. And, the mind alone is called *ahamkaara:*; therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says '*ahama:*'| The word '*ahama:*' means '*ahamkaarasya*'. And,

ahamkaaraa, here, refers to the mind principle. 'Stepping' on the pot, we reach the mind, which is otherwise called *ahamkaaraa*.

Thereafter, 'stepping' on the mind or *ahamkaaraa*, we climb over to the next step which is *saakshi*. Sureswaraacharya stated this in the second line of the verse 56: "*dhrusyathvaath aham api evam dhrashtur aathmana: lingam syaath*" – "the *ahamkaaraa*, also being an object of experience, becomes a clue to the witnessing Self". In this line also, the word '*aham*' refers to *ahamkaaraa* or the mind.

In the second stage, stepping on the mind, the student should catapult / throw himself, on to the lap of the *saakshi*, looking upon his own mind as an object of experience. The '*saakshi*' is referred to as '*dhrashtaa aathmaa*' | '*Dhrashtur aathmana:*' means 'of the Witnessing Self'.

Thus, the word '*lingam*', whose literal meaning is 'clue', can be understood, in this context, as a 'stepping stone' also. Using the world as a 'stepping stone', move to the mind; using mind as 'stepping stone', move to the '*dhrashtaa aathmaa*'.

This is the '*anavaya vyathirekaa*' process; and, the process is over, when the student has arrived at *saakshi*. This 'arriving at *saakshi*' is called '*thvam padhaartha vivekaa*'.

But, 'arriving at the *saakshi*' is not the end of the spiritual journey. With 'arriving at the *saakshi*', one part of *mahaa vaakyam* alone is over. The student has only cleared '*thvam padhaa vivekaa*' | The subsequent '*thath padha eikyam*' is a major leap, which has not been discussed at all, so far. This is what the *Aachaaryaa* is saying in the following portions.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 57:

ननु द्रष्टृदर्शनदृश्यानां जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तेष्वगमापायदर्शनाद्यत्साक्षिकौ तेषामगमापायौ स आगमपायविभागरहित
आत्मा यथा यः निबन्धनः जगतः प्रकाशाप्रकासौ स प्रकाशप्रकाशविभागरहितः सूर्य इति ।

The following objection may be raised: The sun illumines the world and the setting of the sun plunges the world in darkness. Still, in the sun itself, there is no transformation by way of losing luminosity or gaining it. In the same way, the objects of experience seen by the seer, appear and disappear in the course of the three states of waking, dream and sleep; but, he who witnesses their coming into being and cessation, does not undergo changes, by way of coming into being and cessation.

In this *sambhandha gadhyam*, the *Aachaaryaa* starts with a possible objection from a student or a *poorva pakshin*, who says : "With the help of the *anvaya vyathirkhaa* analysis itself, I have successfully landed on *saakshi*. I have understood that *saakshi* is different from mind; that, *saakshi* is different from *chidhaabhaasaa*; that, *saakshi* is different from thought; and, that, *saakshi* is different from the world. By arriving at the *saakshi*, I have acquired a lot of wisdom, viz., that, 'I' am different from the mind endowed with *chidhaabhaasaa*, different from the thoughts and different from the world. These three factors, put together, is called *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-thriputi*. '*Pramaathaad*' refers to the mind, endowed with *chidhaabhaasaa*; '*pramaanam*' is the 'thoughts'; and, '*prameyam*' refers to the world. The *aathmaa* / *saakshi* is different from all of them. By arriving at *saakshi*, I have differentiated myself from the '*thriputi*'. I have further arrived at the wisdom, that, the '*thriputi*' is '*aagamaapaayee*' – subject to arrival and departure, whereas, in contrast, *saakshi* is *anaagamaapaayae*. That wisdom also I have got. I have also got the wisdom, that, *saakshi* is *chaithanya svaroopaa*:"

In other words, the student / *poorva pakshin* says: "I will consolidate what all I have learnt:

- (1) *saakshi* is different from *thriputi*
- (2) *thriputi* is subject to 'arrival and departure'; but, *saakshi* is not; i.e. *thriputi* is *anithyam*, while *saakshi* is *nithya*:
- (3) This *saakshi* is of the nature of Consciousness and
- (4) that *saakshi* is *aathmaa*.

All these mean that I have gained the knowledge about *aathmaa*, which, in turn means I have gained *aathma jnaanam*.

"And, I have also learnt to abide as that *aathmaa*. In *sushupthi*, I am abiding as the *saakshi aathmaa*".

This leads the student / *poorva pakshin* to ask: "Now that I have gained *aathma jnaanam*, through *anvaya vyathirekaa* itself, why do I require *mahaa vaakyam*?"

This is the *poorva pakshin's* question which is presented elaborately by Sureswaraachaaryaa in this portion. The subsequent portion covers the *Aachaaryaa's* answer.

The *Aachaaryaa's* answer to the *poorva pakshin* will be: "This *aathma jnaanam* that you have arrived at, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* analysis, is only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*. It is not *visesha aathma jnaanam*, which *jnaanam* is *advaita jnaanam*, details of which, I will elaborate to you later. At this stage, note that, that *visesha aathma jnaanam* can come only after *mahaa vaakyam*. Also, note, as importantly, that, as long as the aspirant has only

saamaanya aathma jnaanam and not visesha aathma jnaanam, he will continue to be an ajnaani only. Even though, by completing anvaya vyathirekaa analysis, he has travelled a lot, getting to know (i) a saakshi, which is different from thriputi (ii) a saakshi, which is nithya: (iii) a saakshi, which is chaithanya svaroopaa: and (iv) ultimately, that, that saakshi is aathmaa (his own Self), he can still claim to have only saamaanya aathma jnaanam. He will continue to be an ajnaani, a dvaithin and a samsaari. Without mahaa vaakyam, the aspirant will remain in dvaitham only; and, as long as he is in dvaitham, he will be in samsaaraa.

“The *saamkyaa* philosopher had also arrived at an *aathmaa*, as *saakshi*, which is different from *thriputi*, which is *nithya*: and which is *chaithanya svaroopaa*:| But, he also has only this *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*; therefore, *saamkyaa* philosopher is a *dvaithin*. So also, the *yoga* philosopher, the *Nyaayaa* philosopher and the *Vaiseshikaa* philosopher. They have all arrived at the Self, as *saakshi*, which is different from *thriputi*, which is *nithya*: and which is *chaithanya svaroopaa*:| All these four philosophers have this *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*; but, they do not know that *saakshi* is *advaitam*, because they did not employ *mahaa vaakyam*. All four of them, therefore, are stuck in *dvaitham* and therefore, continue in *samsaaraa*. Even in the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* of the *Yoga* philosophy, though the aspirant can abide as *aathmaa*, he will never know that, that *aathmaa* is *advaitam*. Even *Samaadhi* can never give *advaita jnaanam*. Only *mahaa vaakyam*, received in *sravanam*, can give *advaita jnaanam* and consequent liberation from *samsaaraa*. Therefore, if we have to realize our ‘liberation’, we have to travel to *mahaa vaakyam*; otherwise, the spiritual journey is incomplete”.

This is a very, very important topic that Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering now.

Reverting to the text, (the *poorva pakshin's* objection is presented first):

- ननु - But,
- आगमापायदर्शनात् - since I have learnt the fact of the ‘arrival and departure’
- द्रष्ट दर्शन दृश्यानां - of the thriputi, viz., (i) the pramaathaa mind (ii) the pramaanam thoughts and (iii) the *prameyam* objects
- जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तेषु - based on the three states of experience,

The *poorva pakshin*, who is making this statement, is in the *saamkyaa-yogaa-nyaayaa-vaiseshika* group. He is planning to ask a question: “We have learnt many facts. Are they not enough? Why should we go to *mahaa vaakyam*?”. Before asking this question “Why *mahaa vaakyam*?”, he is giving a list of the facts he had learnt through *anavaya vyathirekhaa*.

This first part of the sentence given above, details the first fact learnt by the *poorva pakshin*. He says " By going through and studying the three states of experience, viz., waking, dream and deep sleep, I have learnt that the *thriputi* consisting of (i) the *pramaathaa* , which is the mind (ii) the *pramaanam*, which is the 'thoughts in the mind' and (iii) the *prameyam*, which are the 'objects' observed, is subject to 'arrival and departure'".

The other name for the '*thriputi*' is '*saakshyam*', which is different from '*saakshi*'.

This knowledge that the *thriputi* 'arrives and departs' is knowledge no. (1), gained by the student or *poorva pakshin*. He proceeds: "Based on this first knowledge, I have learnt the second fact". What is that second fact?

यत् साक्षिकौ तेषाम् आगमापायौ - - and that which is 'witness' to their 'arrival and departure',

This term gives the clue to the second lesson / fact learnt by the student / *poorva pakshin*, which lesson is "the existence of a *saakshi*, witnessing the 'arrival and departure'". The very fact that the 'arrival and departure' of *thriputi* is noticed and realized , shows that, there must be a *saakshi* 'observing' and 'gaining the awareness' of their 'arrival and departure'. This is the second lesson, viz., that, "Only because of the existence of a *saakshi*, the 'arrival and departure' of the *thriputi* is known".

The word '*yath*' means 'that' and '*Yath saakshikau*' refers to the 'observer / *saakshi*'. The word '*saakshikau*' is arrived at, as '*ya: saakshi yayo: thau aagamaapaayau*'.

Then, what is the third lesson that the student has already learnt? He says:

- स :आत्मा - is the *aathmaa* ,

The student says: "The third lesson I have learnt is that, that observer / witness of the *thriputi* is the *aathmaa*" and seems to imply "That means I have gained *aathma jnaanam*. *Aathma jnaanam* is the means to liberation and since I have acquired *aathma jnaanam*, the study must be over".

Proceeding, the student says:

- आगम अपाय विभाग रहितः - is not subject to 'arrival and departure';

This is knowledge no. (4). The student says "Not only do I know that the 'observer' of the *thriputi* is *aathmaa*, but I also know that, that *saakshi aathmaa* is not 'subject to arrival and departure' i.e. 'he is *nithya*.' | Because he is the 'observer', I know that he is also '*chaithanya svaroopaa*.'. The implication is again: "I have all this knowledge. Is that not enough? Is this not *aathma jnaanam*?"

The student gives an example also for the constant nature of *aathmaa*. What is the example?

- यथा - just as
- यः निबन्धनः जगत् प्रकाशाप्रकाशौ - that, which is the cause of 'days' and 'nights' of the earth, '*nibhandhana*.' means 'cause'.
- सः सूर्यः - viz., the sun
- प्रकाश अप्रकाश विभागरहितः - is free of 'days' and 'nights';

The example given for '*aathmaa*' is '*soorya*.' | The student says: "The earth has got 'days' and 'nights' alternately. I know that this alternating 'day' and 'night' experience is because of the sun. I also know that, that sun which is the cause of 'days' and 'nights' on earth, is itself free of 'days' and 'nights'. In the same manner as I have observed these facts viz., (i) the earth experiences days and nights alternately because of the sun and (ii) the sun, though the cause of the days and nights of the earth, is itself free of days and nights, I also observe the 'arrival and 'departure' of the *thriputi* and the 'arrival-departure-less' *aathmaa*".

In this analogy, 'earth' is the *upamaanaa* for the '*thriputi*'; the phenomenon of 'days' and 'nights' of the earth, is the *upamaanaa* for the '*aagama apaayaad*' of the '*thriputi*' and the 'sun' is the *upamaanaa* for '*aathmaa*'.

The sentence concludes:

इति - In this way , I have arrived at *aathma jnaanam*.

"Why I do require *mahaa vaakyam*?" is the question of the student, that follows.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 57:

यदा चैवं तदा वाक्यावगम्यस्यार्थस्यानुदितानस्तमितविज्ञानमात्रस्वभावस्यानुमानेनैव प्रतिपन्नत्वात्पुनरपि वाक्यस्य निर्विषयत्वप्रसङ्गः ।

When this is comprehended, we realize, that the import of the *Vedhaanthic* propositions, namely, the Self of the nature of pure Consciousness, subject to no beginning and no termination, is understood by reasoning itself and there is no matter for the *Vedhaanthic* proposition to convey.

The questioner / *poorva pakshin* continues. From the word '*nanu*', in the first line of this *sambhandha gadhyam*, up to the term '*nirvishayathvaprasangha:*', the last term in this sentence , is the *poorvapakshivaakyam*.

This second sentence conveys the conclusion of the *poorva pakshin*. He had said: "I have already gained, by mere logical reasoning, whatever knowledge you want to give me through the *mahaa vaakyam*, namely, *aathma jnaanam* , which consists of the knowledge that, the *aathmaa* is *chaithanya svaroopam* and is not subject to arrival and departure / birth and death". Now he proceeds to state his viewpoint:

- यदा च एवं तदा - When the position is this,
- प्रतिपन्नत्वात् - namely, the acquisition having been achieved,
- वाक्य अवगम्यस्य अर्थस्य - of the '*aathma jnaanam*' message that you want to give me through Mahaa Vaakyam,

'*vaakya avagamyasya*' means 'which is to be revealed through *mahaa vaakyam*'; '*arth*' indicates '*aathma jnaanam*' message, in this context.

What kind of *aathma* is it?

- अनुदित अनस्तमित - which '*athmaa*' is not subject to arrival and departure / free from births and deaths
- विज्ञान मात्र स्वभावस्य - (and) which is of the nature of pure Consciousness,
- अनुमानेन एव - through mere reasoning,
'*anumaanam*' means 'logical reasoning'.
- निर्विषयत्व प्रसङ्गः - redundancy
'*nirvishayam*' literally means 'without any new message' and implies 'redundancy'.
- पुनरपि वाक्यस्य - of the repetition of mahaa vaakyam
-)भवति(- results.

What the *poorva pakshin* says is: "Without using *mahaa vaakyam*, but, using pure logic, in the form of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* process, I have already gained the knowledge about the Self, which you wanted to give me through *mahaa vaakyam*. I have understood an *aathmaa*, which is different from the body-mind complex, which is *chaithanya svaroopam* and which is without birth or death. I have already arrived at this knowledge, through logical reasoning (*anumaanam*), such as 'since changing experiences are observed, there must be a changeless Conscious 'observer' / *nithya vijnaana svaroopam saakshi* etc. Since this has been already achieved by reasoning, is not *mahaa vaakyam* redundant? Why do I require it?". His further implied assertions: "In fact, it would appear, that, I do not require any *saasthraa* or *guru* also for this purpose. Even the *Upanishadic* statement '*naishaa tharkena mathir aapaneyaa*' (*Katopanishad* I.2.9) – 'This knowledge (*athma jnaanam*) cannot be attained by reasoning' does not sound convincing to me".

Up to this is the *poorvapakshaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa gives his reply in a very casual manner. The *poorva pakshi* expended a lot of energy and effort to present his position and his question. The *Aachaaryaa* brushes aside the *poorva pakshin's* query.

What is the answer, that is kept in *Aachaaryaa's* mind? The gist is given below (though covered earlier, in this session, Swamiji repeats it, presumably for emphasis):

"If a philosopher does not focus on *mahaa vaakyam*, his philosophy would come under one of the following four – *nyaayaa*, *vaiseshikaa*, *saamkhyaa* and *yoga*. The first three philosophies in this group are '*tharka pradhaanaa*' i.e., they swear by 'reasoning' or 'logic'. *Yogaa* philosophy lays emphasis on '*samaadhi*' / 'meditation'.

"All those people who emphasize meditation or logic or both, to the exclusion of the *sruthi mahaa vaakyaani* will come under the *saamkya-yoga-nyaaya-vaiseshika* group. They may all acquire '*aathma jnaanam*' – 'knowledge about *aathmaa*', but, **only partially**. They will get to know an *aathmaa*, which is *chaithanya svaroopam*: and *nithya*: / But, all of them will uniformly talk about '*dvaitha aathmaa*' only. By 'logic', they will arrive at *aathma chaithanyam* and also at the *nithyathvam* of *chaithanya aathmaa*. But, they will not and cannot arrive at '**advaita** *aathma chaithanyam*'. Even the *yoga* philosopher, who, in addition to 'reasoning', goes through '*nirvikalapaka samaadhi*', never arrives at *advaitam*. In his philosophy also, there is only '*aathma bahuthvam*' - there are many 'Consciousnesses' or '*aathmaa-s*'. And, quite illogically, all *aathmaa-s*, according to *Yogaa*, are all-pervading.

"To believe that *aathma jnaanam* can be gained by mere reasoning or 'reasoning followed by meditation' is a misconception. **Advaita** *aathma jnaanam* can never be acquired through reasoning or *samaadhi*. It **can** come **only** through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* and it **will** come through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

There is another misconception also prevalent. Even many *Vedhaanthic* students / seekers are under the wrong impression that after completing *Vedhaanthic* study, they have to go into *samaadhi* for *advaita anubhavaa*. This belief is also wrong. *Samaadhi* also cannot give either *advaita jnaanam* or *advaita anubhavam*, just as 'reasoning' / 'logic' cannot.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya wants to say "As long as you emphasize logic or meditation, you will be in *dvaita dharsanam* only". He conveys that in a casual manner:

नैष दोषः - Your charge is not sustainable.

By the word '*dhosha:*', the *Aachaaryaa* means 'your (*poorva pakshin's*) charge'. What was the *poorva pakshin's* charge? Ans : "*Mahaa vaakyam* does not have any new message to be taught".

The *Aachaaryaa* wants to tell the *poorva pakshin*: "*Mahaa vaakyam* alone teaches *advaitam*. Therefore, what you say, namely, that, '*mahaa vaakyam* has nothing to teach' - that *doshaa* is not there at all". Why? The *Aachaaryaa* answers:

- तत्प्रतिपत्तेः - The understanding / knowledge of the Self, in the manner described by you, '*prathipatthi:*' means '*jnaanam*' / knowledge ; the word '*thath*' means 'that you have arrived at'.
- लिङ्गव्यवधानेन - has been arrived at through the mediation of reasoning.
'*vyavadhaanaa*' means 'mediation' or 'instrumentality'; '*lingham*', in this context, means 'reasoning' or 'logic'.

What the *Aachaaryaa* says is: "The *aathma jnaanam* which you have arrived at, is only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*, because, you have arrived at it, through the mediation of reasoning only".

The implication of this cryptic statement is: " 'Reasoning' / *anumaanaa* can never give '*visesha jnaanam*'; it can give only '*saamaanya jnaanam*'". How do we say so? The *Aachaaryaa* does not elaborate; he assumes that, to the *poorva pakshin*, who has raised this question, this rule should already be known.

An analogy will make the rule clear and acceptable. In the common example of the inference of fire from smoke, we do discern the 'existence of fire', by *anumaanam*, because of the perceived smoke. But, this knowledge of the 'existence of fire' can be considered only

as *saamaanya jnaanam*. The other details of the fire, such as the magnitude - whether it is a small one or a conflagration, the cause of the fire etc., will not be known / cannot be discerned through the smoke. *They* can be known only through physical perception of the fire i.e., by using *prathyaksha pramaanam*. In short, the *saamaanya jnaanam* "fire *asthi*" could be had through '*anumaanam*', while the *visesha jnaanam* of the size of the fire, the reason for the fire etc., can be achieved only through *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

In a similar manner, in the case of '*aathma jnaanam*', through anvaya vyathirekhaa reasoning, only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*, in the form of *dvaitha aathma jnaanam* is achieved. But, there **is** a *visesha aathma jnaanam*, which is *advaita aathma jnaanam*/ knowledge of the 'non-dual nature of the Self'. 'Reasoning' or '*anumaana pramaanam*' can never give this *visesha aathma jnaanam*. For that purpose, the aspirant needs another *pramaanam* and that is the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*.

In the case of *agni*, *visesha jnaanam* of the *agni* comes through *prathyaksha pramaanam*. In the case of *aathmaa*, *visesha jnaanam* comes through *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*. In the case of fire, 'reasoning' must be followed by '*prathyakshaa*'; in the case of *aathma jnaanam*, 'reasoning' must be followed by '*mahaa vaakyam*'. Otherwise, the aspirant will continue to remain in *dvaitham*, like the *saamkhyaa-yoga-nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosophers. They used 'reasoning'; they did not arrive at '*advaitam*'; they used meditation; they did not arrive at '*advaitam*'. *Mahaavaakyam* is the only source of *Advaita jnaanam*. Based on these facts, the *Aachaaryaa* briefly said "*linghavyavadhaanena thathprathipatthe:*" | Since, he did not elaborate, the *poorva pakshin* is puzzled. He wonders "What more do I have to know?" Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* restates the *poorva pakshaa*, more clearly.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 57:

ननु साक्षात्परोक्षादात्मस्वभावेनानात्मनो हानोपादानयोःसंबन्धग्रहणात्कमतिशयं वाक्यं कुर्यात् ।

But, the connection between the Self, which is of the nature of immediacy and the objects, which are appropriated and rejected, is directly and immediately grasped. What more can the *mahaa vaakyam* accomplish?

The *poorva pakshin* does not understand, because Sureswaraachaarya has not made the main difference between *saamaanya jnaanam* and *visesha jnaanam* clear, namely, that, in *saamaanya jnaanam* we are in *dvaitham* only and by *visesha jnaanam* alone, we move to *advaitam*. This he has not explicitly mentioned .

Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* is still in a confused state. He says : "I know I am the *saakshi*; I know I am *chaithanya svaroopam*; I know I am *nithyam* also; and I have practiced *samaadhi* also and through *samaadhi*, I *am* able to abide in my *saakshi svaroopam*

also. Is this not enough? What else is to be acquired through *mahaa vaakyam*?" He still persists with this doubt.

- ननु - But,
- आत्मस्वभावेन - 'saakshi' in the form of the very Self / aathmaa

He says: "I have known the *aathmaa* / my Self as the *Saakshi* / the 'observer'"

- अनात्मनः हानोपादानयोः संबन्धग्रहणात् - and also 'my' relationship with the *thriputi anaathmaa*, having been understood by me, *'grahanam'*, in this context, mean *'jnaanam'* / grasping/ knowledge / awareness.
- साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् - directly and intimately,

He says: "I have not only understood that I am the *saakshi*, but, I have also understood my relationship with the *thriputi anaathmaa*, namely, that 'I' am the 'changeless observer' of the 'changing *thriputi* ('I' am the 'changeless observer' of the 'changing' phenomena of the universe)".

This relationship is technically called *'saakshi-saakshya-sambhandhaa'*, the Self / *aathmaa* being the changeless 'observer' / *saakshi* and the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* being the changing *saakshyam*.

"Such being the case" the *poorva pakshin* asks:

- किं अतिशयं वाक्यं कुर्यात् - what more new knowledge can the *mahaavaakyam* add?

The *poorva pakshin's* contention is: "I have intellectually understood that, in reality, 'I' am not this body-mind complex, but 'I' am the *aathmaa*, which is eternal, which is changeless, which is of the nature of pure Consciousness and which is the observer / *saakshi* of the changing universe. Not only have I intellectually understood this fact; I am able to enter into *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, I am able to dissolve the *thriputi* and abide as the *nirvikalpaka aathmaa* / Self without any division. Is this not enough? What else is required?"

Sureswaraacharya's viewpoint was already discussed, namely, that, neither logic nor *samaadhi* nor even a combination of both can give *advaita jnaanam*. At best, they can lead

to an ever-existent, *chaithanya svaroopaa saakshi aathmaa*. Only the *mahaa vaakyam* can give *advaita jnaanam* or knowledge of the non-dual nature of *aathmaa*. He now wants to present this, as his answer to the *poorva pakshir's* doubt.

164. Chapter III, Verses 57 and (05-12-2009)

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse57 :

मैवं वोचः। लिङ्गाधीनत्वात्तत्प्रतिपत्तेः । न हि लिङ्गव्यवधानेनात्मप्रतिपत्तिः साक्षात्प्रतिपत्तिर्भवति" यमेवैष वृणते तेन लभ्यः" इति श्रुतेः । अत आह।

Do not argue in this manner. The apprehension of the Self by way of reasoning is dependent on the inferential ground. Apprehension through the mediation of the inferential ground is certainly not 'direct' apprehension. The *sruthi* avers 'It is attained only by him who seeks that apprehension' (*Katopanishad* I.ii.23). Therefore it follows:

Sureswaraachaaryaa first talks about the *thvam padha vichaaraa*, in which we employ the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* arguments or 'reasoning' to arrive at the *saakshi svaroopam*. In the first stage of *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, we use *dhruk dhruasya vichaaraa* and negate everything else and arrive at *pramaathaa*, the *ahamkaaraa*. Thereafter, we do *avasthaathraya vichaaraa*, otherwise called *saakshi-saakshya-vichaaraa*, and in this second stage, we negate *ahamkaaraa* also as an incidental object. Through *dhruk dhruasya vivekaa*, the world is negated. Through, *saakshi-sakshya-vivekaa*, the *ahamkaaraa pramaathaa* is differentiated from *aathmaa*, and I arrive at myself as the *saakshi aathmaa*. At this stage, not only do I know I am *saakshisvaroopam*; I also know I am *chaithanyasvaroopam*; since, if I have to witness the *saakshya prapanchaa*, I should be *chaithanyam*. I also know that the world and *ahamkaaraa* are subject to arrival and departure, whereas as a *saakshi / witness*, 'I' am not subject to arrival and departure. *Haanopaadhaana varjitha: aham* | That means that I know 'I' am *nithya chaithanyam*. To consolidate: "I know 'I' am *saakshi*; I know 'I' am *aathmaa*; I know 'I' am *chaithanyasvaroopam*; I know 'I' am *haanopaadhaana varjitha*: and therefore *nithya*." | And, this much, I can arrive at through *thvam padha vichaaraa / through anvayavyathirekhaa*. This Sureswaraachaaryaa elaborately established. And, goes on to say, that, having arrived at this *saakshi aathmaa / having arrived at the conclusion 'saakshi nithya chaithanya aathmaa aham asmi'*, thereafter, we have to employ *mahaa vaakyam*, to continue the spiritual journey. When he says this, the student / *poorva pakshin* is surprised. What is his surprise due to? His questions explain. He asks : "By reasoning itself we have arrived at *saakshi nithya chaithanya aathmaa*. Is it not, by itself, the completion of our spiritual journey? Since we have reached the destination / arrived at *nithya chaithanya saakshi aathmaa* by *tharkaa* itself / by reasoning itself / by *anvaya vyathirekhaa* itself, why should we employ *mahaa vaakyam*?"

This viewpoint " *Tharkaa* itself will give *aathma jnaanam*" is the contention of certain other systems of philosophy also, viz., *saamkyaa*, *yoga*, *nyaayaa* and *vaiseshikaa*. They are all

tharkapradhaanaa people. All of them arrive at the *aathmaa*, by using 'reasoning' and their question and conclusion are (similar to the *poorva pakshirts*): "Why are you clinging on to *mahaa vaakyam* ? It is not necessary". This is the question, which Sureswaraacharya is struggling to answer and to convince the student, that, what has been achieved by him by mere 'reasoning', is not enough and that, *mahaa vaakyam* must now be compulsorily employed.

Sureswaraacharya's answer, already discussed earlier, more than once, is given again briefly, as follows: " *Tharkaa* can, at best, give only *aathma saamaanya jnaanam* / a general preliminary knowledge of the *aathmaa* , which knowledge may be more appropriately called '*aathma asthithva jnaanam*', which, literally means 'knowledge that there is an *aathmaa* existing'. But, we will never know the *visesha svaroopam* of *aathmaa* , through any form of reasoning".

To understand this assertion, an example was cited in the earlier session, viz., 'the inference of fire from smoke'. In this example, an individual perceives smoke emanating from the top of a hill; he does not physically perceive any fire. But, from the emanation of the smoke, he infers that there must be a fire on the other side of the hill, causing the smoke. When the individual infers the fire from smoke, he knows that there is fire; but, since he has not physically seen the fire, he does not know the *svaroopam* of the fire, i.e. the magnitude of the fire, the source of the fire etc. To know the *svaroopam* / to acquire the *visesha jnaanam* of the fire, the observer of the smoke, has to see the fire physically – i.e., he needs *prathyaksha pramaanam*. After using inference, from which he got the *saamaanya jnaanam* of the 'existence of the fire', he has to resort to *prathyaksha pramaanam*, if he desires to have *visesha jnaanam* of the *agni*. This is a common example, found in scriptures.

Another example from our mundane experiences, can be cited. When an individual is walking on the road, he hears the horn of a car from behind ; and consequently infers, that, there is a car behind him; but, he cannot infer from the horn, what type of car it is – the size of the car, the make, the colour etc. He has to physically see the car to know these details; in other words, he gets the *visesha jnaanam* of the car, only by *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

In the above two examples, it is seen, that, *saamaanya jnaanam* can be acquired by 'reasoning' or 'inference', while acquisition of *visesha jnaanam* compulsorily needs another *pramaanam*. In a similar manner, in the case of *aathmaa*, '*tharkaa*' can give *aathma saamaanya jnaanam*, whereas *aathma visesha jnaanam* will come only through another *pramaanam*. But, unlike as in the above two examples, in the context of *aathma jnaanam*, the other *pramaanam* that can be used, is not '*prathyaksha*', because, *aathmaa* is **not** *prathyaksha vishayaa*. The other *pramaanam* needed, is the *mahaavaakya pramaanam*,

which **alone** can give *aathma visesha jnaanam* or *aathma svarooopa jnaanam* or *aathma saakshaathkaara*: | This is the topic that is being discussed in the present portion.

To go through the student's vehement question again: "nanu saakshaath aparokshaath aathmasvabhaavena anaathmana: haanaopaadhaanayo: sambhandha grahanaath kamathisayam vaakyam kuryaath" – "But, (through anvaya vyathirekhaa / 'reasoning' itself), I am clearly and intimately arriving at the aathmaa, as saakshi. Not only do I now know that 'I' am saakshi; but, I also know that the mind, the thoughts and the world - in short, the entire thriputi is subject to arrival and departure. Another term for anaathmaa, is saakshyam. Thus, I know what is saakshi and what is saakshyam. I also know the relationship between the saakshi and the saakshyam. I have this much clear knowledge. What more knowledge do I require? What is the extraordinary knowledge that mahaa vaakyam is expected to bestow on me?"

This is the *poorva pakshin's* question. What is Sureswaraachaaryaa's answer ?

- मैवं वोच : - Do not argue in this manner.

The actual word is '*avocho*:' (अवोच:); the letter 'अ' is dropped because of a special grammar rule. '*Maa avocha*:' means 'do not argue' and '*evam*' means 'in this manner'. Why? The reason is given by the *Aachaaryaa*, in a terse statement:

- तत् प्रतिपत्ते : लिङ्ग अधीनत्वात् - Since that aathma jnaanam was derived through reasoning.

'*Prathipatthi*:' means '*jnaanam*' / knowledge. '*Thath prathipatthi*:' means 'the *aathma jnaanam* that we gain in this manner', '*thath*' implying 'that we gain in this manner'. '*Lingha adheenathvaath*' means 'since derived from reasoning'. '*Lingham*' refers to '*anumaanam*' ; '*anumaanam*' refers to '*tharkhaa*' or '*yukthi*' or '*nyaayaa*'. All these terms are synonymous. *Tharkaa* = *yukthi* = *nyaaya* = logic = reasoning.

The sentence literally means "Since it is knowledge derived only through reasoning" and the *Aachaaryaa's* implication is "It is, therefore, *saamaanya jnaanam* or 'incomplete knowledge' ". That is explained further.

- लिङ्ग व्यवधानेन आत्मप्रतिपत्तिः - The aathma jnaanam derived 'through the instrument of reasoning' / 'by means of reasoning',

'*aathma prathipatthi*.' means '*aathma jnaanam*' ; '*lingham*' means 'reasoning'; '*vyavadhaanam*' means 'instrument or tool' and may be interpreted here, as 'means'.

- साक्षात् प्रतिपत्तिः न हि भवति - is certainly not *visesha jnaanam* / *saakshaathkaaraa* / complete knowledge.

"Knowledge received from mere reasoning is not *aathma visesha jnaanam*. It is not complete knowledge" declares the *Aachaaryaa*.

Under such circumstances, what should the aspirant do? Ans: He has to seek that further knowledge through the effort of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

And, who says this? Ans: The *Upanishad* itself says that.

Where is it said? In reply, Sureswaraachaaryaa quotes from *Katopanishad* (I.ii.23):

- साक्षात् प्रतिपत्तिः भवति - *Visesha jnaanam* / *saakshaathkaaraa* / complete knowledge results,
- श्रुतेः - in line with the *sruthi vaakyam*
- "यं एव एष वृणते तेन लभ्य " इति - viz., "(*saakshaathkaara:*) is attained only by that aspirant who seeks it".

'*vrnunthe*' means 'seeks'.

Only that aspirant, who has already got *saamaanya aathma jnaanam* and who desires *visesha jnaanam*, and, therefore seeks it, by approaching a *guru*, for analyzing the *mahaa vaakyam* – that student alone can attain the *aathma visesha jnaanam*.

Now, a student has to clearly understand the difference between *aathma saamaanya jnaanam* and *aathma visesha jnaanam*. Only then he will be able to appreciate Sureswaraachaaryaa's vehement stand on this issue.

Through reasoning, the seeker may and will get to know that there **is** an *aathmaa*, which is different from the body, different from the mind and different from the sense organs. This is called *aathma asthithva jnaanam* or *aathma saamaanya jnaanam*. And, this *aathmaa* is talked about, by all the philosophers, even other than *Advaitin*-s. The *Saamkyaa* philosopher accepts an *aathmaa*, which is different from body, mind, sense organs, intellect etc. He also accepts the *nithyathvam* of the *aathmaa*. The *Yoga* philosopher also talks about

nithya aathmaa, arrived at, through logic, without employing *mahaa vaakyam*. The *Saamkhyaa* philosopher does not employ *mahaa vaakyam*; the *yoga* philosopher also does not employ *mahaa vaakyam*. They have logically arrived at a *nithya aathmaa*, different from body-mind-sense organs. The *Nyaayaa* philosopher also talks about *nithya aathmaa*, different from body-mind-sense complex. The *Vaiseshikaa* philosopher also does.

Then, what is the difference between the *aathmaa*, arrived at by those four systems of philosophy and the *aathmaa* arrived at by the *Advaitin*, by employing *mahaa vaakyam*? What is the uniqueness of the *aathmaa*, talked about, by the *Advaitin*?

Ans: The other philosophers talk of only *aathma asthithvam*; but, the *Advaitin*, in addition, talks of *aathma ekathvam*.

What is the difference between *aathma asthithvam* and *aathma ekathvam*?

Ans: *Aathma asthithvam* means there is *aathmaa* **also**. And, *aathma ekathvam* means there is *aathmaa* **only**.

On the face of it, the difference may not sound big or important and may bring forth the question from the student "Is that all?" But, these terms, viz. '*aathmaa also*' and '*aathmaa only*' are loaded terms in *Vedhaantha saathraa*. The student has to capture the full significance of these loaded terms. Sureswaraachaaryaa assumes that his readers know the significance of these words; therefore, he does not dwell at length on them. It is up to the student to analyze and understand the significance of the terms.

When the statement '*aathmaa also* is there', it means that *aathmaa* is *sajaatheeya vijaatheeya svagatha bedhaa* **sahitha**: / '*Bedhaa*' means 'division'. Three types of 'division' are talked about, in the *saasthraa*-s : (i) *sajaatheeya* (ii) *vijaatheeya* and (iii) *svagatha*.

In all *dharsanam*-s / systems of philosophy, other than *Advaita dharsanam*, *aathmaa* has got all these three types of 'division'.

Of these, '*sajaatheeya bedhaa*', in the context of *aathmaa*, means 'the division existing among **many** *aathmaa*-s'. All the four *dharsanam*-s (*saamkhyaa*, *yoga*, *nyaayaa* and *vaiseshikaa*) talk about '**many**' eternal *aathmaa*-s, which are all different from one another.

Not only do they talk about *jeevaathma-jeevaathma-bedhaa*, they talk about *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa* also. Not only these four *dharsanaa*-s, but, even *Visishtadvaitam*, a school considered to be of *Vedhaanthic* thoughts, which, therefore, is supposed to take its essence from the *Upanishad*-s, believes in both *jeevaathma-jeevaathma-bedhaa* and

jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa. In *Visishtaadvaitam*, therefore, even during *mokshaa*, which is a special *lokaa*, called *Vaikunta Lokaa*, many eternal *jeevaathmaa-s* will be there, in the presence of one eternal *Paramaathmaa* – viz., *Vishnu*; and, all the *jeevaathmaa-s* will be vying with one another, to do *kaimkaryam* to *Paramaathmaa*. This *jeevaathma-jeevaathma-bedhaa* and *jeevaathma-Paramaathma bedhaa* is termed *sajaatheeya bedhaa*.

And, then, these philosophies, again including *Visishtaadvaitam*, talk about an *aathmaa*, which has got *vijaatheeya bedhaa* also. According to them, even in *mokshaa*, there is *aathmaa* and there is *anaathmaa*. Difference between one *aathmaa* and another *aathmaa* is *sajaatheeya bedhaa*; difference between *aathmaa* and non-*aathmaa* or *anaathmaa*, the matter, is called *vijaatheeya bedhaa*. And, the *vijaatheeya bedhaa* also is eternal, according to these philosophies.

Then, there is the third *bedhaa*, viz., *svagatha bedhaa*. What is that? Within one *aathmaa* itself, there are internal differences. According to these philosophies, both *Jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* have got internal differences also. The 'difference' may be in the form of 'various limbs' or in the form of 'substance and attribute'.

When they talk about *Paramaathmaa* as *Maha Vishnu*, that *Paramaathmaa* form has different limbs – beautiful eyes, beautiful hands etc., which, as is well known, are extolled for their grace and beauty. The Tamil poet, *Kambar*, in his Tamil version of Ramayana, sings about Rama's handsome looks, an oft-quoted line being “*தோள் கண்டார் தோளே கண்டார்*”. Even after attaining *mokshaa*, the successful aspirant will be devotedly admiring the various limbs of the Lord, without even blinking his eyes. The happiness resulting from the divine '*dharsanam*' is considered as a part of *mokshaa*, by the *Visishtaadvaitin*.

The second type of *svagatha bedhaa*, in the context of *aathmaa*, is that of 'substance and attribute'. These philosophies talk about *aathmaa* - whether *jeevaathmaa* or *Paramaathmaa* - as a 'substance' with attributes like *jnaanam*, *iccha*, *sankalapa*: etc. *Maha Vishnu* is considered as *ashtaguna visishta Paramaathmaa* / *anantha kalyaana gunaganaika visishta Paramaathmaa*. For *Paramaathma lakshanam*, they tirelessly quote the *Chaandoghya Upanishad manthraa* “*ya aathmaa apahatha paapmaa vijara: vimruthyu: visoka: vijighathsa: apipaasa: sathyakaama: sathyasamkalpa: sa: anveshtavya.*” (VIII.7.1) – “That Self, which has no sin, no decrepitude, no death, no sorrow, no hunger, no thirst, has unfailing desires and unfailing will, has to be known”. This 'difference' in the form of 'substance' and its 'attributes' is called *svagatha bedhaa*.

By mere logic one can arrive only at a *sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-sahitha-aathmaa*. And, even a student of the *Vedaa-s*, if he ignores *mahaa vaakyam*, will also arrive at only such a misconceived *aathmaa*.

Sureswaraacharya stresses on this fact and says " Only when you employ *mahaa vaakyam* and understand the full significance of the *vaakyam*, you will understand *aathma ekathvam*".

What is the meaning of "aathma ekathvam" ? Ans: "Sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-**rahithathvam**" |

'*Sajaatheeya-bedha-rahitha aathmaa*' means, that, there is no possibility of 'many' *jeevaathmaa*-s. The *saamkhyaa* philosopher never arrives at this fact. His logic helps him to arrive at *aathmaa* ; but, he believes in 'many' *aathmaa*-s and thus, never arrives at 'one' *sajaatheeya bedha rahitha aathmaa*. *Visishtaadvaitam* also arrives at *aathmaa*, but, at 'many' *aathmaa*-s again. In addition, it believes in *jeevaathma-Paramaathma bedhaa* also, which will also come under *sajaatheeya bedhaa*. But, what does *mahaa vaakyam* say ? Ans: It firmly avers '*aathmaa eka*.' | '*aathmaa* is bereft of *sajaatheeya bedhaa* | This is not a meaningless statement to be trifled with. It is very profound teaching.

The second revelation through *mahaa vaakyam* is that '*aathmaa*' does not have *svagatha bedhaa* / internal differences also. It is not a substance, with 'consciousness' as its 'attribute'; but, it is Consciousness itself, without substance-attribute division. Consciousness is not the attribute of 'me'; Consciousness **is** 'me'.

Aathmaa is not only *sajaatheeya svagatha bedha rahitha*: | *Aathmaa* is free from the division in the form of *vijaatheeya bedhaa* also. This is because there is no *anaathmaa* existing separate from *aathmaa*. There is no material universe / *saakshya prapanchaa* existing separate from *aathmaa* . *Saakshya prapanchaa* only 'appears'; it is only 'seemingly' existent, not 'really' existent. Whatever 'appears' without 'really existing', is called '*mithyaa*'. Since there is no *anaathmaa* different from 'me', the *aathmaa*, i.e. since *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*, there is no question of *vijaatheeya bedhaa* also. Only when an *aathmaa* **and** an *anaathmaa* which is different from *aathmaa*, are both 'really existent', there can be *vijaatheeya bedhaa*. "There is no '*aathmaa and anaathmaa*'; there is **only** *aathmaa*" is the teaching of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Kaivalyopanishad (16) declares: "Yathparam brahma sarvaathmaa visvasya aayathanam mahath sookshmaathsookshmatharam nithyam thath thvameva thvameva thath" – " You alone are that infinite, eternal, supreme Brahman, which is the Self of all, which is the abode of all and which is subtler than the subtle, that Brahman alone is you". And, again (22 and 23) : "Vedai: anekai: aham eva vedhya:| vedaanthkruth vedavith eva cha aham| na punyapaape mama| naasthi naasa:| na janmadehendriyabuddhirasthi | na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha | evam vidhithvaa

paramaathmaroopam guhaasayam nishkalam advitheeyam samasthaasaakshim sadhasadviheenam prayaathi suddham paramaathmaroopam" –" 'I' alone am to be known through all the Vedaa-s; 'I' am the initiator of the Vedhaanthat; 'I' alone am the knower of the Vedaa-s ; punya and paapa are not there for 'me'; death is not there for 'me'; birth, body, sense organs and intellect are not there for 'me'; earth, water, fire, air and space are not there for 'me'. Having known this nature of the supreme Self which is located in the heart, which is without parts, non-dual , the witness of all, without cause and effect, and pure, one attains the nature of the supreme Self".

This sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-rahitha-aathma- ekathva jnaanam is aathma visesha jnaanam ; it can never be got through tharkaa or through nirvikalpaka samaadhi. It can be attained only through mahaa vaakyam.

That is the reason (i.e., since they did not use the *mahaa vaakyam*) that, all the other four *dharsanam-s*, arrived at *aathmaa* , but, never arrived at *aathma ekathvam*. For them, even in *mokshaa*, there is no *advaitam*.

Through mahaa vaakyam alone, 'aham brahma asmi' is made clear. Brahman is 'sajaatheeya vijaatheeya svagatha bedha rahitham' |

In the well-known *Chaandoghya Upanishad manthraa* (VI.2.1), Sage *Uddhaalakaa* declares to his son *Svethakethu* : " *Sadheva soumya idham agra aaseeth ekam eva advitheeyam*" – "O good looking one, in the beginning, this was Existence alone, One only, without a second" and later points out (*manthraa* VI.8.7): "*eithadhaathmyam idhagum sarvam thath sathyam sa aathmaa thathvamasi Svethaketho*" – "All this has got That as the Self. That is the Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That, O *Svetaketu*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to ask the *poorva pakshin* : "Without that *mahaa vaakyam*, how will you claim that (i)'I' am the *jagadh adhishtaanam* (ii) in 'me', the world appears and disappears (iii) the world can never bind 'me' (iv) *mokshaa* is not escaping from the world in the name of *videha mukthi* ; but, *mokshaa* is converting life itself into a *leelaa* etc.? How can you achieve all these convictions, which are all essential for 'liberation', without *mahaa vaakyam*? How can you afford to brush aside the significance of *mahaa vaakyam*?"

- अत आह - Therefore, I say:

Incidentally, the quote '*yam eva esha vrunuthe thena labhya:*' occurs in two *Upanishad-s* – in *Mundakopanishad* (III.ii.3) and in *Katopanishad* (I.ii.23).

Chapter III: Verse 57 –

लिङ्गमस्तित्वनिष्ठत्वान्न स्याद्वाक्यार्थबोधकम् ।
सदसध्व्युत्थितात्माऽयमतो वाक्यात्प्रतीयते ॥ ५७ ॥

As the inferential ground rests on empirical existence, it cannot convey the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam*. This Self, going beyond existence and non-existence, is, therefore, grasped only through the *mahaa vaakyam*.

All above discussions are condensed by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in one simple *slokaa*.

- लिङ्गमस्तित्वनिष्ठत्वात् - Since 'reasoning' can result only in the knowledge of the 'mere existence of *aathma*,

'*Lingam*' means '*tharkhaa*' or 'reasoning'; '*asthithvam*' means 'existence'; and, '*nishtathvam*' means 'knowledge'. What this portion conveys is : "Since 'reasoning' can lead you only to the basic knowledge of the existence of a *sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-sahitha aathmaa*'. Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to this basic knowledge / *saamaanya jnaanam* as '*asthithva nishta*'.

This *saamaanya jnaanam* is confined to realization of such an *aathmaa* only, viz., a '*sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-sahitha aathmaa*'. But, as long as 'I', the *aathmaa* is subject to such 'divisions' and , as a consequence, 'I' am only one of the many things in Creation, I will be miserable. There will be the tendency to compare and compete with others, resulting in *raaghaa*, *dveshaa* , superiority complex, inferiority complex etc.

Vedhaanthaa says: "I am **not** 'one of the things'. 'I' am the **only** thing". Without this knowledge and firm conviction, *mokshaa* is simply impossible. This is the contention of the *Upanishad*-s; this is the contention of Sankaraachaaryaa; and, this is the contention of Sureswaraachaaryaa also. In any knowledge, other than '*aathma ekathva jnaanam*', you will not be 'free'. You will be a 'bonded' slave. Even as a devotee or even in *mokshaa*, instead of being a *dhaasaa* of local master, you will only be a *dhaasaa*, of course, of a greater master. But, is there any difference between an ordinary *dhaasaa* and an exalted *dhaasaa*?

Dayananda Swami humorously says : "You may be a driver of the President of India; so, the car you drive, may be an extraordinary, expensive car, which you cannot normally drive. The roads may be free of all traffic, when you drive the President's car. But, you are still only a driver. Your job might be a *dhaasaa* of an exalted person; but, you cannot be called 'free'. A 'free slave' is an oxymoron. It does not exist. As long as you have *dhaasathvam*, *mokshaa* is simply impossible. You should become a '*swam*'. The term '*swam*' does not

mean a 'monk with *kaashaaya vasthram*'. It indicates a person with the conviction 'I' am the only Reality; everything else is of a lower order of reality' ".

Tharkaa will not give that *ekathva jnaanam*; therefore (the *Aachaaryaa* says):

- वाक्यार्थबोधकम् न स्यात् - it (reasoning) cannot be a revealer of the message of *mahaa vaakyam*.

The essence of the sentence is that 'reasoning' can never convey the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*. And, what is the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*? Ans: '*Aathma ekathvam*'| '*Aathma ekathvam*' means '*jagadh adhistaanathvam*' meaning "'I' am the *adhishtaanam* of the entire universe".

It may be recollected here, that, the popular concept of "'*jeevan mukthi*', followed later by '*videha mukthi*'" is also only a compromised concept of *mokshaa*. Many *Vedhaanthic* students have this compromised concept and think that every *jnaani* initially attains '*jeevan mukthi*', which consists in 'continuing to survive in this world with a lot of patience and fortitude, to exhaust *praarabhdhaa*' and later attains '*videha mukthi*', which is 'escaping from this world'. The 'escaping from the world' is from *ahamkaaraa* angle. Of course, *Saasthraa*-s do talk of this *mokshaa*.

But, this concept is allowed only in the initial stages of *Vedhaanthic* study. The *Vedhaanthic* student should gradually distance himself from this concept of '*jeevanmukthi-videhamukti mokshaa*', since, this *mokshaa* is based on the idea "I am *ahamkaaraa*", and move to the ultimate concept of real *mokshaa*, which is the conviction : " 'I' am not *ahamkaaraa*; I do not have *sanchithaa* or *aagaami* or *praarabhdhaa*; then, where is the question of exhausting *praarabhdhaa* ? Where is the question of *jeevanmukthi* – *videhamukthi* division? 'I' **am** the '*jagadh adhishtaanam*', in whom the whole universe is moving. *Mayyeva sakalam jaatham*".

This *svaroopa avasthaanam* is the real *mokshaa*; i.e., abiding in the fact "'I' am not the *ahamkaaraa* at all, to have to 'escape' from this world ; 'I' am the *eka aathmaa* " is real *mokshaa*.

Sankara Baghavadh Paadhaa's exhortation in his Upadesa Panchakam (verse 5) "Ekaanthesukham aasyathaam parathare chetha: samaadheeyathaam poornaathmaa susameekshyathaam jagadhidham thadhbaadhitham dhruvyathaam"— "Sit comfortably in a lonely (quiet) place, fix the mind on the Higher (Supreme) Self; seek the all-pervading aathmaa within; look upon the universe as negated / eliminated by the all-pervading aathmaa" is the height of *Vedhaanthic* vision. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa admonishes the

poorva pakshin : " Why do you not recognize this? Why do you bleat like a lamb? Recognize your higher Self and roar like a lion". Reverting to the text:

- अतः - Therefore,
- अयं सदसद्व्युत्थित आत्मा - this advaita aathmaa, which transcends empirical existence and empirical non-existence
- वाक्यात् प्रतीयते - is knowable only through mahaa vaakyam.

The 'ayam' in 'ayam aathmaa' indicates 'aathma ekathvam' and 'aathma adhishtaanathvam'.

What is the nature of this '*advaita aathmaa*'? Sureswaraacharya qualifies it as '*sadhasadhvyutthitha aathmaa*'. '*Sath*', in this context, means *vyaavahaarika* / empirical/ relative existence and '*asath*' means *vyaavahaarika* / empirical/ relative non-existence. 'Relative existence + relative non-existence' is referred to, here, as '*sadhasadh*'. Every object in this creation is subject to empirical existence during *srushti kaalaa* and empirical non-existence during *pralaya kaalaa*. Wherever *vyaavahaarika sath* is there, *vyaavahaarika asath* also will be there. And, who am 'I'? 'I' am *sadhasadhvyutthitha aathmaa* – an *aathmaa* which transcends relative existence and relative non-existence. That means 'I' am *paaramaarthika sathyam*. In another language, 'I' am of the higher order of reality. And, naturally, from 'my' standpoint, the entire world is of the lower order of reality / *vyaavahaarika sathyam* / *mithyaa*.

An aspirant can arrive at this conviction only through *mahaa vaakyam*. The *Aacharya* points this out by saying '**vaakyaath pratheeyathe**'| Throughout this context '*vaakyam*' should be understood as '*mahaa vaakyam*'.

None of the other philosophies – *Saamhkyaa*, *Yogaa*, *Nyaayaa*, *Vaiseshikaa*, *Dvaita Vedhaanthaa* and even *Visishtaadvaita Vedhaanthaa* - arrives at these two orders of reality. *Mahaa vaakyam* **alone** can give me '*satthaabhedha*:'| Then alone world will become *mithyaa*.

And, it should be remembered that the world can become an 'entertainment', only when it is understood to be of a lower order of reality. Even the severest problems met by characters in a movie, are 'entertainment' for the people who watch the movie, since they know that the movie is only make-believe. Problems can be reduced to entertainment, only when they are understood to be of a lower order of reality.

Life also can become an entertainment, when it is appreciated as of a lower order of reality ; and, that will become of a lower order, only when I elevate 'myself' into a higher order and .

This process of 'jacking up' is executed by the *mahaa vaakyam*. The *Vedhaanthic guru* struggles to elevate the disciple from the *vyavahaarika* level to the *Paramaarthika* level, using the the *mahaa vaakyam`Thathvamasf*.

Understandably the process is a long-drawn one, since the student is caught up in the *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind; and, as even as he manages to get elevated to the *paaramaarthika* level, quite often slips back. (Swamiji, in a lighter vein, refers here, to the irony of the students rushing to him, immediately after the intense *Vedhaanthic* lessons on the *mithyaathvam* of the world, seeking his special blessings to get out of their mundane problems.)

Mahaa vaakyaa is the lever which elevates the 'order of reality' of 'me'. The conviction "'I' am the only Reality and whatever I experience is of a lower order- *mithyaa* " has to be internalized. This conviction may be called 'binary' format. If the student fails to move into the 'binary' format and continues in the 'triangular' format of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, he will feel persecuted / harassed by the world and will 'run' to *Bhagavaan* repeatedly for succour.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, stresses on the importance of the *mahaa vaakyam*, assimilation of which will lead the aspirant to the *Paaramaarthika* level, by saying "*ayam sadhasadh vyutthitha aathmaa vaakyaath pratheeyathe*" – "The *paaramaarthika aathmaa*, which transcends empirical existence and empirical non-existence will be known only through the *mahaa vaakyam*".

Reverting to the text: The student / *poorva pakshin* does not give up, but, presents another argument to establish his view that *mahaa vaakyam* is not necessary:

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 58:

ननु यदि व्यावृत्तसदसद् विकल्पजालं वस्त्वभीष्टं वाक्याद्भवतस्तथापि तूत्सार्यते वाक्यविषया तृष्णा ।

If you desire to know the 'reality' bereft of all determinations of the form of existence and non-existence, through *mahaa vaakyam*, even then, the inclination to seek it through the *mahaa vaakyam* ought to cease.

This is the objection of the student / *poorva pakshin* who has not understood the significance of *aathma ekathvam*.

Whenever the term '*aathma ekathvam*' is mentioned, the student should remember these two corollaries: (1) *sajaatheeya- vijaatheeya-svagatha-bedha-rahithathvam* of *aathmaa* and (2) *satthaabedha*: (the difference in the nature of 'existence' between 'I' and 'everything else' viz., that, 'I' am of a higher order of reality and everything else is of the lower order).

'*Aathma ekathvam*' term is a very significant, loaded term. Sankaraaacharya, in the introduction to his *Brahmasoothra Bhaashyam*, gives one of the most brilliant commentaries called '*Adhyaasa bhaashyam*'. This is a very famous and important portion, on which a number of sub-commentators have written further annotations.

In fact, *Sankaraacharya's* original '*Adhyaasa Bhaashyam*', compared to the subsequent commentaries, is a brief, cryptic, terse, encapsulated message.

In this *Adhyaasa Bhaashyam*, *Sankaraacharya* points out that the entire *Vedhaanthee*, especially the *mahaa vaakyam*, is to confer only one wisdom, viz., 'Liberating wisdom'. In conveying this important message, he uses this term '*aathma ekathvam*'. He says: "*Sarve Vedhaanthee: aarabhyanthe 'aatma ekathva vidhya' prathipatthaye*"- "All *Vedhaanthee* portions are meant for conferring the '*aathma ekathva*' knowledge".

What a loaded sentence is this "*Aathma ekathva vidhya prathipatthaye*"? All the *Upanishad-s* are meant only to raise the aspirants from the '*jeeva-jagath-Isvara*' triangular format to the '*aathma-anaathma*' binary format. All the *Upanishad-s* are struggling to achieve this purpose, using the 'lever' / 'jack' of *mahaa vaakyam*. A serious student should appreciate this, make proper use of the *Upanishad-s* and 'raise' himself from the *Vyavahaarika* level to the *Paaramaarthika* level. Otherwise the study of *Vedhaanthee* is futile. *Sankaraacharya* stresses on this aspect also in his *Viveka Chooddamani* (verse 59) - "*avijnyaathe pare thathve saasthraadheethisthu nishpalaa*" – "Study of the scriptures is fruitless, as long as *Brahman* has not been experienced".

Unfortunately, many students tend to consider *Vedhaanthee* study as 'time-pass' or an intellectual hobby, since they find it intellectually stimulating. And, they feel comfortable in the triangular format even after long periods of study, as if to say "The study of *Upanishad*, which, I am, no doubt, interested in, is one aspect; 'raising 'my' level' is an altogether different aspect, which, after all, is only optional".

165. Chapter III, Verses 58 (12-12-2009)**Sambhandha gadhyam (Part) to Verse 58:**

ननु यदि व्यावृत्तसदसद्विकल्पजालं वस्त्वभीष्टं वाक्यात्भवतस्तथापि तूत्सार्यते वाक्यविषया तृष्णा - यस्मादन्तरेणापि वाक्यश्रवणं निरस्त अशेष विकल्पं आगोपालाविपालपण्डितं सुषुप्ते वस्तु सिद्धमतो नार्थो वाक्यश्रवणेन ।

If you desire to know through the proposition (*mahaa vaakyam*) the reality, bereft of all determination of the form of existence and non-existence, even then, the inclination to seek it through the proposition ought to cease. Quite independent of all propositions, reality, bereft of all determinations, presents itself to everyone, be he a fool or a sage, in the state of dreamless sleep.

In the course of the discussion on the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, Sureswaraacharya pointed out, that, of the *mahaa vaakyam*, 'thath thvam asI', the 'thvam' padha vichaaraa part has to be completed first. For this purpose, we use the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* method, which is *tharka pradhaanam*. Through this *tharka pramaanam* itself, we arrive at the *thvam padha lakshyaartha* of *saakshi*. And, after arriving at the 'saakshi', which is the 'subject' in the *mahaa vaakyam*, we move over to the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*, namely, that, 'that *saakshi (thvam)* is *Brahman (thath)*'. 'Thath / Brahman' is, thus, the 'predicate' in the *mahaa vaakyam*.

As discussed already, whenever we use any sentence, the sentence must contain a known 'subject' and an unknown 'predicate'. In other words, in all the sentences, there should be a known part and an unknown part. If both the parts, viz., the 'subject' and the 'predicate' are already known to the listener, the sentence will become redundant. If, on the other hand, both the parts are unknown to the listener, i.e. if the 'subject' is also unknown to him, then the sentence will fail to communicate any message.

Therefore the conclusion, that, every purposeful sentence has got a known subject and an unknown predicate. In the *mahaa vaakyam*, 'thath thvam asI', the 'subject', the *thvam padha*, must be first understood by the aspirant, as *saakshi*, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* or *tharka pramaanaa*. Only thereafter, the *mahaa vaakyam* will be useful in predicating this *Brahma eikyam* with regard to the known subject, viz., the *thvam padha lakshyaartha saakshi*.

In line with this conventional scheme, Sureswaraacharya first talked about the use of *tharka pramaanaa* in arriving at the *saakshi* and is now in the process of moving over to the 'predicate' of the *mahaa vaakyam* and its message of '*saakshi-Brahma-eikyam*'. At this

moment, some *poorva pakshin*-s enter the discussion; and, they argue that this much enquiry and consequent arriving at the *saakshi* itself are enough to complete the spiritual journey. They ask: "Why should we go to *mahaa vaakyam* at all?; why cannot we confine ourselves to *thvam padha lakshyaartha saakshi jnaanam*?" In other words, the *poorva pakshin*-s hold that *tharkhaa* itself gives complete *aathma jnaanam* and that *mahaa vaakyam* is not required at all. This is the contention of *nyaayaa-vaisheshikaa* philosophers, who arrived at *aathmaa* without using *mahaa vaakyam*.

In reply to this view, Sureswaraachaarya elaborately established in the previous *slokaa*, that, through *tharkhaa* or *nyaayaa*, the *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosopher can get only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*, which consists of (i) '*aathma asthithva jnaanam*', i.e. that, there is an *aathmaa* and (ii) '*aathma vyaapithva jnaanam*', i.e., that, the *aathmaa* is all-pervading. The *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosopher does arrive at a *vyaapaka aathmaa*, different from the body-mind-sense complex.

"But" Sureswaraachaaryaa says "that *vyaapaka aathma asthithva jnaanam*, attained through logic, is only 'basic knowledge'. This knowledge is incomplete. The *visesha jnaanam* about *aathmaa*, the complete knowledge about *aathmaa*, cannot be attained by mere logic".

What is that *visesha jnaanam*, which the *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* lacks? Ans: The '*Aathma visesha jnaanam*' is '*aathma ekathva jnaanam*'.

The *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosopher has got *aathma asthithva jnaanam*; he has got *aathma vyaapithva jnaanam* (*vyaapithvam* means 'pervasion'); but, he does not have *aathma ekathva jnaanam*. Consequently, his concept is that there are several all-pervading *aathmaa*-s, all subject to different types of 'divisions' also. Not only does the *nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosopher not have *aathma ekathva jnaanam*, he does not have *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam* also. These two components are extremely important; *aathma asthithva jnaanam* is not sufficient; *aathma vyaapithva jnaanam* is also not sufficient. To achieve 'liberation', we require *aathma ekathva jnaanam* and, in fact, more importantly, *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*.

The *Nyaaya-vaisheshikaa* philosopher, through all his reasoning, is not able to arrive at *aathma ekathvam* and *anaathma mithyaathvam*. Without these two components, liberation is impossible. *Advaitham* insists that we cannot evade or gloss over *anaathma mithyaathvam*. A *mumukshu* should clearly be convinced of *jagan mithyaathvam*.

And, this *jagan mithyaathvam* is not just a theory floated by Sankaraachaaryaa. The *Bhaagavadha Maha Puraanaa* itself presents this elaborately, in its *Uddhava Githa* and *Navayogi Samvaadhaa* portions. In these portions, the *svapna dhrushtaantha* for the world

i.e., 'equation of the world to *svapnaa*', was repeatedly given. The *svapnaa* example clearly points to *jagan mithyaathvam*.

No philosophy, including the *nyaaya* and *vaiseshikaa* philosophies, would ever be able to arrive at *aathma ekathvam* and *anaathma mithyaathvam*, using mere logic. To arrive at these two, what does an aspirant require? Ans: *Mahaa vaakyam* is a compulsory necessity for *aathma ekathva jnaanam* and *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*. And, therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa said, in verse 57: "Any amount of logic will give only *saamaanya jnaanam* ; the *visesha jnaanam* of *aathmaa*, transcending the *vyavahaarika prapanchaa* / going beyond the pairs of opposites, can never be achieved by mere reasoning; it can be attained only through *mahaa vaakyam*".

Aathmaa is defined by Katopanishad as "anyathra dharmath anyathra adharmaath anyathra asmaath kruthaakruthaath anyathra bhoothaascha bhavyaascha" (I.ii.14) – "different from dharma, different from adharma, different from this cause and effect and different from past and future".

Aathmaa is beyond *dhurgunaa* and *sugunaa*. It is beyond good, as well as evil attributes. It is beyond *kaaryam* and *kaaranam*; it is beyond relative existence and relative non-existence. In short, it is beyond all '*vikalpa*' – meaning beyond 'all pairs of opposites'. And, a *mumukshu*, desirous of 'liberation', **has** to gather this '*nirvikalpaka aathma jnaanam*'.

And, when this much was said, another *poorva pakshin* comes and says "But, this *nirvikalpaka aathma jnaanam* **can** be achieved by us, even without *mahaa vaakyam*". He argues: "If you want to get *nirvikalpaka aathma jnaanam* / awareness of an *aathmaa* which is beyond pairs of opposites / good and bad / small and big / healthy and sick / *punyavaan* and *paapavaan* , you can manage it without going to *mahaa vaakyam*. Not only can you 'know' it; you can also directly 'experience' the *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*". And, how? He replies: "Very simple. Go to *sushupthi anubhavaa*, where you experience *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*. And, after all, *Bhagavaan* has blessed every person with instinctive, natural and effortless *sushupthi*".

Of course, in *sushupthi*, *dvaitham naasthi*; *thriputi naasthi*; *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya-vikalapa: naasthi*; *bokthru-boghya-vikalpa: naasthi*; *punya-paapa- vikalpa: naasthi* | In 'deep sleep' state, all these *vikalpa*-s (divisions) are absent and we abide in our *aathma svaroopam*. What type of *aathma svaroopam*? Ans: *Nirvikalpaka aathma svaroopam*. "This being so, why do you require the *mahaa vaakyam*?" is the question of this interesting *poorva pakshin*.

Reverting to the text, the *poorva pakshin* addresses Sureswaraachaaryaa:

- ननु - To object to your conclusion:
- यदि - If,
- भवतः - for you,
- अभीष्टं - the object desired to be known (is)
- व्यावृत्त सदसद्विकल्पजालं वस्तु - the 'aathmaa', transcending all 'divisions' or 'pairs of opposites', like 'sath and asath',

'Sath' stands for 'relative existence' and 'asath' stands for 'relative non-existence'. The use of the term '*vikalpa jaalam*' indicates that '*sadhaasth*' is only one example of the numerous 'pairs of opposites'; and, that, all other pairs such as '*punyam-paapam*', '*bokthaa-boghyam*' etc., should also be included. In fact, it should be extended to '*thriputi-s*' also, such as the '*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi*'. '*Thriputi*' is also a form of '*vikalpa*'. '*Vyaavrutthd*' means 'free from'; what is desired to be known is '*aathmaa* free from all '*vikalpa-s*' / '*nirvikalpa aathma vasthu*'.

- वाक्यात् - from the *mahaa vaakyam*,
- तथापि तु - in that case also,
- वाक्यविषया तृष्णा उत्सार्यते - your desire / keenness for *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is negated (by me).

'*Uthsaryathe*', literally means, 'thrown away' / 'swept aside' / 'brushed aside'.

The *poorva pakshin* wants to tell the *siddhaanthin*: " My view is that you are unnecessarily struggling / grappling with *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, which can cause only intellectual strain, instead of *mokshaa*. You are talking about three stages of analysis – *saamaanaadhikaaranya sambhandha*: , *viseshana-viseshya-bhaava-sambhandha*: and *lakshya-lakshana-bhaava-sambhandha*: | These are all difficult topics to be understood and even if understood, difficult to be remembered. In my opinion, *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is an exercise in futility, when there is an easier method". So, he started with this brief statement: "I negate your theory and I give you an easier option". This is his introduction. Now, he gives his argument. What is the argument and what is the easier method / option that he talks of?

The *poorva pakshin* says:

- यस्मात् - Because,

- वाक्यश्रवणं अन्तरेण अपि - even without engaging in mahaa vaakya Vichaaraa,
- सुषुप्ते - in the state of dreamless sleep,
- निरस्त अशेष विकल्पं वस्तु सिद्धं - an aathmaa, which is devoid of all sorts of 'divisions', is established

'*vasthu*', here, means '*aathmaa*'. '*Nirastha asesha vikalpam*' is adjective to '*vasthu*' and means 'free from all forms of divisions'.

'Savikalpa aathmaa' is there in jaagrath avasthaa. 'Savikalpa aathmaa' is there in svapna avasthaa. Whereas, in sushupthi avasthaa, we are effortlessly abiding as 'nirvikalpa aathmaa'.

The Upanishad-s declare this fact. In the Chaandhogy Upanishad, Sage Uddhaalakaa tells his son Svethakethu: "Yathra ethath purusha: svapeethi naama sathaa soumya thadhaa sampanno bhavathi **svam apeetho bhavathi** | Thasmaath enam svapithi ithyaachakshathe" – "O good-looking one, when a man is spoken of as 'he sleeps', then he becomes merged in Existence; he attains his own Self and that is why he is called 'svapithi' " (VI.8.1). In sushupthi, we are one with Brahman. Prasnopanishad also says the same thing (IV. 1 & IV. 9). Several Upanishad-s say "In sushupthi, we are merged into Brahman". And, therefore, during deep-sleep state, jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa is not there; jeevaathma-jeevathma-bedhaa is not there.

Based on these, the *poorva pakshin* says "*sushupthe nirastha asesha vikalpam vasthu siddham*" – "In deep sleep state, an *aathmaa* which is devoid of all sorts of divisions, is established".

And, obviously, to go to 'deep sleep', one does not require *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi*; one does not require *tharka jnaanam* or *vyaakarana jnaanam* or *meemaamsaa jnaanam*. In the treatise, *Viveka Choodaamani*, a number of qualifications are mandated for venturing into *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*: "*medhaavee purusho vidvaan oohaapohavichakshana: adhikaari aathmaavidhyaayaam ukthalakshana lakshitha*:" (verse 16) – "(the aspirant) should be intelligent and learned, with great powers of comprehension, and able to overcome doubts by the exercise of his reason. One who has these qualifications alone is fit for the knowledge of the *Aathman*".

"Whereas" the *poorva pakshin* claims: "without any of these qualifications, one can get *nirvikalpaka aathma nishtaa* (by going to 'deep sleep' state)". Therefore, who can experience that *nirvikalpaka aathma*, according to the *poorva pakshin*? He answers: "Every

human being, whether literate or illiterate, of any *varnaa* – *Braahmanaa*, *Kshakthriyaa*, *Vaisyaa* or *Soodhraa*". He says:

- आगोपालाविपालपण्डितं - for everyone, whether illiterate or scholarly.

'*gopaala*.' means a 'cowherd boy'; '*avipaala*.' means a 'shepherd boy'; '*aagopaalavipaala*' indicates an 'uneducated' or 'illiterate' person. '*Panditha*.' of course, refers to a scholar.

All persons experience one thing universally. What is that experience? Ans: *sushupthi*. And, in *sushupthi*, *nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu* is *siddham*. *Nirvikalpaka aathma* **is** experienced. The sentence, can be closed here, with the word '*siddham*'.

It is the *poorva pakshin* who is saying all these. The *siddhaanthin*-s have to carefully listen to this line of argument, because, later, the *siddhaanthins*' answer to this argument, is to be extended to *samaadhi* also. Therefore, this discussion on *sushupthi* has to be carefully noted and understood. It *is* important, because many people question the necessity for '*Vedhaantha vichaaraa*' and in its place, prescribe *samaadhi abhyaasaa*. This *poorva pakshin*, in the present portion, is prescribing *sushupthi*, for the 'knowledge' and 'experience' of a '*nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu*'. There is another, stronger school of thought, which prescribes '*samaadhi*' as the *saadhanaa* for achieving '*nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu jnaanam*'. But, the *Advaita siddhanthin*-s say " *Sushupthi* can give neither *aathma ekathva jnaanam* nor *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*" ; and extending the same argument, hold " *samaadhi* also cannot give *aathmaa ekathva jnaanam* and *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*". Therefore, the *Vedhaanthic* student has to carefully study this portion.

The *poorva pakshin* continues:

अतः - Therefore,

वाक्यश्रवणेन न अर्थः - there is no benefit derived from *mahaavaakya sravanam*.

'*Artha*.' means '*prayojanam*' / benefit.

This *poorva pakshin* tells the *Vedhaanthin*: "What you can learn through *vaakya sravanam*, we can know through *sushupthi*". As mentioned earlier, another group says "The knowledge you get through *mahaa vaakya sravanam* can be gathered by us, through *samaadhi*". Both groups hold "Therefore, *mahaa vaakya sravanam* is redundant. It is only an intellectual exercise and a waste of time".

Up to this is the *poorva paksham*. And, what is *Sureswaraachaaryaa*'s answer?

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 58:

नैतदेवम् । किं कारणम् । सर्वानर्थबीजस्यात्मानवबोधस्य सुषुप्ते संभवात् ।

This objection cannot stand to reason. In sleep, there obtains the non-apprehension of the Self, which is the root-cause of all evil.

Sureswaraachaaryaa tells the *poorva pakshin*:

- एतद् एवं न भवति(- What you say is not acceptable in that manner.
- किं कारणम् - Why so?

Sureswaraachaaryaa himself raises this question 'why so?' and answers it. He says:

- सुषुप्ते आत्म अनवबोधस्य संभवात् - Since in the 'deep sleep' state, the 'self-ignorance' persists,

What type of 'self-ignorance'? The *Aachaaryaa* qualifies the 'self-ignorance' by an adjective.

- सर्व अनर्थ बीजस्य - which 'self-ignorance' is the seed / cause for all the problems of *samsaaraa*.

It is true, that, in sushupthi, we are in nirvikalpaka aathma anubhavaa. In sushupthi, there is no jeeva-jeeva-bedhaa; jeeva-Isvara-bedhaa is not there; jeeva-jagath-bedhaa is also not there. 'Pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi' is one type of division. Jeeva-jeeva-bedhaa (difference between one jeevaathmaa and another), jeeva-Isvara-bedhaa (difference between jeevaathmaa and Pramaathmaa) and jeeva-jagath-bedhaa (difference between jeevaathmaa and the world) are other types of division. In sushupthi, we do avoid all these divisions and do get nirvikalpaka-aathma-anubhavaa. But, there is a problem. What is that problem? Sureswaraachaaryaa points out: 'Aathma anavabodhasya sambhava:' – 'persistence of self-ignorance'. Self-ignorance persists in sushupthi. No doubt 'nirvikalapaka aathma anubhavaa' is there in sushupthi; but, along with nirvikalpaka aathma anubhavaa, there is the co-existence of aathmaa ajnaanam. 'Aathma anavabodhaa:' means 'aathma ajnaanam'. During sushupthi, we are very, very happy and comfortable. Then, what happens? We come out of sushupthi and as even as we come out, 'nirvikalpaa' is given up and 'savikalpaa' comes. Jeeva-jeeva-bedhaa comes; jeeva-jagath-bedhaa comes; jeeva-Isvara-bedhaa comes and samsaaraa also successfully comes back. 'Self-ignorance' cannot

be permanently eliminated by going to sushupthi. The self-ignorance which persists / which has not been got rid of, is the seed for all the anarthaa – all problems of samsaaraa.

This is *soothra vaakyam*; hereafter is Sureswaraachaaryaa's *vyaakyaanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 58 :

यदि हि सुषुप्तेऽज्ञानं नाभविष्यदन्तरेणापि वेदान्तवाक्यश्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनान्यहं
ब्रह्मास्मीत्यध्वसायात्सर्वप्राणभृतामपि स्वरसत एव सुषुप्तप्रतिपत्ते :सकलसंसारोच्छित्तिप्रसङ्गः ।

If there were no ignorance in sleep, then it should follow that the experience 'I am Brahman', must occur independent of the hearing of and reflection and meditation on Vedhaanthea; and, the bondage of all creatures must stand destroyed, since all creatures enjoy sleep as a matter of natural law.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "There is no doubt, that, in *sushupthi avasthaa*, I am abiding as *nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu* and I have the experience of the *nirvikalpaka aathmaa* | But, if this *nirvikalpaka aathma anubhavaa* itself is capable of removing ignorance, then that *nirvikalpaka aathma anubhavaa* in *sushupthi* itself, should give me *mokshaa*. That means that I should wake up not as a *samsaari*, but I should wake up as a *muktha*: | But, the situation is, unfortunately, different".

In other words : In *sushupthi*, everybody is abiding as *nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu* and if this abidance can remove ignorance, *sushupthi* should remove ignorance and if *sushupthi* removes ignorance, there must be *mokshaa* for everyone who goes to sleep. But, we know that this does not happen.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

- यदि हि - Suppose,
- सुषुप्ते - in *sushupthi avasthaa* (in which one abides as *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*)
- अज्ञानं न अभविष्यत् - ignorance goes away,

'*Na abhavishyath*' is a grammatical form, conveying situations such as 'could have been' / 'should have been' etc.

The *Aachaaryaa* is talking about a hypothetical situation: " In 'deep sleep' state, when one is abiding as *nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu*, **if** ignorance goes away because of this *nirvikalpaka aathma nishtaa* or *nirvikalpaka aathma anubhavaa* in *sushupthi*," |

What would have happened, if ignorance had disappeared, because of the *nirvikalpaka aathma vasthu nishtaa* of the 'deep sleep' state?

Aachaaryaa says:

- 'अहं ब्रह्म अस्मि' इति अध्यवसायात् - (in that case) because of the rise of the firm knowledge 'I am *Brahman*', (consequent to ignorance 'going away'),

'*adhyavasaaya*' means '*dhruda jnaanam*' or 'firm knowledge'.

- अन्तरेण अपि - even without going through / even without taking resource to
- वेदान्तवाक्यश्रवणमनननिदिध्यासनानि - the '*sravanam* ', '*mananam* ' and '*nidhidhyaasanam*' of the *mahaa vaakyam*,
- सर्व प्राणभृतामपि - for all the living beings,
- स्वरसत : एव सुषुप्तप्रतिपत्ते : - due to the natural / effortless experience of 'deep sleep',

'*svarasatha:*' means 'naturally' / 'effortlessly'; '*sushupthi prathipatthi:*' means 'the experience of the deep sleep state'.

-)स्वरसत : एव (सकल संसार उच्छित्तिप्रसङ्गः - the destruction of *samsaaraa* will naturally and effortlessly result.

The term '*svarasatha: eva*' should be read twice: once, in real sense, in the context of 'deep sleep', which state is a 'natural / effortless' phenomenon for everyone, as '*sarvapraanabhruthaam api svarasatha: eva sushupthi:*'; the second time, in a hypothetical sense, along with '*ucchithi prasangha:*', as *sarvapraanabhruthaam svarasatha: eva samsaara ucchithi:* , i.e. to mean 'destruction of *samsaaraa* 'would have been' a 'natural / effortless' consequence of the deep sleep state'; | '*ucchithi:*' means '*naasa:*' / destruction.

Sureswaraachaaryaa's argument (presentation of the *poorva pakshin's* fallacy-ridden stand) should be followed, step by step:

- You go to *sushupthi*;
- in *sushupthi*, you abide as *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*;
- *nirvikalpaka aathma nishtaa* will remove ignorance;

- 'disappearance of ignorance' means 'acquisition of knowledge';
- therefore, the moment you enter *sushupthi*, you get the clear knowledge '*aham Brahma asmi*'
- And, to whom will this happen? Ans: To all the people, since the experience of *sushupthi* is natural for all living beings.

Therefore, 'destruction of *samsaara*' also happens to everyone, without any effort.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to verse 58:

न च कैवल्यात्पुनरुत्थानं न्याय्यमनिर्मोक्षप्रसङ्गात् ।

From the *mokshaa*, attained in *sushupthi*, arising as a *samsaari* is not logically possible, since the very concept of *mokshaa* will get falsified, if *mokshaa* is temporary.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out the fallacy in the *poorva-pakshin*'s stand: "If a person gets *mokshaa* in *sushupthi*, *samsaara* should not come again at the time of waking, whereas it does". All systems of philosophy are agreed on one aspect, viz., that "*mokshaa* is always final". Any acquired goal, other than *mokshaa*, is subject to loss also. As Lord Krishna points out in the *Bhagavadh Githaa* (IX - 20 & 21), even the attainment of *svargaa* is only finite : "*Thraividhyaa: maam somapaa: poothapaapaa: yagnyai: ishtvaa svargathim praarthayanthe / They punyam aasaadhya surendralokam asnanthi divyaan divi devabogaan / They tham bhukthvaa svargalokam visaalam ksheene punye marthyalokam visanthi*" – " Those people who know the three *Vedaa*-s, who drink the *soma*-juice (in *soma* sacrifice) and who are thus purified of sins, pray for access to the heavens. Reaching the sacred world of *Indra*, they enjoy the celestial pleasures of gods in the heavens. Having enjoyed the vast heavenly world, when their *punyaa* is exhausted, they come back to the world of mortals".

But, *mokshaa*, by definition, is never subject to loss. Therefore, if *sushupthi* gives *mokshaa*, on waking up, the sleeper should never be a *samsaari* again, whereas, he is.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says :

- कैवल्यात् - From the *mokshaa*, attained in *sushupthi*
- पुनरुत्थानं - arising / waking up, as a *samsaari*
- न च न्याय्यं - is not logically possible,

Why not? Ans: Because, if a person considered to have got *mokshaa* during *sushupthi*, wakes up a *samsaari* after *sushupthi*, the very definition of *mokshaa* will be falsified. This is what is said:

- अनिर्मोक्ष प्रसङ्गात् - since the very concept of *mokshaa* will get falsified, as *mokshaa* will become temporary.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to verse 58:

न चान्य एव सुषुप्तोऽन्य एवोत्थित इति शक्यं वक्तुं नाद्राक्षमहं सुषुप्तेऽन्यत्किंचिदपीत्युत्थितस्य प्रत्यभिजादर्शनात् ।

It is also not possible to say that one person goes to sleep and another person wakes up, because, the man who wakes up, recognizes his identity with the subject of sleep, in the experience 'I saw nothing else, while asleep'.

Sureswaraacharya answers a possible question, which the *poorva pakshin* may rise. The *poorva pakshin's* possible question is not given in the text. But, the *Aacharya* is answering a hypothetical position of the *poorva pakshin*.

The *poorva pakshin* may argue: "Everybody in *sushupthi* is going through *nirvikalpaka aathma avasthaanam / nishtaa / anubhavaa*. And, every *jeevaathmaa*, during and through that *anubhavaa*, destroys ignorance and becomes *muktha*: | What happens thereafter, is, that, when that *muktha purusha*:, i.e. that man who becomes *muktha*: in *sushupthi*, wakes up, it is not the same *jeevaa*, who went to sleep, that is waking up. It is another *samsaari*, who is waking up". This is a funny and foolish argument. Sureswaraacharya, probably, wants to have some fun also while discussing the serious *Naishkarmya Siddhi* topics, and, probably, therefore, presents such an argument by a *poorva pakshin*.

To repeat the possible argument of the *poorva pakshin*: "Everybody who enters into *sushupthi* becomes liberated; and, then, who comes back from *sushupthi*, is not the same person, but another person. Why cannot you say so?"

Sureswaraacharya answers : "That is also not possible, because the one who comes out of *sushupthi*, clearly says 'I slept like a log of wood and now I have woken up'. In other words, there is *prathyabhignya* of *soham*".

The term '*soham prathyabhignya*' means 'recognition of the identity of the past 'I' in *sushupthi* and the present 'I' in *jaagrath*'. In this context, it is worth recollecting the use of this term, in the 6th verse of *Sri Dakshinamooorthy Sthothram* of *Sankara Bhagavdh*

Paadhaa. The relevant portion is "*Praag asvaapsam ithi prabodha samaye ya: prathyabhignyaayathe*" – "He, Who on waking up, **remembers** to have slept well".

"Therefore" the *Aachaaryaa* continues "you cannot say *sushupthi* has given liberation to the sleeper and the *waker* is a different entity. The *prathyabhignyaa* disproves your stand".

Reverting to the text: The *Aachaaryaa* tells the *poorva pakshin*,

- न च वक्तुं शक्यं - You cannot also give the argument,
- "अन्य एव सुषुप्तः अन्य एव उत्थितः" इति - that "the one who went to sleep is different and the one who woke up is different",

The word '*sushuptha*:' means 'the sleeper', and, in this context, 'sleep' refers to 'dreamless sleep', because, only in dreamless sleep, the sleeper is in *nirvikalpaka aathma nishtaa*.

According to this assumed *poorva pakshaa*, the one who went to 'deep, dreamless sleep' got *mukthi* / liberation and the one who wakes up from the 'deep sleep' state is a different *samsaari*. In other words, the one who went to sleep and the one who woke up are different. This is the statement of the *poorva pakshi*.

And, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that the *poorva pakshin* cannot make such a statement. Why not? The *Aachaaryaa* explains:

- प्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनात् - because of the experience of *prathyabhignyaa*,

'*Prathyabhignyaa*' means 'recognition of the equation of the past 'I' and the present 'I''. Whenever there is 'recognition', there is an equation of past and present. This is, in fact, indicated by the very English word 'recognition'. When an object is seen the first time, it is 'cognized' and when it is seen subsequently, it is 're-cognized'.

- उत्थितस्य वचनेन (- (because of the statement) of the person who wakes up,
- "अहं सुषुप्ते अन्यत् किञ्चित् अपि न अद्राक्षं" इति - viz., that "In deep sleep, I did not experience anything".

'na adhraaksham' means 'na dharsanam kruthavaan' / 'did not experience'.

When a person wakes up from 'deep sleep' state and says "I had a sound sleep, during which I did not experience anything", through this statement, he is equating the waking 'I'

and the sleeping 'I', indicating that both are one and the same. In other words, the statement "I did not experience anything at the time of *sushupthi*" means "I was there in *sushupthi* and now the same I have woken up". This proves that the 'sleeper' and the 'one who has woken up' are one and the same. Therefore, what is the conclusion?

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to verse 58:

तस्मादवश्यं सुषुप्तेऽज्ञानमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् ।

Therefore, the existence of ignorance in sleep must be necessarily admitted.

- तस्मात् - Therefore,
- सुषुप्ते - in *sushupthi* avsthaa,
- अज्ञानं - the existence of *ajnaanam*
- अवश्यं अभ्युपगन्तव्यम् - should be definitely accepted.

A person is *nirvikalpaka aathma nishta*: in *sushupthi*; he is in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* alright; his *anubhavaa* is *nirvikalpaka anubhavaa* alright; but, that *nirvikalpaka anubhavaa* does not remove ignorance. Ignorance continues in *sushupthi*. That is the reason, that, while waking up, he does not wake up as a *muktha purusha*:, but, only as a *samsaari purusha*: /

We have to extend this law to the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* practiced through *Yoga*. Consider the case of a a person who (i) has mastered the *yama-niyama-aasana-praanayama-prathyaaharaa-dharana-dhyanaa-samaadhi ashtaanghaa* of *Yoga saasthraa*, (ii) has also successfully done *savikalpka* and *nirvikalpaka samaddhi abhyassa* and (iii) is able to go to *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* effortlessly, suspending all thoughts, removing *thriputi* and the world, but refuses to study *Vedhaanthee* and to do *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

If the questions "Can this *nirvikalpaka samaadhi anubhavaa* - which means *nirvikalpaka aathma nishta* in the state of wakeful *samaadhi* - **not** in deep-sleep state, give *aathma jnaanam* to such a person? Can that *anubhavaa* give him *aathma ekathva jnaanam* and *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*? Can that *anubhavaa* educate him that *aathmaa* is *eka*: and everything else is *anaathmaa* and *mithyaa*?" are raised, the answer can only be "No, *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* can never give him *aathma visesha jnaanam* / *aathma ekathva jnaanam* nor *anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam*, since without *mahaa vaakyam*, the *Yoga aspirant* has no *pramaanam* to give him that knowledge". The *nirvikalpaka aathmaa* also cannot tell him that *aathmaa* is *eka*: and the entire *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*. It cannot / does not whisper into his ears "I, the *nirvikalpaka aathmaa* is *eka*: and not only am 'I' the only one, the entire universe is *mithyaa*".

What is the proof? Ans: Because, in the *yoga saasthraa*, they talk about *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* and *svaroope avasthaanam*. But, after going through *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, their conclusion is that, there are many *aathmaa*-s. *Samaadhi* did not give them the knowledge of *aathma ekathvam*. And, it never gave them the knowledge of *anaathma mithyaathvam* also.

Samaadhi cannot give aathma ekathva jnaanam and anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam. To achieve the aathma ekathva jnaanam and anaathma mithyaathva jnaanam, study of Vedhaanthaa / mahaa vaakya vichaaraa is a 'must'.

PLEASE NOTE

The above class notes have been typed out by Shri Viswanathan of Chennai. However, he could not proceed after class No.165; therefore the classnotes of Naishkarmya Siddhi is not complete.

Swamiji has however explained the whole of Naishkarma Siddhi in 251 classes.

As and when it is possible for someone to transcribe the rest of the audio lectures of Swamiji, the same will be posted in this site.

Visit website www.arshaavinash.in

To download the following

Books On Pujya Swamiji

Biography of Swami Dayananda Saraswati in English, Hindi and Tamil

Books in English On Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Yoga, Gita, Upanisads, Brahma Sutra and Vedanta Texts

Books in Tamil on Vedanta

Books on Indian culture, Upanisads and Vedanta Texts

Books on Sanskrit Grammar

Books on Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi and Sanskrit Grammar for Vedanta Students

Books on Sanskrit Texts

Text Books in Sanskrit on Gita, Upanisads and Brahma Sutra with Sankara Bhasyam

Books on Indian Culture

Books in English on Yoga and Indian Culture

Books for Youth

Books in English on Yoga, Indian Culture & Self improvement

Books on Holy Chant

Books in English and Sanskrit on Holy Chant

Articles

Articles in English on Indian culture & Vedanta Texts

PARTICIPATE IN ONLINE QUIZ

Online Quiz on Gita, Upanisad and Brahma Sutra

Website of:



Arsha Avinash Foundation

104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, INDIA

Phone: + 91 9487373635

E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com

www.arshaavinash.in

166. Chapter III, Verses 58 (19-12-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa pointed out that anvaya vyathirekhaa reasoning is very important and very useful for thvam padha lakshyaartha jnaanam, otherwise called saakshi jnaanam, otherwise called aathma saamanya jnaanam. "But", he also pointed out "this aathma saamanya jnaanam is not at all sufficient for liberation". After gaining this aathma saamanya jnaanam, one has to necessarily go for mahaa vaakya vichaaraa, which alone gives aathma visesha jnaanam / aathma ekathva jnaanam / aathma advaita jnaanam, which alone is the 'liberating' knowledge. Thus, the necessity of employing mahaa vaakyam, after using anvaya vyathirekhaa is being highlighted by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

But, different objections are raised by different *poorva pakshin-s*, to Sureswaraachaaryaa's viewpoint. There are people who argue "Why should *mahaa vaakyam* be employed at all? Why cannot we manage to get the *aathma jnaanam* by the use of 'reasoning' itself?"

In this paragraph under study, another *poorva pakshin* is voicing an objection to *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, in another manner. This topic was introduced in the earlier session. This *poorva pakshin* asks: "After all, our aim is to gain the knowledge of division-less *aathmaa / vikalpa rahitha aathmaa / nirvikalpaka aathmaa*. Why should we go to *mahaa vaakyam* for this purpose? *Bhagavaan* Himself has provided us with a *nirvikalpaka* state, a state devoid of any division, namely, *sushupthi*, wherein, in fact, we even *experience* a *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*. That being so, are we not gaining *nirvikalpaka aathma jnaanam*, in that division-less state, called *sushupthi*? Since the *nirvikalpaka aathmaa* can thus be known through *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* of *sushupthi*, why do we require *mahaa vaakyam*?"

To this objection, Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving his answer. He says: "No doubt, *sushupthi* is a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*; but, in that *avasthaa*, no knowledge is possible. Knowledge is not possible, because, in *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, *thriputi* is resolved, which means there is no *pramaathaa* and there is no *pramaanam*. What knowledge can a person gain, in the absence of *pramaanam*? Therefore, *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* is not a state of knowledge; it is a state of ignorance only. When no knowledge at all is possible, where is the question of achieving *aathma visesha jnaanam*? I will show

that your stand is fallacious, by another fact also. If, as you claim, the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* of *sushupthi* is a state of *nirvikalpaka aathma jnaanam*, then everyone who enters *sushupthi* will become a *jnaani* and since everyone naturally gets into the state of *sushupthi*, everyone will also naturally ('*svarasatha: eva*') get *aathma jnaanam* and will come out of *sushupthi*, as a liberated person. Does this happen?"

(In a lighter vein, Swamiji adds: "If this were to happen, how wonderful it would be? In that case, every *aachaaryaa* need provide only an ideal condition for *sushupthi*. In fact, you may argue, that the study of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* itself provides the condition.")

Thus, Sureswaraachaaryaa's contention is, that, the *nirvikalpaka sushupthi avasthaa* is *ajnaana avasthaa* only.

As an extension of the above objection, another question, which is also very important, can arise: "I concede, that, *sushupthi*, as a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* may be a state of ignorance. But, what about *samaadhi* as a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*? The *Yoga saasthraa* of the revered Sage *Pathanjali* talks about *nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa*. Why cannot you take that *avasthaa*, as a state of knowledge?"

For this question also, *Advaithin-s* have the same answer only: " It is true, that, *nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa* is also a division-less state, which is *deliberately* entered into, by the *Yoga* practitioners, in contrast to *nirvikalpaka sushupthi avasthaa*, which is a *naturally* attained state. But, whether one 'naturally' enters *nirvikalpaka sushupthi avasthaa* or whether one 'deliberately' enters *nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa*, as far as 'knowledge' is concerned, it does not make a difference. What does '*nirvikalpaka avasthaa*' mean? It means a 'division-less state', which, in turn, means that there is no *pramaathaa* and more importantly, there is no *pramaanam*. When there is no *pramaanam*, how can there be any knowledge? In fact, when even available knowledge will be resolved during the *nirvikalpaka avasthaa*, where is the question of any new knowledge arising? Therefore, our firm opinion is, that, *nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa* also is a state of *ajnaanam* only".

The *poorva pakshin* persists: "But in the *yoga saasthraa*, when they talk about *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, they do talk about it, as a state of awareness and wisdom. The *yoga* philosophers say '*thadhaa dhrashtu: svaroope avasthaanam*' meaning 'at the time of *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, after practicing *Yogaa* and after dissolving all the

vrutthi-s (*Yoga: chittha vrutthi norodha:*) the *Yoga* aspirant is abiding in *aathma svaroopaa*. *Yoga Saasthraa* does not stop with this statement. The *Saasthraa* further claims, by another powerful *soothraa*, that the state of *samaadhi* is a state of wisdom. That relevant powerful *soothraa* runs '*rhuthambharaa thathra pragnyaa*' – meaning 'there, i.e., in that state of *samaadhi*, a wisdom which is latent with / which is saturated with 'truth', is attained".

The word '*rhuthum*' (ऋतं) means 'truth' or '*sathyam*' | '*Rhuthambharaa pragnyaa*' means '*sathya vishaya yuktha pragnyaa*' or '*sathya vishaya jnaanam*', meaning 'a wisdom latent with 'truth' '.

Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* asks the *Advaithin*: "Thus, *yoga soothraa* clearly says that, in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, the knowledge of 'truth' is there; that, *samaadhi* is a state of the knowledge of 'truth'. What do you say to this?"

What is the *Advaithin's* response? He will, in return, ask a question of the *poorva pakshin* / *Yoga* aspirant "If, in the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, you have attained the knowledge of the 'truth', tell me what is that 'truth', which you have attained?"

In the opinion of the *Advaithin*, if the *yogic* practitioner has really attained knowledge of the 'truth', he must reply "I have attained the knowledge that *Advaitham* is *sathyam*". But, this *yoga* expert, after going through *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* and claiming that he has got the knowledge of the 'truth', when asked "What is the 'truth'?" does not give this reply. Instead, like a layman, he continues to believe in *jeevaathma-jeevaathma-bedhaa*, *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa* and also *aathma-anaathma-bedhaa*.

What does this prove? **Ans:** It only shows that, if at all the *nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa* had produced any knowledge, it has endowed the *samaadhi* practitioner with '*aathma dvaitha jnaanam*' only.

The *Advaithin's* opinion is that a *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* cannot give any knowledge whatsoever. But, even if it is accepted for argument's sake, (as *abhyupethya vaadhaa*) that *nirvikalpaka avasthaa* produces some knowledge, it does not give *advaitha jnaanam*; it does not give *abedha jnaanam*; it gives only *bedha* / *dvaitha*

aathma jnaanam. It should be noted, that, even this acceptance of some kind of knowledge in *samaadhi*, is only a concession to the *yoga* practitioner.

The *Yogi* may have *aathma saamaanya jnaanam*. But, he does not have *aathma visesha / ekathva jnaanam*. He does not know that *aathmaa* is *eka*: / He thinks and says that there are many, many *aathmaa*-s. More importantly, he also does not know that *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*.

Thus, the *Advatha Vedhaanthin's* contention, is that, *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* can never give *aathma visesha jnaanam* and, that, it is a state of ignorance only. The *Advatha Vedhaanthin* qualifies '*samaadhi*' as '*andha samaadhi*'. The adjective '*andha*' literally means 'blind' and implies 'ignorance'. The *Advatha Vedhaanthin*, thus, holds *samaadhi* as a 'state of ignorance'. **Even** if it is conceded to be a state of awareness, the resulting 'awareness' can only be *aathma saamaanya jnaanam*.

And, what should the aspirant do for *aathma visesha jnaanam*? **Ans:** (In a lighter vein). As a first step, he should get up from *samaadhi*. (Seriously) He should resort to *Vedhaantha / mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

Swami Dayanandhaa says "Some *Vedhaanthic* students try to listen to *Vedhanthaa* class, in meditation. But, *Vedhaantha* is not to be listened to, in meditation. It should be listened to, in *mahaa jaagrath avasthaa*, when the mind is fully awake and alert". The aspirant can, of course, use *samaadhi* for *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*, *chittha ekaagrathaa* and also for *chittha saanthi*. But, *samaadhi* will not help in acquiring *aathma visesha jnaanam*, for which purpose, the aspirant **has** to do *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, naturally, in *jaagrath avasthaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa consistently gives enormous importance to *mahaa vaakyam*, pointing out that neither *tharkaa* (reasoning) nor *samaadhi* can give *aathma visesha jnaanam* and, that, *mahaa vaakyaa alone* can.

Another important note, at this juncture: As is known, *Advaitha aachaaryaa*-s advise, that, after *mahaa vaakya sravanam* and after gaining *visesha jnaanam*, the aspirant is to practice *nidhidhyaasanam* meditation. The student may get confused by this statement, assuming that the recommended meditation is the same as *yogic samaadhi*. But, he should carefully note, that, it is not. This *nidhidhyaasanam* meditation is not the same as the *yogic* meditation of *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. In

nirvikalpaka samaadhi all *vrutthi*-s are removed. In *Vedhaanthic* meditation, the aspirant does not remove *vrutthi*. In other words, *Vedhaanthic Nidhidhyaasanam* is not a thoughtless state. *Vedhaanthic* meditation is a state of invoking *advaita aathma jnaana vrutthi*. The aspirant practices "*chidhaanandha roopa: sivo ham sivo ham*" *vrutthi*.

And, if the question "Is *visesha jnaanam* there, in *Vedhaanthic nidhidhyaasanam*?" is asked, the answer will be "Yes. In *Vedhaanthic nidhidhyaasanam*, which is not a thoughtless state, '*rhithambaraa prangnyaa*' can be accepted".

This is because, in that meditation, the aspirant is not remaining in 'silence of the mind'; he is not removing all the thoughts; he is invoking *advaita aathma jnaana vrutthi*: and therefore, it is not *ajnaana* state. *Vedhaanthic* meditation is a state of knowledge only, as different from *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. *Vedhaanthic* meditation involves *jnaana vrutthi*.

Then the last important note: When it is said that *Vedhaanthic* meditation is associated with *jnaana vrutthi* / *advaita jnaana vrutthi* / *aathma visesha jnaana vrutthi*, another question may be asked: "What generates that *jnaana vrutthi* in the *Vedhaanthic* meditation?" The answer will be: "That *jnaana vrutthi* in *Vedhaanthic* meditation is **not** generated by or in the meditation. It has been already generated through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. That *jnaana vrutthi* which the aspirant acquired earlier during *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is only 'invoked' by him during meditation"

To repeat: When a *Vedhaanthin* is meditating, he has got *jnaanam* but the *jnaanam* is not generated in the meditation; the *jnaanam* has been generated during the earlier *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, through the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*. The *jnaana vrutthi* of the aspirant, during meditation, is a re-collected *jnaana vrutthi*; not generated *jnaana vrutthi*. This distinction should be understood properly.

To sum up, meditation does not generate *jnaanam*, whether it is *Yogic* meditation or *Vedhaanthic* meditation. In *Yogic* meditation, *jnaanam* is never there. In *Vedhaanthic* meditation *jnaanam* *is* there, *jnaanam* not generated during meditation, but, which has been collected during *sravanam*. It is 'recollected' *jnaanam*.

When the aspirant invokes "*mano buddhyahamkaara chitthani na aham*", he has already heard it from his *guru* during *sravanam*; *sravanam* 're_lived' is *vedhaanthic nidhidhyaasnam* . It is not a thoughtless state.

In *Vedhaanthic* meditation, *jnaanam* is there; but in *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, or in *sushupthi*, *jnaanam* is not there. Both are replete only with *ajnaanam*. Reverting to the text:

ॐ तस्मात् - therefore,

ॐ सुषुप्ते - in the state of 'sushupthi',

ॐ अज्ञानं - the presence of ignorance

ॐ अवश्यं उपगन्तव्यम्- should certainly be accepted.

This is true about *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi* also.

What is the 'ignorance' talked about? **Ans:** '*Aathma visesha jnaana abhaava:*'| And, to remove that ignorance, the aspirant should resort to *mahaa vaakyam*. This is the stand of Sureswaraacharya, all through these discussions.

(In a lighter vein : Just as in the modern election campaigns, the speakers conclude their election addresses with the fervent appeal "Vote for our candidate", Sureswaraacharya's bottom line is "Vote for *mahaa vaakyam*. Do not vote for *samaadhi* for knowledge. Do not get confused". This is the election campaign of Sureswaraacharya, for the *mahaa vaakyam* candidate).

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 58:

ननु यदि तत्र अज्ञानं अभविष्यत् राग द्वेष घटाज्ञानादिवत् प्रत्यक्षम् अभविष्यत् यथा इह लोके "घटं न जानामि " इति अज्ञानं अव्यवहितं प्रत्यक्षम् । अत्रोच्यते । न अभिव्यञ्जक अभावात्। कथं अभिव्यञ्जक अभावइति चेच्छृणु । :

"But" it may be argued "if there were ignorance in sleep, it should have been a matter of perception like the ignorance of desire, hatred and things like a jar in waking life. In ordinary experience, ignorance of the form 'I do not know the jar' is a case of immediate perception". To this, we reply that, there is no perception of ignorance in sleep itself, because, the conditions needed for manifesting perceptual experience are absent in sleep. If you ask how the conditions are absent then, we give the following explanation.

ॐ ननु - But,

'*Nanu*' means 'an objection'. In the Indian Parliament, it has become the practice of the opposition party, to create obstacles to the ruling party, in the conduct of the business of the House. In a similar manner, the *poorva pakshin* does not allow the *Aachaaryaa* to proceed further. He starts his objection with the word '*nanu*'.

Before we commence to elaborate on the *poorva pakshin's* objection, it should be noted, that, when the term '*ajnaanam*' is used, it should be understood, in this context, as '*aathma visesha ajnaanam*' / '*advaita ajnaanam*' / 'Ignorance of *advaitam*'.

To proceed with the *poorva pakshin's* question: "You say that, in *sushupthi*, *jnaanam* is not present; *ajnaanam* is present. If *advaita ajnaanam* is there, in *sushupthi* or in *yogic samaadhi*, how come, I am not able to clearly know the presence of that ignorance? How come, I do not clearly experience that *ajnaanam*? I should be saying, 'in *sushupthi*, I am experiencing ignorance'. Why cannot I say that? After all, *aathmaa* is there, in *sushupthi* also, to reveal the *ajnaanam*. How, then, do I not clearly and directly experience and also claim that I have *ajnaana anubhava*? In *jaagrath avasthaa*, when I have got ignorance of anything, I am able to clearly know that ignorance. Not only do I know and experience the ignorance, I directly express my 'ignorance' also. If somebody asks me whether I am aware of something of which I do not have any knowledge, I am able to admit, very clearly, 'No, I am ignorant of that'. There are many types of ignorance, which I have in *jaagrath avasthaa*. The ignorance is directly experienced by *saakshi*. Ignorance is *saakshi prathyaksham*. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, *saakshi* directly experiences *ghata ajnaanam* / *pata ajnaanam* etc. Not only do I experience the ignorance, I can directly express it also. For instance, if I do not know the language of Chinese, when someone asks me 'Do you know Chinese?', I am able to reply: 'No, I do not know Chinese'. Similarly, when I am walking on the street, if somebody asks 'Where is the house of such and such person?', and I do not know the house, I reply 'I do not know'. Whereas, in *sushupthi*, when *saakshi* is there, and *advaita ajnaanam* is there, how come I do not clearly experience that *ajnaanam* and also do not declare 'I do not know?' "

Proceeding with the text,

ॐ यदि अज्ञानं अभविष्यत् - if ajnaanam were there,

'*Abhavishyath*' (as discussed already, in an earlier session) is a special usage in Sanskrit grammar, indicating a 'conditional class' or a 'hypothetical situation'. According to the *poorva pakshin*, in *sushupthi* and *samaadhi avasthaa*-s, *ajnaanam* is not there. Therefore, he starts his question with this conditional class, '*if ajnaanam* were there'.

ॐ तत्र in 'sushupthiavasthaa' (and 'yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi avsthaa')

Though Sureswaraachaaryaa does not include the *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi avasthaa*, the word '*thathra*', can be taken to mean '*yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi avsthaayaam*' also.

ॐ प्रत्यक्षम् अभविश्यत् - it (that *ajnaanam*) should be a matter of perception,

The *poorva pakshin* again uses the special word '*abhavishyath*', to indicate a hypothetical possibility 'I should have directly known that *aathma ajnaanam*'. His contention is that *if aathma ajnaanam* is there in *sushupthi avasthaa*, as held by the *Vedhaanthin*, the person in 'deep sleep', should be directly aware of that ignorance.

To support his contention, he gives an example:

ॐ राग द्वेष घट अज्ञानादिवत् - similar to emotions such as attachment or hatred or ignorance of things like a jar,

ॐ राग द्वेष घट अज्ञानादिवत्

He explains the example.

ॐ यथा इफ़ लोके - as in the world , during the jaagrath avasthaa

ॐ अज्ञानं अव्यवहितं प्रच्यक्षम् - ignorance is a matter of direct / immediate perception
'*avyavahitham*' means 'direct' or 'immediate'.

ॐ “घटं न जानामि” इति - in the form of 'I do not know the pot' etc.

The *poorva pakshin* asks: "In *jaagrath avasthaa*, when I have attachment or hatred or when I have ignorance of various objects in the world, they are all '*saakshi prathyaksham*', different from '*indriya prathyaksham*'. The external world is *indriya prathyaksham*. The internal world is *saakshi prathyaksham*. The internal *raaghaa* is *saakshi prathyaksham*, in *jaagrath avasthaa*. The internal *dveshaa* is *saakshi prathyaksham*, in *jaagrath avasthaa*. The internal *ghata ajnaanam*, *pata ajnaanam* etc., are *saakshi prathyaksham* in *jaagrath avasthaa*. Why is *aathma ajnaanam* in *sushupthi*, not *saakshi prathyaksham*, in a similar manner? *Sushupthi avasthaayaam*, *aathma ajnaanam saakshi prathyakshathaayaa katham na anubhootham*? How come it is not directly experienced? In *jaagrath avasthaa*, I am also able to admit to my 'ignorance' on many things. In *sushupthi avasthaa*, why do I not say 'I don't know *aathmaa*', in the same manner? How come a person in 'deep sleep', does not know and does not declare his ignorance?"

Up to this is the *poorva pakshaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "I will tell you; listen to me".

ॐ अत्र - With regard to this question,

ॐ उच्यते - the answer is being given.

What is the answer?

ॐ न - There is no perception of ignorance (in *sushupthi*),

ॐ अभिव्यञ्जक अभावात् - because of the absence of the conditions needed for perceptual experience / because there is no medium available for manifestation of the ignorance.

What is the idea conveyed? This is a very important, subtle and technical idea, requiring a detailed explanation, which is given below:

There are certain things in the creation, which can be experienced directly, because of their very existence. But, there are certain other things, which cannot be experienced directly based on their mere existence, as they are of very subtle nature. Such subtle entities require a manifesting medium. Only in the presence of the medium, they will become manifest or available for experience. Their *existence*

does not require a medium. But, their '*availability for experience*' requires a medium.

An illustration for this fact, 'sunlight', has been discussed in earlier sessions, in different contexts. The sunlight may be spread over an entire hall; but, even though the light exists all over and the light is existent by itself, it is not 'experienced' all over. Because of its subtle nature, its very existence is lost sight of. 'Experience' of the sunlight requires a medium, for instance, the 'stretched palm of a hand', i.e., a palm, which is put out. When the palm is not there, the sunlight is not noticed; but, when the palm is stretched out in the light, the palm becomes the medium for turning the 'non-experienced' sunlight to 'experienced' sunlight. This shows that the 'existent' sunlight depends on a medium for its 'experience'. The hand depends upon sunlight for its 'illumination'. In turn, the sunlight also depends on the hand for its manifestation or for its 'availability for experience'. Therefore, there is a mutual dependence between the hand and the sunlight. Light is 'experienced' because of the hand; hand is 'experienced' because of the light. Each one is experienced because of the other. But their methods of mutual help are different. Sunlight helps the hand as an 'illuminator'. In Sanskrit, it is called *prakaasakam*. The hand helps the sunlight, not as an 'illuminator', but, as a 'manifesting medium'. In Sanskrit, it is called *abhivyanjakam*. Sunlight helps the hand as *prakaasakam*. Hand helps the sunlight as the *abhivyanjakam*. *Prakaasakam* depends on *abhivyanjakam* and *abhivyanjakam* depends on *prakaasakam*, for both of them to be experienced. If any one of them is not available, neither of them can be experienced.

'Sunlight' is only an example; this is true of Consciousness also. 'Consciousness' and 'matter' are dependent on each other for their 'availability for experience'. Consciousness 'illuminates' the matter, i.e., the 'matter' is 'experienced' because of Consciousness. Consciousness helps matter as *prakaasakam*, as a revealer or illuminator. In turn, matter also helps Consciousness, as *abhivyanjakam*. If body-matter or mind-matter is absent (*abhivyanjaka abhaave*), though Consciousness continues to exist, it cannot be experienced in the form "'I' am".

To consolidate: Consciousness depends on matter and matter depends on Consciousness for their 'availability for experience'. They are mutually dependent, but, in two different ways – one (viz., matter) requires *prakaasakam* and the other (viz., Consciousness) requires *abhivyanjakam*.

This fact is eloquently presented in Chapter VI, of the *Prasnopanishad*. The *Upanishad* says, that, before creation, *aathmaa* made a *samkalpaa*. What is that *samkalpaa*? **Ans:** "If I have to do *vyavahaaraa* in the world, in the forms, 'I am *aathmaa* / 'I am *Brahman* / 'I am *saakshi* etc., I require body, mind, *praanaa* etc." "Therefore" the *Upanishad* declares "*sa: praanam asrujatha praanaath shraddhaam kham vaayurjyothiraapa: pruthiveendriyam mana: | annam annadveeryam thapo manthraaa: karma lokaa lokeshu cha naama cha*" (VI.4) – meaning " Therefore, He (*Purushaa*) created *praanaa*; from *praanaa*, he created faith, space, air, fire, water, earth, organs, mind, food; from food, He created vigour, self-control, *manthraa-s*, rites, word and name in the worlds"| The *Upanishad* uses the term '*shodasa kalaa purusha:*' – 'a *Purushaa*, in whom originate sixteen digits or limbs'. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* writes an elaborate *Bhaashyaa* for this portion.

All these show that there are many 'pairs', which are mutually dependent as *prakaasakam* and *abhivyanjakam*. The first example quoted above (for the pair) is "sunlight and object". 'Sunlight' is *prakaasakam* or 'revealer'; and 'object' is *abhivyanjakam*, called in English, as 'medium'. In the example, 'sunlight' and 'object' have '*prakaasaka-abhivyanjaka-sambhandha:*' or 'revealer-medium-relationship'.

In the same manner, 'Consciousness' and 'mind' (or '*anaathmaa*', in general) have got '*prakaasaka-abhivyanjaka-sambhandha:*'|

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces a third similar pair. What is that? **Ans:** '*Ajnaanam*' and 'mind'. He says, that, they also have got that connection.

In *sushupthi avasthaa*, 'pure ignorance', called '*moolaavidhyaa*' exists; but it is not manifest. (It may be recollected that the term '*moolaavidhyaa*' was studied in great detail, in the introduction to this chapter).

In *sushupthi*, *moolaavidhyaa* does exist; but to 'experience' that *moolaavidhyaa* and to express that *moolaavidhyaa*, in the form "I do not know", an *abhivyanjakam* / medium is required.

And, what is the *abhivyanjakam*? **Ans:** Mind is that *abhivyanjakam*.

But, it should be carefully noted, that, in the context of the pair '*moolaavidhyaa*' and 'mind', we **do not say** that '*moolaavidhyaa*' is *prakaasakam* and 'mind' is '*abhivyanjakam*', as we did in the two examples given above. We only say, that, '*moolaavidhyaa*' is '*abhivyaktham*' when the mind is there and that, '*moolaavidhyaa*' is '*avyaktham*', in the absence of the mind. To repeat: When the mind is not there, *moolaavidhyaa* is *avyaktham*; when the mind is there, *moolaavidhyaa* is *abhivyaktham*. ('*Abhivyaktham*' means 'available for experience' or 'manifest'. '*Avyaktham*' means 'not available for experience' or 'not manifest').

It follows, therefore, that, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, because the mind (the *abhivyanjaka* medium) is available, one can admit "I do not know the fact '*Aham Brahma asmi*". When such a statement is made, the '*moolaavidhyaa*' is '*abhivyaktha moolaavidhyaa*' i.e., 'manifest ignorance'.

In contrast, the '*moolaavidhyaa*' in *sushupthi*, is '*avyaktha moolaavidhyaa*', or 'non-manifested ignorance'. This is because of the absence of the mind, in *sushupthi*. Even though *saakshi* is present in *sushupthi*, *saakshi*, by itself, is incapable of converting *avyaktha moolaavidhyaa* into *abhivyaktha moolaavidhyaa*. In other words, in *sushupthi*, *saakshi* is there; *moolaavidhyaa* is there; and, still, *moolaavidhyaa* continues to be *avyaktha moolaavidhyaa*. For *moolaavidhyaa* to become *abhivyaktham*, mind is **also** required, in addition to *saakshi*. *Saakshi*, only **along** with the **mind medium**, can 'manifest' *moolaavidhyaa*. The mind being absent in *sushupthi*, though *moolaavidhyaa* **is** there, the person in *sushupthi* does not know that he suffers from *moolaavidhyaa*.

This is true of '*yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi*' also. In *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi* also, *moolaavidhyaa* **is** there. Even if an aspirant sits in *samaadhi*, for a length of time, when he gets up from *samaadhi*, he will not / cannot claim "*aham brahma asmi*" | Why not? **Ans:** Because *moolaavidhyaa* is there, in *yogic samaadhi* also.

Whereas, when the aspirant operates *mahaa vaakyam*, he attacks the *moolaavidhyaa* directly and gets rid of it.

Sureswaraacharya implies all the above details, when he succinctly gives the reason as '*abhivyanjaka abhaavaath*', meaning 'since there is no manifesting medium for manifesting *moolaavidhyaa*'. This brief reply '*Abivyanjaka abhaavaath*'

should be understood as '*moolaavidhyaa abhivyanjaka antha: karana abhaavaath*'.
When? **Ans:** *Sushupthi avsthaayaam* / in '*sushupthi*' state.

Proceeding:

कथं अभिव्यञ्जक अभावः" - "How do you say that *abhivyanjaka* is not there?"

This may be taken as the next question by the *poorva pakshin* or as a preemptive question by the *Aachaaryaa*.

If it is assumed as the *poorva pakshin's* question, how do we understand his mind?
Ans: He thinks: "In *sushupthi*, *saakshi* is there. And, *saakshi* is a 'revealer'. Admitting that *moolaavidhyaa* is there in *sushupthi*, as the *Vedhaanthin* claims, I should clearly know and also say, "I do not know *Brahman*" because of the 'revealer' *saakshi*. But, I am not able to." This is the *poorva pakshin's* doubt.

The *Aachaaryaa* replies:

इति चेत् श्रुणु - If you are raising such a question, then, listen to me.

The *Aachaaryaa's* answer follows in the verse.

167. Chapter III, Verses 58 and 59 (26-12-2009)

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to point out that we have to first arrive at the *saakshi* with the help of *anvaya vyathirekhaa* reasoning and after arriving at the *saakshi*, we have to use the *mahaa vaakyam*, to gain *saakshi brahma eikyam*, which is the liberating knowledge. We can arrive at the *saakshi* without *mahaa vaakyam*; but we can never know the *saakshi advaitham*, without *mahaa vaakyam*. That knowledge has to be gained through *mahaa vaakyam* only.

At this juncture, different *poorva pakshin*-s are raising objections, to this viewpoint of Sureswaraachaaryaa. They argue that *mahaa vaakyam* is not a compulsory necessity for acquisition of *saakshi svaroopaa jnaanam*; that, even without going through *mahaa vaakyam*, using other means, it is possible to get the *saakshi svaroopaa jnaanam* and the consequent liberation.

One set of *poorva pakshin*-s talk about the experience of *sushupthi*. In *sushupthi*, *saakshi* alone is present as the *advaitam*, because all the *dvaitham*-s and *thriputi*-s are resolved in *sushupthi*. *Nirvikalpaka advaita saakshi* is available in *sushupthi*. "Therefore" this *poorva pakshin* says "It must be possible for a person to get the *saakshi svaroopaa jnaanam* or *saakshi advaita jnaanam* by going to *sushupthi*. And, for such people, the *mahaa vaakya* will not be required".

An identical argument is presented by another *poorva pakshin*, favouring *samaadhi avasthaa*, instead of *sushupthi avasthaa*.

When these arguments are presented by the *poorva pakshin*-s, Sureswaraachaaryaa replies: "No doubt when *dvaitham* and *thriputi* are resolved, there is only *advaita* or *nirvikalpaka saakshi*; but, even so, the *saakshi svaroopaa jnaanam* will not take place in *sushupthi* or *samaadhi*, because, there is no *pramaanam* in *sushupthi* and *samaadhi*, to remove the already existing *ajnaanam*. Since *ajnaanam*-removing *pramaanam*-s are absent both in *sushupthi* and in *samaadhi*, *ajnaanam* will continue to exist in those states. I do not say that *ajnaanam* 'comes' in *sushupthi* / *samaadhi*; *ajnaanam* need not 'come', for the simple reason that, we are already 'rich' with *ajnaanam*. But, I do hold and say, that, that the existing *ajnaanam* will continue in *sushupthi* and *samaadhi*. '*Ajnaana nivarthaka pramaanasya abhaavaath thathra* -

'because of the absence of a *pramaanam* capable of removing *ajnaanam*, both in *sushupthi* and *samaadhi*, the *ajnaanam* will continue.

When this much was said by Sureswaraachaaryaa, the *poorva pakshin* is raising another question. He asks the *Aachaaryaa*: "How do you say, that, in *sushupthi* or *samaadhi*, *ajnaanam* is present? If *ajnaanam* were there in *sushupthi*, that *ajnaanam* must have been clearly experienced by the *saakshi*. In *sushupthi*, *dvaithaa* is absent; but, *saakshi* is present; *thriputi* is absent; but, *thriputi-saakshi* is present; and, *saakshi* is of the nature of *chaithanyam* / Consciousness. 'I' am there, as the *saakshi* in *sushupthi*; 'I' am of the nature of Consciousness and, therefore, 'I' should be able to experience the *ajnaanam* at that time. Not only should 'I' be able to experience, 'I' should be aware of that *ajnaanam* also; i.e. I should know that '*aham saakshi ajnaanam jaanaami*'. If there were *ajnaanam* in *sushupthi*, I should have the experience of the *ajnaanam* and also the realization that I have that *ajnaanam*.

"You are talking about the presence of ignorance in *sushupthi*, but, after waking up. After waking up, you say, there must have been ignorance in *sushupthi*. In other words, you are proving 'ignorance in *sushupthi* only by inference, based on the '*anubhavaa* in the waking'. Why should there be inference? Why cannot I directly experience *ajnaanam*, when the illuminator-*saakshi* is present? The fact, that, *saakshi* is capable of directly experiencing any *ajnaanam*, is proved in *jaagrath avasthaa*. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, when I am ignorant of different things (say, the Chinese language or a mathematical theorem), I am able realize that *ajnaanam*. In other words, during *jaagrath avasthaa*, *saakshi* is illumining *ghata ajnaanam*, *pata ajnaanam* etc. directly. I do not 'infer' *ajnaanam*. Not only do I realize my ignorance, but, I am also able to express that ignorance. I say 'I do not know Chinese, *ghata: / pata: etc.*'. Why cannot I directly 'know' my *saakshi advaita ajnaanam* in *sushupthi*, 'directly', in the same manner, and also say that I have got *saakshi ajnaanam* or 'ignorance'? "

The *poorva pakshin* uses the term '*raagha dvesha ghata ajnaanavath*', to give (i) desire (ii) hatred and (iii) ignorance of 'objects', all in *jaagrath avasthaa*, as examples. He says: "In *jaagrath avsthaa*, *ghata ajnaanam* ('*ghata* is only an example) is directly experienced by me and I say '*aham ghatam na jaanaami*'. In *sushupthi*, why cannot I experience the 'ignorance' and also say '*aham saakshinam na jaanaami*', in the same manner? Since I do not experience 'ignorance' in *sushupthi*, I conclude 'ignorance' must not / cannot be there in *sushupthi*".

The answer to this question of the *poorva pakshin* is given by Sureswaraachaaryaa briefly as "*na abhivyanjaka abhaavaath*". What is the answer? "Even though ignorance is there in *sushupthi*, ignorance is not manifestly / clearly / directly available in *sushupthi*, because there is no medium to manifest the ignorance".

"'Ignorance' also requires a medium to manifest" is the information that the *Aachaaryaa* gives. He says: "For its *existence*, 'ignorance' does not require any medium other than *saakshi*. But, for the ignorance to be directly experienced, *saakshi* alone is not enough; in addition to the *saakshi*, a medium is required for *manifestation* of ignorance". 'Manifesting medium' is called *abhivyanjakam*.

This subtle and abstract fact was illustrated in the earlier session, by two examples. The first example was 'light'. Light in its pure form cannot be experienced, without the availability of an object; i.e., if light has to be experienced, one requires an object to manifest / reflect the light. In Swamiji's words : " When I am conducting the class, you experience the light on my body and you experience the light on the mike before me. But, though light exists also in the space between my body and the mike, that light is not manifest because an object- medium is not there in that space". 'Consciousness' was given as the second example. Consciousness is also manifested, only when there is a medium, namely, the body-mind complex.

In the same manner, ignorance also requires a medium. And, that 'medium' is the mind. Only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, the mind is available and therefore, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, we can clearly experience and talk about not only ignorance of '*anaathmaa*', but, about *aathma ajnaanam* also. We can talk about these, only when the mind is available", whereas in *sushupthi*, the mind-medium is dormant.

To establish this fact, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives *his* example in this *slokaa*.

Verse 58 – Chapter III :

बाह्यां वृत्तिमनुपाध्य व्यक्तिः स्यान्नाहमो यथा ।

न ऋते अन्तः करणं तद्वत् ध्वान्तस्य व्यक्तिराञ्जसी ॥ ५८ ॥

The ego does not manifest itself without generating the awareness of external objects. In the same way, in the absence of the internal sense,

namely, the mind, ignorance does not enjoy the status of a perceptual object.

What is the example that Sureswaraacharya gives? The example is '*ahamkaaraa*' and its non-perception / non-manifestation in deep sleep state.

Sureswaraacharya says: "*Ahamkaaraa* is existent in all the three periods of time / states of existence. *Ahamkaaraa* is there in *jaagrath avasthaa*; *ahamkaaraa* is there in *svapnaa avasthaa*. In *sushupthi avasthaa* also, *ahamkaaraa* is there. If anyone doubts the existence of *ahamkaaraa* in *sushupthi*, that doubt will be dispelled, if he considers the fact, that, if *ahamkaaraa* is 'destroyed' or 'gone' in *sushupthi*, a sleeper will not wake up at all. *Ahamkaaraa*, having been 'destroyed', will not 'come out'. The very fact that the 'sleeper' wakes up and *ahamkaaraa* 'comes out' in the next *jaagrath avasthaa*, shows that *ahamkaaraa* is very much there, in *sushupthi avasthaa* also.

"This statement may give rise to the questions: 'If *ahamkaaraa* is there in *sushupthi*, how come, I do not experience the *ahamkaaraa*? How come, I am comfortably sleeping, forgetting my individuality, worry etc? How come, I am not claiming that I am the *ahamkaaraa*?' etc. My answer to these questions is that, *ahamkaaraa* requires a medium for its manifestation. The 'I' notion / the 'I' thought requires a medium for its manifestation. And, that medium is the 'mind'. The mind-medium is required for the manifestation of *ahamkaaraa*. In *sushupthi*, the mind-medium is resolved / dormant / inactive / passive / nonfunctional. But it is **not** absent. Since the medium is not active, '*aham*', the *ahamkaaraa*, is also not active. And, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, only when the external world and the thoughts arise, then alone the *ahamkaaraa* gets manifested. In other words, the external world has to get activated and the world *vrutthi* / the *idham vrutthi*-s will have to arrive and only at that time, *aham vrutthi* will become evident. In the absence of *idham vrutthi*, *aham vrutthi* cannot become evident".

Reverting to the text,

ॐ यथा - Just as,

ॐ बाह्यां वृत्तिं अनुत्पाद्य - without the awareness of external objects,

'*Baahya vrutthi*' mean '*idham vrutthi*', which, in turn, means 'world *vrutthi*', such as 'this is pot / this is cot / this is bedroom' etc.

Without the rise of this objective *vrutthi*,

ॐ अहमः व्यक्तिः न स्यात् - the 'ahamkaaraa' / 'aham vrutthi' cannot express / manifest itself,

'*ahama:*' means '*ahamkaarasya*'/of *ahamkaaraa*. '*Vyakthi:*' means 'manifestation'.

In *sushupthi*, *ahamkaaraa* is in non-manifested form. Only, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, when '*idham vrutthi*' rises, '*aham*' also will rise.

Using *ahamkaaraa* as the example, the *Aachaaryaa* says "In a similar manner, 'ignorance' also does not manifest in *sushupthi*, in the absence of the medium of 'mind' ".

ॐ तद्वत् - in the same manner,

ॐ न ऋते अन्तकरणं - without the mind,

ॐ '*ruthe*' (ऋते) is an indeclinable word, meaning *vinaa* /without.

ॐ ध्वान्तस्य व्यक्तिः (न स्यात्) - manifestation of 'ignorance' will not be there

ॐ आज्ञसी - directly.

The literal meaning of '*dhvaantham*' is 'darkness'. In this context, the word implies 'ignorance' – 'darkness of ignorance'. '*Vyakthi:*' means 'manifestation'.

The essence of the sentence: "In *sushupthi*, in the absence of the mind, direct manifestation of the ignorance will not be there, similar to the non-manifestation of *ahamkaaraa*, in the absence of the mind". And, since, thus, 'ignorance in *sushupthi* is not *prathyaksha siddham*, we are forced to 'infer' that ignorance.

To repeat: For the *prathyaksha siddhi* of ignorance, mind is required. In the absence of mind, ignorance will not be *prathyaksha siddham*. How it will become *siddham*? You have to only 'infer', that, in *sushupthi*, ignorance must have been there.

Therefore, what is the conclusion? **Ans:** In *sushupthi* and *samaadhi*, *ajnaanam* will continue to exist in a non-manifested condition.

And, if you want to remove that *ajnaanam*, what should you do? **Ans:** You will have to resort to *Vedhaantha vichaaraa*. You will have to come to *mahaa vaakyam* to remove the ignorance. Proceeding:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 59:

कश्चिदतिक्रान्तं प्रतिस्मृत्य "दृश्यत्वादहमप्येवं लिङ्गं स्यादष्टरात्मनः" इति
निर्युक्तिकमभिहितमित्याह । किं कारणं । अहं तद् ज्ञात्रोः विवेक अप्रसिद्धेः । यथेह
घटदेवदत्तयोर्ग्राह्यग्राहकत्वेन स्फुटतरो विभागः प्रसिद्धो लोके न तथा अहंकार तद् ज्ञात्रोः विभागः
अस्तीति तस्मादसाध्वेतदभिहितमिति । अत्रोच्यते ।

Someone remembering what has been discussed before, objects to the statement that 'the ego also, being an object, becomes an inferential clue to the witnessing Self' (in verse 56) as illogical. On what grounds? He says: "Because the distinction between the ego and the knower of the ego is not a well known fact. We know clearly that the jar and *Devadatta* who knows the jar, are mutually different, one being the object seen and the other its seer. The same is not the case with the ego and its seer. Hence the statement referred to, is untrue". We say the following in reply:

Another abstract topic follows. In these portions, Sureswaraacharya has continuously discussing abstract topics. Dayananda Swamiji exclaims: "Our *aacharyaas* have got un-sagging / untiring intellects. Our (ordinary mortals') intellects' after studying just one abstract topic, will 'sag', just as our physical bodies get tired and sag. We will look for a break from the study, trying to spur our minds with cups of coffee. But, these *aacharyaas* have got such thorough-going intellects, that after discussing one abstract topic, they can effortlessly move to another abstract topic without a break, and with the same vigour shown, while discussing the earlier topic".

Now, the *poorva pakshin* comes again, raising another question, averring that the *Aacharyaas anvaya vyathirekhaa* argument itself has got certain defects. He tells the *Aacharyaas*: "You went through a series of *vivekaa*, called *dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*, through which *vivekaa*, you talked about arriving at the *saakshi* as the 'subject'. In the process of *dhruk dhrusya vivekaa*, you said, that, (i) when the external world is object, the sense organs are the subject (ii) when sense organs are the objects, mind is the subject and (iii) when mind is the object, *saakshi* is the

subject. Thus, in your opinion, through a series of *dhruk-dhrusya vivaadhaa* or *graahaka-graahya vivaadhaa*, the ultimate stage, viz., 'I am the *saakshi* – *dhruk*; mind is *dhrusyam* / an 'object of experience' is reached. You said that, mind, otherwise called *ahamkaaraa* is *dhrusyam* and if the mind has to be a *dhrusyam*, it presupposes a *dhruk*, which is the *saakshi*. You also pointed out, that, *saakshi* never becomes *dhrusyam*, but is always *dhruk*. Thus, with the help of the mind as *dhrusyam*, you inferred or arrived at *saakshi* as the *dhruk*. But, I find this conclusion of yours illogical"

Before we proceed, the following should be noted: "When the mind is there, I use the word *aham*, meaning I. When the mind is not there, I do not use the word *aham*; therefore, mind is equal to *ahamkaaraa*; i.e. the mind is otherwise called *ahamkaaraa* or simply *aham*. The three words are synonymous. *Aham* = *ahamkaaraa* = mind".

Proceeding: The topic of *saakshi-ahamkaara vivekaa* was covered in verse 56, in which, Sureswaraacharya said "*aham* / *ahamkaaraa* / mind is *dhrusyam*, the 'object of experience'. If the mind is an object, there must be a subject. What is that subject? **Ans:** 'I', the *saakshi*. 'I', the *saakshi* / *dhruk* am different from *ahamkaaraa*, the *dhrusyam*". This was the argument given by Sureswaraacharya in verse 56.

The *poorva pakshin* is quoting this, from verse no. 56, here. He says:

ॐ "अहं अपि दृश्यत्वात् - "Ahamkaaraa also being an object of experience

ॐ द्रष्टुः आत्मनः लिङ्गं स्यात्" - becomes an indicator of the witnessing Self".

The *ahamkaaraa-dhrusyam* is an indicator of the *dhrastaa-aathmaa*. 'I' the *saakshi*, am different from the mind, the *ahamkaaraa*, which is *saakshyam*. *Ahamkaaraa* is *saakshyam*; 'I' am the *saakshi*. This '*saakshya-saakshi* separation' was done by Sureswaraacharya using this sentence. What is the object of the *poorva-pakshin* in recollecting this sentence of the *Aacharya*?

The *sambhandha gadyam* has the explanation:

ॐ कश्चित् - Someone (a *poorvapakshin*),

ॐ प्रतिस्मृत्य - remembering / recollecting

ॐ अतिक्रान्तं - what has been said earlier, (referring to the statement above),

ॐ आह - says:

ॐ अभिहितं - "what has been averred by you (again, meaning the statement above),

ॐ नित्युक्तिकं इति - is illogical / yukthirahitham / unreasonable".

The *poorva pakshin* tells Sureswaraacharya: "What was stated by you (in verse 56), namely, 'the ego also being an object of experience, becomes an inferential clue to the witnessing Self' is illogical".

Then, Sureswaraacharya asks the *poorva pakshin*:

ॐ किं कारणं - What is the cause (on which you find my statement illogical)?

The *poorva pakshin* replies:

ॐ अहं तद् ज्ञात्रोः विवेक अप्रसिद्धेः- Because the distinction between the ego and the knower of the ego is not a clearly understood fact.

The *poorva pakshin's* contention is: "We never experience *saakshi* and the mind as two distinct entities. I am not able to clearly / distinctly experience *saakshi* and the mind as two distinct entities. I am not able to say, with conviction: 'I am the *saakshi* and here is my mind'. Nor: 'I am the observer Consciousness and my mind is the observed object'. The observer / observed division between the Consciousness and the mind is not at all clear for me. You are making this division, which I am neither able to experience nor understand. When you say 'pot is an object observed and you are the different observer', I am able to clearly understand, that, I am the 'observer' and pot is the 'observed'; that, I am 'here' and pot is 'there'. The *dhruk-dhrusya vivekaa* is *sputam* (clear) when you are making that statement. I can clearly understand that statement; but, when you extend it as the example to the 'mind-Consciousness' pair, I am at a loss. I do not distinctly experience mind as the 'observed object' and Consciousness as the 'observer subject'. Therefore, in my opinion, the *saakshi-ahamkaara* differentiation / the *chaitanya*-mind differentiation is unnecessarily created by you. I am not willing to buy your argument.

Consciousness as something distinct from mind and as an 'observer of mind' is not convincing to me".

Therefore, the *poorva pakshin* gives this reply "*aham thadh jnaathro: viveka aprasiddhe:*" | In this statement, '*aham*' means '*ahamkaara*', which, in turn, means 'mind'. '*Thadh jnaathru*' means 'the knower / observer of that mind'. And, what is that observer? **Ans:** *Aathmaa / saakshi / the Consciousness*. '*Viveka*' means 'distinction' and '*aprasiddhi:*' means 'not clearly understood'.

The *poorva pakshin* says: "The distinction between the 'mind' and the 'observer of the mind' is never clearly known, nor clearly experienced, nor clearly understood. Only in *Vedhaanthaa*, you say: 'Mind is an 'object' and 'you' are the 'subject' ' When it comes to a '*ghatam*' and its 'observer', the distinction is very clear. But, not in the context of the 'mind' and its 'observer' ".

The *poorva pakshin* further argues: "I try to meditate on what you have stated ; I try to silence the mind; I try to see the mind; I try to remain as *saakshi*. But, nothing happens. Even in meditation, I am not able to distinctly experience / discern a *saakshi* separated from the mind, unlike the 'pot'. I am able to distinct the 'mind' from the 'pot; but not from the '*saakshi*, however much I dwell or meditate on this".

'*Aham thath jnaathro: (madhye)*' means '*ahamkaara saakshino: (madhye)*' / '*antha:karana chaithanyo: (madhye)*' | In all the above three terms, '*Madhye*' meaning 'between them', is supplied.

The cause of the *poorva pakshin's* suspecting the veracity of the *Aachaaryaa's* statement, is given in the sentence '*Aham thadh jnaathro: viveka aprasiddhe:*', which is connected to the earlier term, in the text, '*abhihitham niryuktham*', as below:

ॐ *viveka aprasiddhe:* - Since distinction is not evident

ॐ *Aham thath jnaathro: (madhye)* - between the mind and *saakshi*,

ॐ *Abhihitham niryuktham* - your statement is illogical.

The *poorva pakshin* explains his statement further:

ॐ घटदेवदत्तयोः विभागः - The distinction between a 'pot' and its 'observer',(say)
Devadhatthaa,

ॐ स्फुटतर : प्रसिद्धः - is very clearly known

ॐ ग्राह्य ग्राहकत्वेन - in the form of the 'observed' and the 'observer',

ॐ इह लोके - in our mundane experience,

(An aside: '*graahaka graahyam*' is another term for '*dhruk dhrusyam*'. Yet another term is '*bhaasaka bhaasyam*'. It is interesting to note, that, in their treatises, the *Aacharya*-s use different Sanskrit terms to convey the same meaning. Their object is to add literary value even to their *Vedhaanthic granthaa*-s, though, such usage may be somewhat confusing to the students. But, the practice does have an advantage, viz., that, the *granthaa* becomes more attractive).

ॐ अहंकार तद् जात्रोः विभागः - The distinction between *ahamkaaraa* and *saakshi* / the mind and the Consciousness

ॐ (स्फुटतरः) न अस्ति - is not at all clear,

ॐ यथा तथा - in the same manner as the clear distinction between the 'pot' and its 'observer' *Devadhatthaa*.

It is because of this reason, that, we find it difficult to claim: "I am the Consciousness, different from the mind". If that fact is clear, we can understand and also implement the extortion "neighbourise the mind / *ahamkaaraa*".

'Neighbourise' is not a word in use in the English language, but conveys the meaning effectively. The word is used to convey "Mind is an object different from 'I', the Consciousness and 'I' am the Consciousness, separate from the mind". This 'distancing' is quite difficult to achieve, if not impossible. That is why when one's mind is depressed, one does not say "my mind is depressed" and instead says "I am depressed". The 'objectification' of the mind is more easily said than done.

ॐ इति तस्मात् - This being so,

ॐ एतद् अभिहितं - what you said, (viz., that '*saakshi* is *dhruk* and mind is *dhrusyam* and therefore, they are distinct')
'*abhihitham*' means 'your statement'.

ॐ असाधु - is unreasonable and illogical.

ॐ इति - So argues the *poorva pakshin*.

And, if the aspirant cannot arrive at the *saakshi* itself, how can he go to *mahaa vaakyam*? Only after arriving at the *saakshi*, one can go to *mahaa vaakyam*.

"We are not able to arrive at *saakshi*; that is why *mahaa vaakyam* also fails" is the *poorva pakshaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa answers:

अत्र उच्यते - With regard to the *poorva pakshaa*, answer is given .

Verse 59 – Chapter III:

दाह्यदाहकतैकत्र यथा स्याद्वह्निदारुणो : ।

जेयजातृकतैवं स्यादहंजात्रोः परस्परम् ॥ ५९ ॥

The object being burnt and the agency that burns co-exist in the fire and fuel. In the same way, the property of being the knower and that of being the object known, co-exist in the knower (Consciousness) and the ego.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives a very subtle and abstract answer. He says: "There are many 'subject-object' pairs, such as (i) the 'seer' and the 'seen' (ii) the 'hearer' and the 'heard' (iii) the 'lifter' and the 'lifted' (iv) the 'teacher' and the 'taught' etc. In every action, there is a subject and there is an object. In other words, every action links a subject and an object. And, therefore, in creation / in this world, there are many subject-object pairs. But, the 'subject-object' pairs are of two types. There is one group of 'subject-object' pairs, where the subject and object have got very clear distance and distinction. Whereas, there are certain other cases, where, though there is a subject-object pair, that pair does not exist with a distinct physical distance between the subject and object. Therefore, *their* distinction also (as subject and object) is not discernible ; it is not clearly visible. But, just because the distinction is not clear you cannot take them as one entity; you should understand them as 'subject-object' pair only, even though they are co-existing as if they are one entity.

"To repeat: In certain subject-object pairs, even though they are distinct as subject and object, they co-exist. But, even though they co-exist and appear as one unitary entity, you have to discern and understand that it is not one unit; it appears as one unit; but, it is a pair having subject-object relationship.

"There are examples, through which, you will clearly understand my view. You will have to extend those examples to 'Consciousness and mind' pair also, and discern them as one such pair. Mind and Consciousness together appear as one unit; but, they are two distinct units put together, *appearing* as one; and, they are related as 'subject - object' / 'illuminator-illuminated' pair".

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives an example in this verse.

Before entering the text, the example is explained by Swamiji: "Assume that a pot of rice is being cooked using an old-fashioned earthen stove. The pot of rice is placed on the stove. Under the pot, there is fire i.e. burning firewood. We say that, the firewood is cooking the rice. Between the firewood and rice, the distinction is very clear; firewood is underneath and rice is above; the division between the 'cooking' fire and the rice that is being 'cooked', is physically experienced.

"But, when you look at the firewood itself, what do we experience? We experience the fire and the firewood as one unitary entity. The fire principle and the wood are co-existing in one place, as though there is an unitary entity. You know that the 'fire' you experience is not one entity; it consists of the 'fire principle' and the fuel 'wood'. We use the word 'fire' , because we think that the fire principle and the wood put together is one entity; but, when you enquire into it , you realize, that, 'fire' is not one entity; there is co-existence of two things - the 'fire principle' and the wood. The 'fire principle' is the 'burner' and the wood is the 'burnt'. 'Fire principle' is *dhaahakam*; wood is *dhaahyam*. They are co-existing as one 'burning fire' and you also tend to treat them as one unitary entity. You are taking the *pair* as the 'burner' / 'cooker' and the rice as the 'cooked'. But, in the experience of 'fire' itself, how many things are there? There are two things. What are the two things? The wood and the fire principle You treat them as one 'fire'; but, it is not one 'fire' cooking the rice; the fire itself consists of the pair of 'subject' and 'object', appearing as one entity. 'Fire' *is* a pair consisting of 'subject' and 'object'. What is the 'subject'? The fire principle is the subject, the *dhaahakam*. And, the wood is *dhaahyam*. The *dhaahya* and *dhaahaka* are experienced together as one unit. Visibly you are not able to separate the fire and the wood. But, still you know that they are two separate entities. Why? Because the wood does not have burning power of its own. Therefore, there are two things (i) the wood and (ii) the non-separable 'fire principle' in and through the wood. 'Fire principle' is not a part or product or property of the

wood; it is an independent all-pervading fire principle, which is in and through the firewood. There are two things, the fire principle and the wood. But, in this case, i.e., when the wood is 'burning' and 'cooking' the rice, this pair of 'fire and wood' cannot be physically separated; you will have to separate them only cognitively / intellectually.

"Another example is 'hot water'. When you experience hot water, when you say 'hot water burnt my hand', our experience is as though hot water is one entity; but, really speaking hot water is a mixture of non-hot water and the fire principle, which is pervading the water. When you say 'hot water burns my hand', actually, it is not the water that is burning; it is the fire principle, which is pervading the water which burns. In fact, the 'fire principle' burns the water first and *through* the water it burns the hand".

"Sureswaraachaaryaa's argument is, that, in a similar manner, in many cases of 'pairs', the 'subject' and the 'object' cannot be physically separated. They have to be intellectually separated. The *Aachaaryaa* points out, that, the '*saakshi*' – '*ahamkaaraa*' pair is also one such pair to be similarly discerned, though they (*saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*) appear as one unitary entity".

Swamiji concludes his detailed explanation of the example, with the comment: "I will give you another example later".

Reverting to the text:

ॐ एकत्र - co-existing in one and the same locus,

ॐ दाह्य दाहकता स्यात् - there exists the relationship of the 'burner' and the 'burnt'

ॐ यथा - Just as,

ॐ वह्नि दारुणोः (मध्ये) - between the fire and the firewood (fuel)

'*ekathra*' means '*ekasmin sthale*' / in one and the same place . The subject, 'burner fire' is there; in the very same place, the 'burnt wood' is also there. They are not physically separable. But, you understand and know that there are two principles.

ॐ एवं - in the same manner,

ॐ अहं जात्रोः (मध्ये) - between the *ahamkaaraa* and its knower '*saakshi*' also / between the mind and Consciousness also

'*aham*' refers to '*ahamkaaraa*', the mind ; '*(thadh) jnaathru*' means 'its knower', which denotes 'Consciousness', the *saakshi*.

ॐ परस्परम् ज्ञेयज्ञातृकता - a mutual relationship of the 'observed' and the 'observer'

ॐ स्यात् - exists.

Which is the 'observer'? **Ans:** 'Consciousness' is the 'observer'; but (to be carefully noted) 'not by doing the job of 'observing''. 'Fire' is not doing the job of 'burning the firewood'. Fire just 'is'; the firewood gets burnt. Similarly, in the presence of the Consciousness, the mind gets observed. From that standpoint only 'Consciousness' is called 'observer'.

Therefore, one cannot physically separate mind and Consciousness. One has to intellectually understand. How to do that? The explanation will follow.

168: Chapter III, Verses 59 and 60 (02-01-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is clarifying a doubt raised by a *poorva pakshin*, with regard to the *dhruk-dhrusya vivekaa*. The *poorva pakshin's* doubt is: "When I try to differentiate the observer Consciousness and the observed objects of the world, the difference between the two, viz., the observer Consciousness and the observed objects like a pot etc., is very, very clear. But, when I try the same exercise with my physical 'body' as the 'observed' object, instead of the 'pot', the difference between the 'observer' and the 'observed' gets hazier. And, when I finally extend the exercise to my mind or *ahamkaaraa*, in the place of the pot and the body, the difference between the 'observer *saakshi*' and the 'observed mind / *ahamkaaraa*' is not at all clearly distinguishable. I can 'distance' the pot outside; but, I am not able to 'push' the mind away, like the pot; and, I am not able to exist as pure *saakshi*. In other words, I am not able to differentiate *saakshi*, as something in my close proximity, simultaneously visualizing the mind as an object, a few feet away. I am not able to say "here 'I' am, the *saakshi* and 'there' is the mind / *ahamkaaraa*' or conversely, "here' is the *ahamkaaraa* and 'there' is the *saakshi*. I am not able to physically distinguish *saakshi* from *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, I am not able to clearly understand your *dhruk-dhrusya vivekaa*".

Sureswaraachaarya replies: "Yes, such a problem does exist. That is because, unfortunately, *saakshi* and mind cannot be physically separated. Therefore, let me explain. In mundane experiences, we come across many cases of 'subject-object' pair, where the 'subject' and 'object' are physically away from each other. But, we also find, that, in certain other cases, the 'subject' and 'object' pair are not physically away from each other. In other words, we have 'subject-object' pairs with a physical distance and we also have 'subject-object' pairs without a physical distance. There are many examples for 'pairs' with physical distance between the subject and object. For instance, when an individual sits on a chair for dining and the food is on the table, there is a clear distinction between the 'eater' on the chair and the 'food' on the table. The diner is the 'subject' and the food is the 'object'. There is a clear physical distance between the two. We can have several examples of such 'pairs'. But, there *are* a few rare cases, where there is no physical distance between the subject and the object."

The *Aachaaryaa* gives an example for such unique pairs. What is the example? **Ans:** The fire principle and the firewood which the fire is burning. When the fire is burning the wood, both the 'burnt wood' and the 'burning fire' are co-existing in one locus. And, we experience them as one single entity viz., as 'fire'; but, in that one experience, there is the 'subject-object' pair. The burning fire is the subject and the burnt wood is the object. They are co-existing and we experience them as a single entity. If the fire is separated from the wood, or from any fuel, whether the fuel is oil, gas or wood, the fire principle separated from the fuel, is not even visible. In other words, whenever you experience fire, it is invariably experienced only along with the burnt fuel. The '*saakshi-ahamkaaraa*' or 'Consciousness-mind' pair is similar. *Saakshi* is like fire; mind is like the fuel. The *saakshi* fire and the mind fuel coexist in one locus. You cannot physically separate them and experience only the Consciousness or only the mind. 'Fire principle and firewood' is the example, that is given by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the *slokaa*, for the '*saakshi-ahamkaaraa*' pair.

In Swamiji's words: "As promised in the earlier session, I will give you another example. This topic is a very important topic, since you can have many corollaries derived from it. It has to be, therefore, analyzed thoroughly and understood clearly.

"The example, which I want to give, is the example of the moonlight on a full moon night. I am planning to analyze the experience of the moonlight on a full moon night. The example will give us a lot of insight, with regard to *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa*. When I experience moonlight on the full moon night, I generally refer to it as just 'moonlight', without a second thought. But, suppose I make a detailed analysis of the so-called 'moon-light', the first information I get / the first shocking discovery that I make, is, that, there can be no such thing called moonlight, since moon does not have light of its own. When moon does not have light, the very word moonlight is a loosely used expression, born out of misconception. In that case, what is actually there? **Ans:** There are two things co-existing there, both of which I am experiencing together. I am not experiencing moonlight; but, I am experiencing a pair of things which are co-existing in one locus. What is that pair? I am experiencing (i) the moon and (ii) the sunlight which is falling on the moon. I am not experiencing moonlight; in reality, I am experiencing moon *plus* sunlight. I am experiencing sunlight on the moon / sunlight spread over the moon / moon and sunlight mingled.

“And, what is the relationship between the sunlight and the moon, which pair I am experiencing ? **Ans:** Sunlight is the ‘illuminator’ principle and the moon is the ‘illuminated’ principle. I am experiencing the sunlight, the illuminator principle and the moon which is the illuminated principle. I am experiencing the ‘illuminator-illuminated’ pair as a mixture. The relationship between the moon and the sunlight is called ‘*avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandha:*’ | I am experiencing the *avabhaasya-avabhaasakaa* pair. Sunlight is the illuminator or *avabhaasakaa*; moon is the illuminated or *avabhaasyam*. The moon is non effulgent. It is illuminated and sunlight is the illuminator. (Swamiji cautions: Later, we are going to apply each of these points to ‘*saakshi* and mind’ pair, and at the time of application, you should remember every point.)

“Moon gets illumination from the sunlight. But, from where does sunlight gets illumination? **Ans:** Sunlight does not / need not get illumination from anywhere. Sun is self-effulgent. The self-effulgent sunlight illumines the non-effulgent moon. The self-effulgent sunlight is the illuminator and the non-effulgent moon is the illuminated. So, if the question ‘what do you experience on a full moon night?’ is asked and you reply ‘moonlight’, really speaking, it will not be the correct answer. ‘I am experiencing the illuminator sunlight and I am experiencing the illuminated moon’ will be the appropriate answer. Also, the moon being non-effulgent, if the sunlight is not there, the moon will not be illuminated, the moon cannot be revealed and the moon cannot be experienced.

“Now, suppose I get a desire ‘I am experiencing the sunlight along with the moon. But, I want to experience the pure sunlight alone’. And, suppose, to fulfill that desire, I remove the moon. Of course, the ‘removal’ can only be hypothetical. To experience the pure sunlight, hypothetically, I remove the moon. What will be left out? If the moon is abolished, in the sky where the moon was there before, in that place, the pure sunlight should be there.

“But, when there is pure sunlight without the moon, is it possible for me to experience the sunlight in that place of the moon? What will be the answer? The answer will be: ‘If the moon were absent, even though the sky is there, even though the sunlight is there, even though the sunlight is self-effulgent, the self-effulgent sunlight will not be revealed’.

“Therefore, the important lesson is, that, the self-effulgent sunlight also requires a medium for its revelation. Self-effulgent sunlight also, even though it is self effulgent, requires a medium. What is the medium here? **Ans:** The moon. Sunlight is revealed because of the moon. Earlier, it was said that moon is revealed because of the sunlight. Now, on analysis, we understand, that sunlight is revealed, only because of the moon. Therefore, each of them is revealed, because of the other. Moon will not be revealed without sunlight and sunlight will not be revealed without moon. In short, both of them mutually help each other in their revelation. And, any one of them will not be revealed, if the other one is absent.

“On further analysis, I realize, that, even though both of them depend on each other for their revelation, the nature of ‘dependence’ is of two different types. An analogy can be considered an ‘employer–employee’ pair. In this ‘employer – employee’ pair also, both the employer and the employee depend on each other and the natures of the ‘dependence’ are different. The employer depends on the employee for getting his work done; the employee depends on the employer for money. Obviously, a situation where each of them depending on the other, for the sake of money is not possible. They are dependent on each other for two different purposes. Similarly, though sunlight and moon depend on each other for the revelation of both, the natures of the dependence is different. How? Moon depends on sunlight for illumination ; as the ‘illuminator’, sunlight helps the moon. Their relationship (as already indicated) is called ‘*avabhaasya ababhaasaka sambhandha:*’| As the *avabhaasaka* (the ‘illuminator’), sunlight helps the moon and the moon is helped, as the *avabhaasyam* (the ‘illumined’). Now, how does the moon help the sunlight? Even though sunlight is self-effulgent, even that self-effulgent sunlight requires the assistance of the moon; the moon helps in the manifestation of the self-effulgent sunlight. Sunlight has to be manifested and only then, it will be revealed; therefore, moon helps the sunlight as the manifesting medium. In *Sanskrit*, the moon, in this context, is called *abhivyanjakam*, a very powerful role. The moon plays the role of *abhivyanjakam*, the ‘manifesting medium’. The sunlight helped by the moon is *abhivyanjyam*. *Abhivyanjya-abhivyanjaka sambhandhaa* is also there, between the sunlight and the moon. Moon helps the sunlight as *abhivyanjakam*; sunlight helps the moon as *prakaasakam*. Thus, mutually helping each other, both of them get revealed.

“If the moon is absent, self effulgent sunlight will not be revealed; the self effulgent sunlight will be *anabhivyaktham* or *avyakthaam*. It will be ‘unrevealed sunlight’ in

the absence of moon; and, the unrevealed sunlight cannot be experienced by anyone. Therefore, both of them require each other for their revelation. Only when both of them are revealed, they can be experienced.

“Now, let us assume that the moonlight is experienced by two people on a full moon light, one an ‘informed’ person and the other an ‘uninformed’ person. When the uninformed person experiences moonlight he will say: ‘I am experiencing the moonlight’. And, when he thus says ‘I am experiencing the moonlight’, by using the word ‘moonlight’, what is the mistake he is committing? **Ans:** He thinks that he is experiencing the light belonging to the moon i.e. he thinks it is the ‘light’ for which moon is the source. Whereas, when an informed person experiences the moonlight and says ‘I am experiencing the moonlight’, even as he says that, in his mind, he will never think that he is experiencing the moonlight. What will be his understanding? It will be: ‘I am experiencing the sunlight, manifested by the moon’.

“Ignorant person thinks and says ‘I am experiencing the moonlight belonging to the moon’; the wise person understands ‘I am experiencing the sunlight manifested by the moon’. The experience of the light is the same; there is no difference in the experience. But one is experience backed by right understanding and the other is experience backed by wrong understanding. Experience backed by wrong understanding is ‘moonlight’ experience. Experience backed by right understanding is ‘sunlight’ experience.

“Now, let us apply this ‘sunlight-moon’ pair as analogy to the *saakshi*-mind pair. The mind is like the moon. And, *saakshi* is like the sunlight. And, we (in *Vedhaanthaa*) say that both of them depend on each other for their revelation. Both of them depend on each other for their revelation and if anyone of them is removed / if they are separated, neither will be revealed. The two of them are not dependent on each other for their *existence*. But, both of them do depend on each other for their *revelation*. Therefore, when they are separated, mind also will not be revealed; and, *saakshi* also will not be revealed. Both of them can be revealed only when both of them are there together.

“And, while, thus both of them depend on each other for their revelation, the dependence is of two different types, just as in the case of the ‘sunlight-moon’ pair. For what purpose is ‘mind’ dependent on the *saakshi*? **Ans:** For its illumination. Mind is dependent on the *saakshi* for its illumination, because mind is *jadam*. Therefore,

what is the relationship between mind and *saakshi*, from this perspective? **Ans:** *Avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandha:* | *Saakshi* is the *avabhaasakaa* (the illuminator) and mind is the *avabhaasyam* (the illumined). *Saakshi* also depends on the mind for its revelation. For what purpose does *saakshi* depend on the mind?

Ans: Not for its illumination because *saakshi* is self-effulgent; but, that self-effulgent *saakshi*, even though it is self-effulgent (most important fact, to be noted very carefully), the self-effulgent *saakshi* depends on the mind for its manifestation. For its manifestation, *saakshi* depends on the mind. If the mind is removed, even though *saakshi* is self-effulgent, that self-effulgent *saakshi*, in the absence of the mind, will become non-manifest. And, the non-manifested *saakshi* will be unrevealed *saakshi* and unrevealed *saakshi* cannot be experienced. From this perspective, the relationship between *saakshi* and mind is *abhivyanjya-abhivyanjaka sambhandha:*, the mind being *abhivyanjakam* and *saakshi* being *abhivyanjyam*.

"*Saakshi* cannot be experienced if the mind is removed" is a very important fact to be known and registered, in order to remove a very big misconception that is prevalent among *Vedhaanthic* students. I will explain the misconception, since only then, you will know the intensity of the resulting problem.

"During the teaching of *Advaita Vedhaanthee*, the *Aacharyaas* say: '*Aathmaa* is the Consciousness principle. And, Consciousness is experienced all the time. *Kenopanishad* (II.4) declares '*prathibodhavidhitham matham* – '*Brahman* is known, when it is discovered as the witness awareness in every thought'. Therefore, you need not work for *aathma anubhavaa*; Consciousness is experienced all the time. As is known, *Maneesha Panchakam* also points this out as '*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu spututhaaraa yaa samvidhujrumbathe* – '*That Brahman*, which shines forth brilliantly in all the three states of existence viz., waking, dream and deep sleep states'. Since Consciousness is thus experienced all the time, you do not have to sit in meditation for experiencing the Consciousness'.

"And, even though the teacher, thus, says 'Consciousness is experienced all the time', quite a few *Vedhaanthic* students are not satisfied. They think: 'I am experiencing Consciousness all the time; but, that is only *chidhaabhaasaa*. I want to experience *chith*. The *guru* says I am experiencing Consciousness all the time. No doubt I do. But, I am experiencing the *chidhaabhaasaa* Consciousness only. What I want to experience is *chith*.'

"In other words, such a student wants to experience *chith*, separated from *chidhabhaasaa*. He wants pure *saakshi anubhavaa*. His goal in life is pure *saakshi anubhavaa*, unadulterated with *chidhaabhaasaa*. What does one experience, in both *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*? **Ans:** Only *chidhaabhaasaa* is available. Therefore, this aspirant looks for an alternate state, where he can remove *chidhaabhaasaa* for experiencing pure *saakshi*. *Chidhabhaasaa* will be there, as long as mind is there. He has also heard the maxim: *Mana eva manushyaanam kaaranam bhandha mokshayo* | And, therefore, to remove *chidhaabhaasaa*, what does he think, he should do? **Ans:** He thinks '*Manonaasa: karthavaya:*' | He thinks that he should abolish the mind; that, mind should be abolished. For what purpose? **Ans:** for experiencing pure *saakshi*. But, when can mind be abolished? **Ans:** Only when thoughts are removed. Therefore, what does he think, he should do, in meditation? **Ans:** He thinks, that, he has to abolish thought.

"To consolidate, in reverse order: This aspirant wants to remove the thought, so that mind is removed. He wants to remove the mind so that *chidhaabhaasaa* is removed. He wants to remove *chidhaabhaasaa*, so that he can come across pure *chith*. And, he wants to abide in *nirvikalpka samaadhi* as pure *chith*. And, he wants to experience pure *chith*.

"But, this 'waiting' for pure *saakshi anubhavaa* is futile; his attempt will miserably fail, because, pure *saakshi* can never be experienced; because, pure *saakshi* can never be revealed if the mind *abhivyanjakam* is abolished. Pure self-effulgent *saakshi* will be there; but, that *saakshi* will never be revealed. Why? Because the self-effulgent *saakshi* requires the mind for (not illumination) manifestation.

"For argument's sake, if, in meditation, an aspirant removes the mind and *chidhaabhaasaa*, what will be his condition? Let us imagine that a person removes the mind and *chidhaabhaasaa*, in meditation. What will be his condition? **Ans:** He will be dead. A state in which mind and *chidhabhaasaa* are absent is called the state of death. It is not the state of *saakshi anubhavaa*. If you go to a state where thoughts are eliminated / mind is eliminated / *chidhabhaasaa* is eliminated, it is not a state of *saakshi anubhavaa*. Only in the state of death, mind and *chidhaabhaasaa* are removed. Therefore, the notion, that 'removal of mind and *chidhaabhaasaa* will help in experiencing pure *chith*' will lead to the absurd position of all dead bodies having *saakshi anubhavaa*, because *chidhabhaasaa* and mind are not there in dead

bodies, while the self-effulgent *chith* alone is there. All the dead bodies will be 'realized' dead bodies! This shows that this line of thinking, viz., 'to realize pure *chith*, remove *chidhabhaasaa* ; in order to remove *chidhabhaasaa*, remove the mind ; in order to remove the mind, remove thought' etc. is totally illogical.

"Unfortunately, there *are* misguided people who sit in meditation to experience pure *saakshi*. But, it should be clearly understood by a serious and informed aspirant, that pure *saakshi* is to be recognized not by abolishing the mind; that, pure *saakshi* should be discerned *in the presence* of the mind only and *by* the mind only; that, without going in to meditation, without removing the thought, without removing the mind, keeping the mind alert and using the mind as *abhivyanjakam*, the *jnaani* should claim (similar to the 'informed' person in the 'sunlight-moon' example, who firmly understands that it is not the moonlight that he experiences but the sunlight manifested by the moon): "I am not the *chidhabhaasa*; I am the *chith saakshi*, which is manifested by the mind".

"I am not the Consciousness belonging to the mind. If I mistake myself as the Consciousness belonging to the mind, I am called *chidhabhaasaa*. If I understand I am the Consciousness manifested by the mind, but, not belonging to the mind, who am I? **Ans:** The *saakshi*.

"And, when I am experiencing the *saakshi*? **Ans:** I am experiencing the *saakshi* (do not use the word *chidhabhaasaa*; just as the wise person looks at the moonlight but does not call it moonlight and calls it sunlight, similarly I experience the Consciousness and I do not call it *chidhabhaasaa*; I call it the *saakshi*) using the mind as *abhivyanjakam*. Not in meditation but as '*pasyan srunvan sprusan jigrant*'.

"I am the Consciousness principle; mind does not have Consciousness; mind is only manifesting Consciousness.

"To consolidate: How do I get *saakshi anubhavaa*? Not by abolishing the mind; I get *saakshi anubhavaa*, by understanding the Consciousness; that, what I am experiencing all the time is not the Consciousness of the mind, but, it is the Consciousness manifested by the mind. This wisdom makes me shift the vision from *chidhabhaasaa* to *chith*. I shift the vision from *chidhabhaasaa* to *chith*, not by abolishing the mind but by changing my attitude towards the mind. When I look upon the mind as the source of Consciousness, then, I am experiencing

chidhaabhaasaa. But, when I look upon the mind as the 'manifestor' of the Consciousness, I am experiencing the *chith*.

"Therefore, *chidhaabhaasaa* experience and *chith* experience are not two separate experiences. In the 'moonlight' example given, 'moonlight experience' and 'sunlight experience' are not two separate experiences; it is one light experience, which, the ignorant call 'moonlight experience' and the wise call 'sunlight experience'. In the same manner, the 'ignorant' and the 'wise' experience one Consciousness alone; the ignorant man calls it *chidhabhaasaa* ; the wise man understands it as *chith*.

"Thus, when am the *saakshi*? **Ans:** Even now / even when I am using the mind and using the thoughts also, I can say I am the *saakshi* ; and, even to say 'I am the *saakshi*' I am using the thought but even that thought is an *abhivyanjakam* to say that I am the *saakshi*. And, 'I' the *saakshi* am not destroyed when the mind goes away; but I become *avyakthaa* when the mind goes away. I am *vyaktha*: when the mind is operating.

"This comfort, born out of understanding, is called *saakshi dharsanam*. For this comfort also, I am using the mind. I am using the mind for the *abhivyakthi*.

"And, I am not limited by the dimensions of the mind, just as sunlight is not located in the moon but sunlight is manifested by the moon. Where is the sunlight located? **Ans:** Sunlight is *not* located. On the other hand, moon is located in the all-pervading sunlight. Similarly mind is located in 'me'; but, even though I am all-pervading, even though the mind is located in 'me', I am using the mind for claiming I am the *saakshi*. I am using the mind as *abhivyanjakaa* to claim I am the *saakshi*. To *be* the *saakshi*, I do not need the mind. But, to *claim* 'I am the *saakshi*', I need the mind.

"All these corollaries are involved in this *slokaa*.

"Therefore, for *saakshi anubhavaa*, never go to *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* and abolish the mind. If you abolish the mind, you will not have *saakshi anubhavaa*; you will be like a dead body, not because *saakshi* is absent, but because there is no manifesting / revealing medium. Unfortunately, there is a prevalent wrong notion, that, people in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* are all experiencing *saakshi*. No such thing is possible. It is logically impossible. '*Saakshi*' is claimed *in the presence* of the mind, *with* the mind.

"And, for the next step, viz., to learn that, 'that *saakshi* 'I' am *Brahman*', the aspirant requires *mahaa vaakyam*. That is the development of Sureswaraachaaryaa".

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam (Part) to Verse 60:

एवं तावदविध्योत्थस्यान्तःकरणस्य बाह्यविषयनिमित्तरूपावच्छेदायाहंवृत्तिर्याप्रियते ।

Thus, the modification of the nature of the ego comes into being, in the mind, which is a product of nescience, for determining the specific form of it induced by the external object.

Sureswaraachaaryaa tirelessly enters the next, a slightly different topic. What is the topic he is entering into? It is a known topic; the *Aachaaryaa* is presenting it in a nice form. The topic is briefly presented as follows:

(Before we proceed further, an important point has to be noted and remembered: Sureswaraachaaryaa calls the mind itself as *ahamkaaraa*, throughout this discussion. For Sureswaraachaaryaa (i) *aham* (ii) *ahamkaaraa* and (iii) mind are synonymous. Mind = *ahamkaaraa*= *aham*).

It has been seen that *Saakshi* illumines the mind. The *saakshi* illumines the mind and lends Consciousness to the mind. It was also seen, that, *saakshi* also takes the help of the mind to reveal itself as *saakshi*. Without mind, *saakshi* is there, but, in an unrevealed, non-manifested form, even though it is self effulgent. In the absence of mind, *saakshi* is (i) unrevealed (ii) non-experienced and (iii) non-manifest. (All the three words are to be noted and remembered). Only with the help of the mind, *saakshi* becomes manifest, revealed and experienced as *saakshi*.

Saakshi reveals the mind. But, who or what reveals all the other objects in the world? **Ans:** It is again Consciousness which reveals all the objects in the world also.

Consciousness reveals the mind and Consciousness reveals the objects of the world also.

And, mind and the objects of the world have got several common features, which have been studied in an earlier context. The most important common features are

five, as listed below: (1) *dhrusyathvam* (2) *baudhikathvam* (3) *sagunathvam* (4) *savikaarathvam* and (5) *aagamaapaayithvam*. Incidentally, *dhrusyathvam* means *avabhaasyathvam*. These five are common features of the mind and the world.

And, both of them, with these common features, are revealed by Consciousness only, otherwise called *saakshi*. As *Mundakopanishad* (II.ii.11) declares: "*Thameva bhaantham anubhaathi sarvam*" – "Everything 'shines' because of that Self alone, which Self is itself self-effulgent".

But, there is a difference between the '*saakshi* revealing the mind' and the '*saakshi* revealing the objects in the world'. *Saakshi* can never illumine the objects of the world directly, whereas *saakshi* can illumine the mind directly. Therefore, what does the *saakshi* do? **Ans:** In the first stage, the *saakshi* illumines the mind, which is the same as 'arriving at the *jaagrath avasthaa*'. In *sushupthi avasthaa* also, *saakshi* was present, but, not illumining the mind and therefore not illumining the world also. What happens in *jaagrath avasthaa*? **Ans:** *Saakshi* illumines the mind directly. In the form of the two *sambhandhaa-s*, viz., *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* and *abhivyanjya-abhivyanjaka sambhndhaa*, both *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* get revealed, mutually helping each other. Thus, the word '*aham*' comes to existence. During *sushupthi*, '*aham*' itself did not exist; but, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, *saakshi* gets revealed because of the mind and mind gets revealed because of the *saakshi*.

Saakshi after revealing the *ahamkaaraa*, uses the *ahamkaaraa* as a medium After illumining the mind, *saakshi* uses the mind as 'illuminator' of the world and its objects; i.e. in the first stage, *saakshi* makes the mind an 'object' and in the second stage, that 'object mind' is used as an 'instrument'. In an earlier context, an example was given for this phenomenon. The example is quoted again below: An individual who is forced to use spectacles for clear vision, immediately on getting up in the morning, takes the spectacles out from the container in which it was placed for protection, before going to sleep. At that time, when the individual looks at the spectacles in his hand, the spectacle is an 'object'. Then what does he do? He takes the 'object spectacles', puts it on and makes it a medium or instrument; and thereafter, when he uses the word 'I', the word includes the spectacles also. Spectacles becomes one with the user. Similarly, *saakshi* 'objectifies' the mind first and, later, uses that mind, as the medium to perceive the world and its objects. The mind and *saakshi* put together becomes '*aham*'. '*Aham*' is a mixture of *saakshi* and mind. And, this *aham* reveals various objects. Are those objects directly revealed or

indirectly revealed by Consciousness? **Ans:** They are indirectly revealed by Consciousness, through the mind. And, all those indirectly revealed, become '*mama*'. '*Mama*' means 'mine'. *Saakshi* joining the mind, '*aham*' is born; '*aham*', *saakshi* and mind together, illumining the world '*mama*' is born. One is direct illumination; the other is indirect illumination.

And once '*aham*' and '*mama*' are born, the *samsaaraa* drama starts. That is going to be the discussion.

169: Chapter III, Verses 60 (16-01-2010)

Sambhandhagadhyam to Verse 60 :

एवं तावदविध्योत्थस्यान्तःकरणस्य बाह्यविषयनिमित्तरूपावच्छेदायाहंबुत्तिर्व्याप्रियते ।
 तयावच्छिन्नं सत्कूटस्थप्रत्यगात्मोपादान अवबोधरूपस्य अव्यवधानतया विषयभावं
 प्रतिपद्यत इति । तत्र तयोः जात्रहंतरूपयोः अवभासक अवभास्यसंबन्धव्यतिरेकेण
 नान्यत्संबन्धान्तरमुपपद्यते । अहंन्तारूपं तु आत्मसात्कृत्वाऽहंकञ्चुकं परिधाय
 उपकार्यत्वोपकारकत्वक्षमः सन् बाह्यविषयेण उपकारिणापकारिणा वा अत्मात्मीयं संबन्धं
 प्रतिपद्यते । तदभिधीयते

Thus, the modification of the nature of the ego comes into being in the mind, which is a product of nescience, for determining the specific form of it induced by the external object. That modification of the mind becomes directly the object of an awareness which is a product of the eternal Self. Between the knowing Self and the ego, there can be no relation other than that of the 'illuminator' and the 'illuminated'. Appropriating the ego to itself and putting on the coat of the ego, the Self assumes the forms of the 'helped' and 'helper'. In connection with external objects, favourable and adverse, it attributes to itself appropriate relations towards them. This is brought out now:

The main topic under discussion is: "After *anvayavyathirekhaa* and consequent separation of the *saakshi* from all the *anaathmaa*, one will have to necessarily come to *mahaa vaakyam*, when alone '*aham brahma asmi*' *jnaanam* is possible".

'*Aham saaakshi asmi*' *jnaanam* cannot liberate a person. The mere knowledge "'I' am *saakshi* " cannot liberate the aspirant, because when the aspirant understands himself to be *saakshi*, different from *saakshya anaathmaa*, he is accepting a duality in the form of '*saakshi* and *saakshyam*' or '*dhruk* and *dhrusya*'. Therefore, *saakshi jnaanam* does not reveal *dvaitha mithyaathvam*.

To repeat: *Saakshi jnaanam* gives the aspirant the knowledge that *saakshi* is *chaithanyam*, distinct from the *saakshya prapanchaa*, which *prapanchaa* includes the mind also. But, in this *saakshya-saakshi viveka jnaanam*, *dvaitha mithyaathva nischayaa* has not taken place.

Whereas, '*dvaitha mithyaathva nischaya jnaanam*' is a necessary condition for liberation. We cannot hope to somehow manage to achieve liberation, avoiding *dvaitha mithyaathva nischayaa*.

Liberation is possible only through the conviction '*aham Brahma asmi*'| And, this conviction '*aham Brahma asmi*' also, should, as a corollary, include the conviction of *dvaitha mithyaathvam*. That is why, while summarizing *Vedhaanthaa*, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* succinctly declared: "*Brahma sathyam; jagan mithyaa; jeevo Brahma eva na apara.*"| All these three components are equally necessary for liberation. *Brahma sathyathva jnaanam* is compulsory. *Jagan mithyaathva jnaanam* is equally or even more compulsory. And, '*jeevo brahmaiva naapara.*' *jnaanam* is also equally or still more compulsory. All the three components are important for the culmination of the *Vedhaanthic* study.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya's main thesis is "*saakshi saakshya vivekaa* is only an intermediary stage and not the final stage of *Vedhaanthic* understanding, which is *jeeva-Brahma aiykya vivekaa*, attained only through *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*".

In the previous *slokaa*, in the course of his discussions, Sureswarachaaryaa made the following point: "When the aspirant does *saakshi-saakshya vivekaa*, he can clearly see the distinction between the 'observer' *saakshi* and the 'observed' *jagath* as *saakshyam*, since the external world has got a physical distance from the *saakshi*; whereas, when he tries to do the same *saakshi-saakshya vivekaa* with the mind as *saakshya-anaathmaa*, in the place of the external world, he finds the separating of the *saakshi* and mind very difficult, since he will not be able to separate them physically." He had progressed in his thesis, up to this stage.

To re-cap: What *is* the Sureswaraacharya's main thesis? **Ans:** 'The route-map for the *Advaita* student is, (i) *saakshi-saakshya vivekaa*, through *anvayavyathirekhaa*, as the first step and (ii) thereafter, through *mahaa vaakyam*, *saakshi brahma eiykyam*. That is the topic under study.

Now, in three verses from the 60th verse (in verses 60, 61 and 62), Sureswaraacharya is taking a small diversion to reveal some important and useful points, even though the diversion is not directly connected with his thesis, the main topic under study. But, it is a useful and important digression. And, it is a subtle and technical topic. The topic has been discussed before, but, Sureswaraacharya has got his own method of conveying his ideas and therefore, the topic is broached again by him, in these three verses.

To continue in Swamiji's own words: "Since it is a subtle and technical topic, I will independently present this and thereafter we can go to the textual part. And, I will present this topic as five distinct points.

"The main idea that Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to discuss here, is this: The entire world is *anaathmaa*. Likewise, the mind is also *anaathmaa*. There are similarities between the world and the mind. What are they? One is that, both are *anaathmaa* and therefore, both have five common features, namely, *dhrusyathvam*, *baudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*.

"Another similarity is, that, the *anaathmaa*-world is illumined by Consciousness and likewise, the mind is also illumined by Consciousness, which is otherwise called *aathmaa* or *saakshi* or *chith*. The terms *aathmaa*, *saakshi*, *chith* and Consciousness are synonymous. *Aathmaa / saakshi / chith / Consciousness* reveals the *anaathmaa*-world and also the *anaathmaa*-mind.

"But, even though, both of them, viz., world and mind, are equally *anaathmaa*, having the five common features, and even though both are illumined by Consciousness, there are certain differences in the method of the illumination of the two, which differences are to be noted.

"To repeat in other words: World is *anaathmaa* and the mind is also *anaathmaa*. World is *saakshi bhaasyam*; mind is also *saakshi bhaasyam*. Even though, thus, both are *anaathmaa* and both are illumined by *chaithanyam* only, there are certain distinctions or differences. We have to note those differences, as well as the corollaries derived from them.

"Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting these in *his* way and introducing the corollaries also, all of which I want to present as five points.

"Point No. 1: *Saakshi*, as *saakshi*, illumines or reveals the mind directly. Thereafter, *saakshi* joins the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa* and illumines the world through the mind. Therefore, it is *saakshi* that reveals the mind and it is *saakshi* that reveals the world also; but, while revealing the world, *saakshi* has to join the mind, under the name of '*chidhaabhaasaa*' and illumine the world. This is point no. 1.

"And, while assimilating this point, we have to note another subsidiary point, namely, that, Sureswaraachaaryaa does not want to treat *chidhaabhaasaa* as a

separate entity; he wants to say that *chidhaabhaasaa* is the name of *saakshi* itself, when it has joined the mind. Do not think that *saakshi* is one Consciousness and *chidhaabhaasaa* is another Consciousness. Do not imagine there are two Consciousnesses. *Saakshi* itself, *joining the mind*, gets the name *chidhaabhaasaa*; and, gets the status of *ahamkaaraa*. *Saakshi* joins the mind and as *chidhaabhaasaa* or *ahamkaaraa*, illumines the world, through the mind. It is like the example given in the last class; I am, again, quoting that example. On a full moon night, we can say 'sunlight illumines the moon; moonlight illumines the earth'. The statement is not totally wrong; but, it may lead to a misconception. What is the misconception? **Ans:** 'That, there are two lights, sunlight being one and moonlight being another'. If I desire to avoid the misconception, I should make a re-presentation. I should say 'sunlight illumines the moon; then sunlight itself, in the name of moonlight / joining the moon, illumines the earth'. This is because there is no second light called moonlight, since moon does not have any light of its own. The term 'moonlight' is, in reality, a misnomer. Therefore, what do I say? **Ans:** 'Sunlight itself, in the name of moonlight – joining the moon - illumines the earth'. In a similar manner, Sureswaraacharya says '*saakshi* itself, joining the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa*, gets the status of *ahamkaaraa*, and *saakshi*, with the status of *ahamkaaraa*, illumines the world, through the mind'.

"*Saakshi* itself reveals the mind also; *saakshi* itself reveals the world also. While revealing the mind it has got *saakshi* status; and, while revealing the world, it has assumed a new status, as *ahamkaaraa* or *chidhabhaasaa*. Therefore, do not imagine there is one separate *saakshi* and one separate *chidhaabhaasaa* and try to physically separate them. *Saakshi* is *chidhabhaasaa*. *Chidhaabhaasaa* is *saakshi*. *Saakshi*, associated with the mind, functions as *chidhabhaasaa* and gets the name *ahamkaaraa*.

"Condensing the first point: *Saakshi*, as *saakshi*, reveals the mind directly; *saakshi* as *ahamkaaraa*, the *chidhaabhaasaa*, reveals the world, through the mind".

(At this juncture, Swamiji explains as to why he wants to present Sureswaraacharya's concepts in Swamiji's own words, before entering the text. He says: "Once we enter the text, we have to face two struggles, struggle with the language and struggle with the concepts. The first struggle is 'understanding the language'/'un-knotting the Sanskrit compounds', especially because Sureswaraacharya has an unique method of communication. The second struggle

is 'understanding the concepts'. Therefore, I am keeping the text aside, so that we can grapple with the concepts first. Thereafter, we can go to face the language struggle".)

"Now, let us go to the second point. The second point is, that, *saakshi* directly illumines the mind, as *saakshi, in the medium of ajnaanam or kaarana sareeram*. Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces the medium of *ajnaanam* here, to show that all the dualities are *mithyaa* in nature. Unless he brings in the *ajnaanam* medium, we will think that *saakshi* and mind have got the same order of reality. Therefore, he wants to caution us, that, mind is of lower order of reality and *saakshi* is of a higher order, and also that when the mind is abolished or negated, *saakshi* does not have even *saakshi* status itself. In other words, the mind is also *mithyaa*; the *saakshi status* is also *mithyaa*. To be carefully noted: Consciousness is **not** *mithyaa*; but, its *saakshi status* **is**. To remind us of that fact, Sureswaraachaaryaa says: 'In the *ajnaanam* medium, Consciousness, enjoying the *saakshi* status, directly reveals the mind, which is a *mithyaa* product of *ajnaanam*. This is a very subtle point, difficult to comprehend. To repeat the concept: 'Consciousness, in *ajnaanam* medium / *maayaa* medium / *moolaavidhyaa* medium / *kaarana sareeram* medium, gets the *saakshi* status and illumines / reveals the mind directly'. Whereas, the *saakshi*, joining the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa*, reveals the external world in the medium of the mind. That is why, if I want to experience this hall, I require the mind medium. What does this statement 'I require the mind medium' mean? **Ans:** It means 'I should be awake'. Only in the waking condition, *saakshi* in the medium of the waking mind / the active mind can reveal the external world.

"Therefore, what is the second point? **Ans:** '*Saakshi, in the ajnaanam medium*, as the *saakshi*, reveals the mind directly, whereas, *saakshi, in the mind-medium*, joining the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa*, taking the status of *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world. The moment mind-medium is gone, the world cannot be seen.

"To condense the point: *Saakshi* reveals the mind, **in ajnaanam medium**; *saakshi* reveals the world **in the mind-medium** or **through the mind-medium**". This is point No. 2.

"Now, let us proceed to the third point, which is: In the *ajnaanam* medium, when the *saakshi*, as *saakshi*, reveals the mind directly, *saakshi* does not require any

modification to reveal the mind. By its mere presence, it reveals the mind. Mind is revealed directly, *nirvikaarathayaa*, i.e., without undergoing any modification action. It requires only *ajnaanam* medium for the mind to be revealed by the *saakshi*. No modification is required. Whereas *saakshi*, joining the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa*, taking the status of *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world by undergoing thought modification. Without thought modification, external world cannot be revealed.

"So, if my words are to be revealed by the *saakshi*, what are all the things required?

Ans: (i) *Saakshi* should join the mind. (ii) They get the status of *ahamkaara* and then (iii) **mind modification is required**.

"Suppose, now, in the class, your mind is in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, i.e. your mind remains thoughtless. Under that circumstance, obviously, my words will not be revealed to you; they will not be heard by you. That is why Dayanadanda Swamiji used to say: 'Never learn *Vedhaanthaa*, in meditation. If you do so and remove all your thoughts, the poor teacher will be crying in wilderness'. So do not go to meditation, in class; let all your sense organs be bright. Every word I utter must enter your mind and, therefore, your mind should be alive and awake ; it should not be in *samaadhi* or meditation. And, '**modification of thought**' is required, for the Consciousness to reveal the world.

"Therefore, what is the third point? **Ans:** '*Saakshi*, as *saakshi*, reveals the mind, **without requiring any change / modification**, whereas, *saakshi*, as *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world, **requiring thought modification**'.

"Then the fourth point: When *saakshi*, as *saakshi*, in the *ajnaanam* medium / *moolaavidhyaa* medium reveals the mind, they (the *saakshi* and the mind) have a relationship, namely, 'revealer-revealed relationship' or '*avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa*'. What is the 'revealer' and what is the 'revealed'? **Ans:** '*Saakshi* is the revealer. Mind is the revealed'. "And, they are related; there is '*avabhaasya avabhaasaka roopena sambhandha*:' between the two.

"And, Sureswaraacharya says that, while this 'revealer-revealed *sambhandhaa*' is there between the two, both the 'the revealer *saakshi*' and 'the revealed mind' do not influence the nature of each other, during the process of revelation. Neither of them influences the nature of the other, either positively or negatively. That means, when *saakshi* reveals the mind and the mind gets revealed, during the process of

revelation, the nature of the mind does not get improved nor worsened; it remains the same. Mind does not become better because of the revelation; nor does it become worse; an agitated mind remains agitated and a calm mind remains calm. The *saakshi* does not do anything good to the mind; nor anything bad also. Similarly, the mind also, while it is related to the *avabhaasakaa - saakshi*, as *avabhaasyaa*, does not do anything to the *saakshi's* nature. There is neither *upakaaraa* nor *apakaaraa* caused mutually. There is neither a positive influence, nor a negative influence, for either the *saakshi* or the mind because of the other. The *asamsaari saakshi* remains *asamsaari*; the *samsaari* mind remains *samsaari*."

(Swamiji digresses marginally. He says: "You may wonder why are we studying all these 'points'. Remember, all these points *are* connected to 'liberation'. At this stage, individually, they may look meaningless; but, later, you will have to join them all together, like pieces of a jig-saw puzzle. As you very well know, a piece of a jig-saw puzzle, by itself, will appear worthless; but, when all the pieces of the puzzle are joined together, you get a grand picture. And, you realize that every single piece is essential to form the full picture.

"All these 'points', now under discussion, are similar to pieces in a jig saw puzzle. We will know the value of each 'point', only when we combine them all together. Unfortunately, in the class, we can deal with only one 'point' at a time. But, later, we should combine all the 'points' and get the grand picture viz., '*Brahma sathyam; jagan mithyaa; jeevo Brahmaiva naapara*'. Therefore, my request to you is: 'do not reject any of these topics as meaningless, since, if you do so, you will be the loser. When you grasp the significance of the topics, a grand view will evolve. Otherwise you will miss *mokshaa*'.)

"To get back to the fourth point: When *saakshi* reveals the mind, there is neither *upakaaraa* or *apakaaraa* done, either to *saakshi* or to the mind. Whereas, when the *saakshi* joins the mind as *chidhaabhaasaa* and takes the status of *ahamkaaraa*, and reveals the world, between the *ahamkaaraa* and the world (when I use the word *ahamkaaraa*, it is the name of *saakshi* itself, which is now named *chidhaabhaasa* and has taken *ahamkaaraa* status. To repeat: *ahamkaaraa* is the name of the *saakshi*. Sureswaraacharya uses the word '*kanchukam*' or 'coat' for *ahamkaaraa*.), there is not only the 'revealer-revealed relationship' / '*avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa*', as between *saakshi* and mind; but, not merely the *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa*, an additional *sambhandhaa* also comes, in the second

stage. I will clarify. When *ahamkaaraa* and the world come in contact, no doubt, the basic relationship is the 'revealer-revealed' relationship. In addition to that, they influence each other mutually also, either positively or negatively. *Ahamkaaraa* influences the world positively or negatively, doing good or doing bad; and, similarly, the world also influences the *ahamkaaraa* positively or negatively. Let us consider this class itself as an example. You are the *ahamkaaraa* student, the 'revealer'; *Naishkarmya siddhi* class is the 'revealed'. That *sambhandhaa* is there. But, it does not stop with that. The *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class is not only revealed by the *ahamkaaraa*; but, the class can do *upakaaraa* to you, if you understand the subject, smile and nod your head. *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is not only revealed by the *ahamkaaraa*; *Naishkarmya Siddhi* does *upakaaraa* to you. Not ordinary *upakaaraa*. If you understand and assimilate the subject, it does *mahaa upakaaraa*, called *mokshaa* itself. And, when? **Ans:** 'Now itself, it can do *upakaaraa*'. Let us imagine a different scenario: The *Naishkarmya Siddhi* Class is revealed; but, you do not understand the subject. The whole class 'goes above your head'; if you say so, the result is that, you are worried, disturbed and confused also. Under such a circumstance, what has the Class done to you? **Ans:** *Apakaaraa* .

"The example shows that, between the 'revealer' *ahamkaaraa* and the 'revealed' world, in the first stage, there is 'revealer-revealed relationship', i.e. '*avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa*'. There is a second *sambhandhaa* also between *ahamkaaraa* and world, which is either '*upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa*' or '*apakaarya apakaaraka sambhandhaa*'. '*Upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa*', indicates positive influence resulting in happiness ; '*apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*' indicates negative influence resulting in worry / *samsaaraa* . 'Worry' or 'unhappiness' does not come at *saakshi* level; but, at *ahamkaaraa* level; when the *ahamkaaraa* cloak is put on and 'I' interact with the world, *ahamkaaraa* says "I am worried' or "I am happy'. But, (again) who is *ahamkaaraa*? **Ans:** 'It is only *saakshi*'.

"I', the *saakshi*, put on the *ahamkaaraa* cloak. I reveal the world; not only I have got revealer-revealed relationship with the world; in addition to that, I am depressed or happy with the world. The world can be a 'burden' for me or the world can be '*sampoornam nandanavanam sarvethi kalpadhrumaa*.' | When the world and I have got *upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa*, I call the world *nandanavanam*. But, when 'I', as *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world and there is *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*, I say the world is a burden. I want to run away from the world in the

name of *videha mukthi* and, as a consequence, pray 'O Lord! Take me away from the world at the earliest.' Which I? **Ans:** *Saakshi* 'I', who am ever free; but, putting on the *ahamkaaraa* cloak.

"Let us now condense the fourth point: When, *saakshi* as *saakshi*, illumines the mind, there is only one *sambhandhaa*, viz., 'revealer-revealed' or (in Sanskrit) '*avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa*. Whereas, when *saakshi*, as *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world, there are two *sambhandhaa*-s, (i) *Avabhaasya-avabhaaska sambhandhaa* and (ii) *upakaarya-upakaarakaa sambhandhaa* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*.

"The term '*upakaarya-upakaarakaa sambhandhaa*' can be translated as 'beneficiary-benefactor relationship'; and, '*apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*' can be translated as 'victimized-victimizer relationship' or 'persecuted-persecutor relationship' or 'harassed-harasser relationship'. Naturally, both relationships, viz., the '*upakaarya-upakaarakaa sambhandhaa*' and the '*apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*' cannot exist simultaneously.

"Now, what is the fifth point? It is this: When *saakshi*, as *saakshi*, in the *ajnaanam medium*, reveals the mind, I have got the mind awareness / I am aware of the mind. Thus, when I have the 'mind-awareness' because of the *saakshi*, Sureswaraachaarya gives that awareness / knowledge, a technical name. He calls the mind awareness as "'*idham*'- *jnaanam*". It is just a technical term, that he uses. He calls it "'*idham*' – *jnaanam*" / "this knowledge". And, what is 'this knowledge'? What is the concept of '*idham*'- *jnaanam*? When you say '*idham*'- *jnaanam*, what does it refer to? **Ans:** '**The mind-awareness caused by *saakshi***'. The *saakshi* reveals the mind; and, therefore I am aware of the mind. In other words, the mind-awareness is caused by *saakshi*, because the mind is not self-revealer by itself. Mind is not 'revealed' / 'awared' by itself. Why? **Ans:** 'Because mind is *jadam*'. When I have got mind-awareness because of the *saakshi*, in the medium of *moolavidhyaa*, Sureswaraachaarya calls that mind-awareness "'*idham*'- *jnaanam*".

"At this stage, *moolaavidhyaa* carpet also has to be there; only at the end, we are going to remove this carpet. And, when the carpet is removed, the world is dismissed and mind is dismissed. What about *saakshi*? **Ans:** 'It should be carefully remembered, that *saakshi* is **not** dismissed. You cannot say *saakshi* is dismissed.

You would say *saakshi status* is also dismissed'. This is because Consciousness is a *saakshi* from the standpoint of the mind. After dismissing the mind, Consciousness alone remains without *saakshi* status.

"To retain the Consciousness as *advaitam*, we have to negate all the others – mind, world etc. - as *mithyaa* . Since all of them have to be negated later, by removing ignorance, we have to first spread the carpet of ignorance to introduce duality.

"Therefore, what is the first job, whenever duality discussion is there? **Ans:** 'Spread the carpet of *ajnaanam*. (In a lighter vein: Before all *vaidhika* rituals, we put an *aasanam*). The whole *Vedhaanthic* teaching should start with the *moolaavidhyaa aasanam*. That is why the medium of *ajnaanam* is introduced in the first stage. Finally remove the *moolaavidhyaa*. The word 'remove' means 'falsify'. 'Remove *moolaavidhyaa*' means 'falsify *moolaavidhyaa*'.

"In the *Brahadharanyaka Upanishad* (IV.v.14), Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* brings this fact out, by asking his wife and disciple *Maithreyi* – ' *yathra thu asya sarvam aathmaiva abhooth thath kena kam pasyeth thath kena kim jigreth*- 'but, when, to the knower of *Brahman*, everything has become the Self, then, what should one see and through what; what should one smell and through what?' In that *advaita aathmaa*, when you negate *ajnaanam*, where is the world/ Where is the mind?

"In the *Kaivalyopanishad* (*manthraa* 22) also the *jnaani's* understanding of his own glory as a *jnaani*, is given in the words '*na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambram cha* – 'Earth and water are not there for me. Fire is not there for me. Air is not there for me. Space is also not there for me'.

"The *Mundakopanishad* (II.ii.12) declares: '*Brahmaivedam amrutam purasthaadh brahma paschaadh brahma dhakshinathascha uttharena adhascha oordhvam cha prasrutham brahmaivedham viswamidham varishtam*' –'All this in front is the immortal Brahman alone. Brahman alone is behind. Brahman alone is on the right as well as on the left. Brahman pervades below and above also. This universe is this supreme Brahman alone'.

"*Katopanishad* (II. i. 11) declares '*Neha naanaasthi kinchana* – 'There is no plurality at all here'.

"When the *Upanishad*-s make these declarations, how do all of them (viz. the duality and plurality) appear? **Ans:** 'Because of the *moolaavidhyaa* carpet'. In fact, this very class is going on, because of *moolaavidhyaa* carpet.

"Reverting to point no. 5: When the Consciousness reveals the mind in the medium of the *moolaavidhyaa* carpet, and I have got the 'mind awareness', Sureswaraachaaryaa calls this 'mind awareness' by the term '*idham-jnaanam*'. And, thereafter, when the *saakshi* joins the mind as *chidhabhaasaa*, and takes the *ahamkaaraa* status and reveals the world, there is 'world-awareness' and I am aware of the world. Taking the *ahamkaaraa* status, I am aware of the world. Sureswaraachaaryaa calls this 'world awareness' as "'*mama*'- *jnaanam*". World awareness results in the claims "'My' house / 'my' wife / 'my' children / 'my' notebook / 'my' pen etc. All the 'world awareness' is "'*mama*'-*jnaanam*".

"Mind awareness' is called "'idham' – jnaanam". In "'idham' – jnaanam", there is one sambhandhaa, viz., 'avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandha'. In 'world awareness' or "'mama'- jnaanam", there are two sambhandhaa-s (i) avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa and in addition to that (ii) upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandhaa or apakaarya apkaaraka sambhandha.

"An example, to explain the distinction between *upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandhaa* and *apakaarya apkaaraka sambhandha*: When you say 'this is my son' and you introduce him as 'married and happily settled', your face is all aglow. When you say 'my son, married and settled, working in TCS', it is not only 'revealer-revealed relationship'; the blooming face reveals that the '*mama-jnaanam*' has got '*upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandhaa*'; that, your wonderful son is making you happy. But, if, due to market recession, the son has lost his job and he has got two children, as even as you introduce the son, your face is writ with anxiety. In this case also, 'revealer-revealed *sambhandhaa* is there; but, in addition to that, your son is not a source of joy for you; but a source of anxiety. Therefore, what is the second *sambhandhaa*, in this situation? **Ans:** '*Apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*'. In essence, "*yathra yathra eka sambhandha*.; *thathra thathra 'idham-jnaanam*;; *yathra yathra sambhandha dvhvayam*, *thathra thathra 'mama-jnaanam*". This is the fifth point.

"Sureswaraachaaryaa gives all these five points, in these three verses, 60, 61 and 62. He builds up gradually. I gave you the total picture, so that each sentence in the text will make easier sense. We will enter the text in the next session"

170: Chapter III, Verses 60 (23-01-2010)

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 60:

एवं तावदविध्योत्थस्यान्तः करणस्य बाह्यविषयनिमित्तरूपावच्छेदायाहंवृत्तिर्व्याप्रियते ।
तयावच्छिन्नंसत् कूटस्थप्रत्यगात्मोपादान अवबोधरूपस्य अव्यवधानतया
विषयभावं प्रतिपद्यत इति ।

The main discussion, that we have at this moment is: "In the course of achieving liberation, *aathma anaathma vichaaraa / vivekaa* is a stepping stone and *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* is the final *saadhanaa*."

And, while discussing *aathma anaathma vivekaa*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering into a brief diversion. This diversion is to reveal a small, internal difference within *anaathmaa* itself.

We use the term *anaathmaa* for everything which is an 'object' of Consciousness. Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say that within that *anaathmaa* itself, there is an internal difference.

The entire *jada prapanchaa*, which is revealed by Consciousness, is *anaathmaa*; and, this entire world comes under one type of *anaathmaa*. The mind is also *anaathmaa*; but, the mind comes under a different type of *anaathmaa*.

The *anaathmaa* status is common to the mind and to the world. As already discussed, the two have the five common features of *anaathmaa*, viz., *dhrusyathvam*, *boudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*. Based on these five features, both mind and world come under *anaathmaa* category; still, there is an internal difference. Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to mention that internal difference here. And, what is that internal difference? **Ans:** "The mind can be directly illumined by Consciousness, whereas, the world cannot be directly illumined by Consciousness. The Consciousness / *saakshi* will have to reveal the mind first and thereafter, through the mind, the *saakshi* will have to reveal the world".

This idea itself is presented in two different ways, in different contexts. One method of presentation is "*saakshi* reveals the mind; mind reveals the world". This first method of presentation is similar to making the statement "On a *pournami* night, the sun illumines the moon and the moon illumines the earth". '*Saakshi*' is akin to 'sun'; 'mind' is akin to 'moon'; and, 'world' is akin to 'earth'.

There is another way of presentation, which we are adopting here. What is that? **Ans:** "*saakshi* illumines the mind; and, joining the mind, and, through the mind, *saakshi* illumines the world".

Thus, in the second method of presentation, we are giving the credit for 'illumination', to the *saakshi* only; we do not want to give any credit to the mind, as an illuminator. Why do we not want to give credit to the mind? **Ans:** "Since mind does not have a consciousness of its own, why should we say 'mind illumines the world?'".

Therefore, what we say is: "*Saakshi* illumines / reveals the mind; thereafter, *saakshi* joins the mind; after joining the mind, *saakshi* itself gets re-named *ahamkaaraa*; and, *saakshi*, as *ahamkaaraa*, reveals the world also."

Going back to the example, instead of saying "Sun illumines the moon and moon illumines the earth" , it will be more appropriate to say "Sunlight illumines the moon ; and , after illumining the moon and joining the moon, with the help of the moon, the sunlight illumines the earth also"; i.e., to be more appropriate, we do not want to say "moon / moonlight illumines the earth". Why we are avoiding that statement is because of the fact, that moon is non-luminous and therefore, when we say "moon illumines the earth", we are actually making a compromise. If we want to avoid making that compromise, we do not want to say "moonlight illumines the earth", since the very word 'moonlight' is a misconception.

Therefore, we avoid the statement "moon / moonlight illumines the earth". What do we say? **Ans:** "Sunlight, with the help of the moon, through the medium of the moon, illumines the earth".

The approach to the 'revelations' made by *saakshi* is similar to this. We say : "*Saakshi* illumines the mind; joins the mind; gets the status of *ahamkaaraa*; and, reveals the world".

Sureswaraacharya presents this idea in the five points which were covered in the earlier session. And, therefore, it is very necessary for the student to remember these five points, when the textual portion is entered into.

Going to the text part:

ॐ एवं तावत् - This being so,

ॐ अहं वृत्तिः - antha: karana vrutthi / the thought of the mind / the mental thought

ॐ व्याप्रियते - functions / takes steps

ॐ बाह्य विषय निमित्त रूप अवच्छेदाय - to get associated with the external objects

The language used by the *Aacharya* is 'involved' / complicated. The essence of this statement is: "The mind acts in such a way as to get associated with thoughts relating to the external world". When I am looking 'out', the mind is functioning through the sense organs; and, what is the intention of the mind, when the mind goes out through the sense organs? **Ans:** "Mind wants to get 'thoughts', relating to external objects, such as *sabda vrutthi*, *roopa vrutthi* etc."

For instance, when the student is attending the *Naishkarmya Siddhi* class and keeps his ears alert, his mind wants *Naishkarmya Siddhi sabdha vrutthi*. And, if and when the student watches a programme on the television, his mind wants '*roopa vrutthi*'. Hence the conclusion "*vishaya aakaara vrutthi sambhandhayaa mana: vyaapriyathe*" meaning "mind functions to get associated with *vishaya aakaara vrutthi*"

And, according to *Vedhaanthic* epistemology (theory of knowledge), while the *antha: karana vrutthi* is supposed to go outside, mind remains within the body.

The mind remains in the body; but, the thoughts of the mind can and do travel outside the body through the five sense organs. When a thought / *vrutthi*, thus, travels outside the body, that *vrutthi* / thought is called *pramaana vrutthi*; but, it is called *pramaana vrutthi* only until it gets associated with an object. Once it gets associated with an external object (*vishayaa*) it becomes what is termed '*vishaya*

aakaara vrutthi. For example, say, the *pramanaa vrutthi* goes out towards a pot. Until it reaches the pot, it is called *pramaana vrutthi*. Once it reaches the pot, the *pramaana vrutthi*, which does not have any specific shape until it reaches the pot, combines with the *ghata vishayaa* and the *pramaana vrutthi* becomes *ghata aakaara vrutthi*. In general terms, *pramaana vrutthi* travels out, to assume *vishaya aakaara vrutthi*.

Now, to whom or what does this *pramaana vrutthi* belong? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

अन्तःकरणस्य - belonging to the mind, which is within the body,

Here, Sureswaraachaarya refers to *pramaana vrutthi* as *ahamvrutthi*. *Ahamvrutthi* is *pramaana vrutthi*. *Ahamvrutthi* / *pramaana vrutthi* goes out. That *pramaana vrutthi* belongs to the mind, which is within the body.

Antha: karana vrutthi / *aham vrutthi* / *pramaana vrutthi* (the three names refer to one and the same *vrutthi*) goes out; *antha:karanam* remains inside ; similar to a torch carried in the hand. The torch remains in the holder's hand; but, the beam of the torch travels away from the holder. The beam of light can reach hundreds of feet away, the torch remaining in the hand of the holder. Similarly, *antha:karanam* remains within. The *vrutthi* travels. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* refers to this fact, in his '*Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram*' (verse 4) : "*Naanaacchithra ghatodhara sthitha mahaa deepa prabhaa bhaasvaram jnaanam yasya thu chakshuraadhikaranadvaaraa bahi: spandhathe*" etc. - "Just like the bright light of a great lamp placed in a jar having many holes, He , whose intelligence flashes outside through eyes and other sense-organs" etc.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, having thus said that the *pramaana vrutthi* or *ahamvrutthi* belongs to *antha:karanam*, adds an adjective to the *antha:karanam* or mind: अविध्योत्थ - (which mind is) born out of *moolaavidhyaa*.

The term '*avidhyaa*', in this context, means *moolaavidhyaa*, which is another name for *maayaa*, which is another name for *kaarana sareeram*. *Moolaavidhyaa* = *kaarana sareeram* = *maayaa*. Born out of that *avidhyaa* is this *antha:karanam*.

This may give rise to the question: "Why should Sureswaraachaaryaa say the mind is born out of *moolaavidhyaa*? Why should he add that specific adjective here? He has

already mentioned that fact, in the introduction of *moolaavidhyaa vichaara*. Why should he repeat it here?" **Ans:** "There *is* a significance. Only when we say 'mind is born out of *moolaavidhyaa*', we will know that mind is matter. The material nature of the mind must be remembered throughout, when we are studying *Vedhaanthic* theory of knowledge. *Vedhaanthic* theory of knowledge can be fully comprehended, only if we remember that mind is matter and thought is matter. Mind does not have Consciousness of its own. This must be consistently remembered. That is why, the *Aachaaryaa* adds the adjective '*avidhyottha*' |

Moolaavidhyaa is *maayaa*; *maayaa* is *jadam*; mind is born out of *jadamaayaa*; therefore, mind is also matter only. Thought is also matter. The difference is, that, they are subtle matter; not concrete matter. The inert thought goes out and contacts inert object. Mind is inert; thought is inert; external object is inert. Inert thought and inert object come together and *vishaya aakaara vrutthi* takes place.

But, since all these things happen on the inert plane, knowledge cannot take place ; *saakshi* will have to arrive, for converting all these into a knowing process. In other words, the phenomenon at the inert level can be called a cognitive process, only when the *saakshi* / Consciousness 'blesses' the phenomenon. This is similar to the fact, that, 'light' has to bless the classroom, for the *guru* and the students to have visual transactions.

The *Aachaaryaa* has said '*Aham vrutthi: baahya vishaya nimitttha roopa avacchedhaaya vyaapriyathe*'. Then what? The *saakshi* comes.

तया अवच्छिन्नं सत् - When the *vishaya aakaara vrutthi* (i.e. the *ahamvrutthi* associated with the object), in turn, gets associated with the mind,

It was already mentioned, that, once the thought gets associated with the object and the thought assumes the form of the object, that thought is called *vishaya aakaara vrutthi*: | All *vishaya aakaara vrutthi*-s such as *ghata aakaara vrutthi*, *pata aakaaravrutthi*, *sabdha aakaraa vrutthi*, *roopa aakaara vrutthi* etc. are formed because of the contact between the *antha:karana vrutthi* / *aham vrutthi* / *pramaana vrutthi* and the respective *vishayaa*. That *vishaya aakaara vrutthi*, naturally, is associated with the mind. '*Thayaa*' means '*vishayakaara vrutthiyaa*'. '*avacchinaam sath*' means ' when associated with the mind'.

विषयभावं प्रतिपद्यते - (that mind with the vishaya aakaara vrutthi) becomes an object,

'That mind with the *vishaya aakaara vrutthi* is to be supplied as 'subject' of the sentence. The Consciousness of the *saakshi* spreads over the mind. Just as the sunlight spreading over all objects, both the mind and *vishaya vrutthi* are spread over, by the Consciousness of the *saakshi*.

And, when it is, thus, spread over, what does the mind become? **Ans:** "Mind becomes an 'object'". '*Vishaya bhaavam prathipadhyathe*' means 'becomes the object'. Of what? The *Aachaaryaa* answers:

ॐ कूटस्थ प्रत्यगात्म उपादान अवबोधरूपस्य - of the *chaithanyam*, whose source is the eternal inner Self,

ॐ अव्यवधानतया - directly / *saakshaath*.

The mind 'directly' becomes the object of the 'Consciousness'.

'*Avabodha*' means '*chaithanyam*'. The *Aachaaryaa* adds an adjective to the '*chaithanyam*' viz., '*kootastha prathyagaathma upaadhaana*'; '*upaadhaana*' means 'emerging from'; '*kootastha*' means 'eternal'; '*prathyagaathmaa*' means 'inner Self'. '*Kootastha prathyagaathma upaadhaana avabhodha roopasya*' therefore means 'of the *chaithanyam*, whose source is the eternal inner Self'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa has said that, the *chaithanyam* comes from / emerges from the *kootastha prathyagaathmaa*. Why should the *chaithanyam* come from *aathmaa*?

Ans: 'Because the mind does not have *chaithanyam* of its own'. To recollect the example of the sun and the moonlight on a full moon night, the use of the word 'moonlight' causes confusion, since the moon is not self-luminous ; and, therefore, after using the word moonlight, we try to differentiate moonlight and sunlight. We use the word 'moonlight' and then we remember the sunlight and we take pains to separate moonlight and sunlight. Similarly, we use the word *chidhaabhasaa* and thereafter we use the word *chith*; then, ironically, we tend to differentiate *chidhaabhasaa* and *chith*. But, it should be understood and remembered that *chidhaabhasaa* is *chith* and *chith* is *chidhaabhasaa*. *Chith* obtaining in the mind is called *chidhabhasaa*. There should be no attempt to experience '*chith*' separate from '*chidhaabhasaa*'. Whenever you are experiencing *chidhaabhasaa*, you are

experiencing *chith* only. Just as 'moonlight experience' is 'experience of the sunlight on the moon', '*chidhaabhaasaa* experience' is 'experience of *chith* in the mind'.

Never work for separate *chith anubhavaa*. Whenever one says 'I am', it is experience of *saakshi* in the mind.

Reverting to the text: "(*Vishaya aakaara vrutthi sahitha antha:karanam*) *kootastha prathyag aathma upaadhaana avabodha roopasya vishayabhaavam prathipadhyathe*" which means "(the mind) becomes the object of *saakshi*".

Samabhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 60:

तत्र तयोर्जात्रहंतरूपयोरवभासकावभास्यसंबन्धव्यतिरेकेण नान्यत्संबन्धान्तरमुपपद्यते ।

Between the knowing Self and the ego, there can be no relation other than that of the 'illuminator' and the 'illuminated'.

Now, we have got (1) the mind and (2) upon the mind is spread the *saakshi chaithanyam*. The mind and *saakshi chaithanyam* are co-existing. The *saakshi chaithanyam* is named *chidhaabhaasa*, when it is spread over the mind. But, as already stressed, it should be carefully remembered, that just because a new name has been given, the student should not think *chidhaabhaasa* is an entity different from *chith*. *Chidhaabhaasaa* is just another name for the *saakshi chaithanyam* itself, when it is spread over the mind. In one locus, there are two entities, the mind and the *saakshi chaithanyam*. Sureswaraacharya says that when they (the *saakshi chaithanyam* and the mind) are thus co-existing in one locus, they have got subject-object relationship / *avabhaasaka avabhaasya sambhandhaa*.

Swamiji gives an example. Referring to his dress, Swamiji says: "For example take this dress. The cloth and the orange colour are intimately present; what is the relationship between the cloth and the orange colour? **Ans:** 'Substance-attribute relationship is there'. Now, the sunlight also is falling on the cloth; sunlight is also intimately there with the cloth, as the colour is; but, what is the relationship between the sunlight and cloth? It is *not* substance-attribute relationship. What is it, then?

"Orange colour also is also close to the cloth; sunlight is also close to the cloth. But, there is a difference in the relationship between 'the cloth and its colour' and the relationship between 'the cloth and the sunlight that is falling on it'. What is that

difference? **Ans:** 'The colour and cloth have *guna-gunee sambhandhaa*. Light and cloth have *avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa*'.

"Light is very close to the cloth, like an attribute. But, it is **not** an attribute; therefore, while, between the colour and the cloth, *guna-gunee sambhandhaa* is there, between the light and the cloth, the relationship is *avabhaasaka avabhaasya sambhandhaa* .

"Extending this example to the trio, (i) the mind (ii) its emotions and (iii) the Consciousness : the mind is like the cloth; emotions are like the colour; Consciousness is like the light. Between emotions and mind, the relationship is *guna-gunee sambhandhaa*. But, between the Consciousness and the mind, even though Consciousness is the *saakshi chaithanyam in* the mind and the mind is there closely, it is not *guna-gunee sambhandhaa* between the *chaithanyam* and the mind; it is *avabhaasaka avabhaasya sambhandhaa*.

"When you say 'I am aware of the mind', 'I am the 'awarer' and the mind is the 'aware'; 'I am the subject and the mind is the object; 'I' and the mind are intimately together. But, even though 'I' and the mind are intimately together, remember, 'I am not a *gunaa* of the mind.

"In this context, what is the meaning of the word 'I'? 'I am the *saakshi chaithanyam*. What type of *saakshi chaithanyam*? **Ans:** '*Saakshi chaithanyam* intimately spreading over the mind'. Because 'I' spread over the mind, I am called *chidhaabhaasaa*. But, I am nothing but the *saakshi* obtaining in the mind, only named as *chidhaabhaasaa*. But, who am 'I'? **Ans:** "This *saakshi* only". Even if the mind is not there, 'I' will be there; but, at that time, 'I' will not be named *chidhaabhaasaa*.

"Remember *chidhabhaasaa* is a name of the *saakshi*; do not imagine there is a separate *chidhaabhaasaa* and there is a separate *saakshi*; and, also, that, you have to remove *chidhaabhaasaa* and retain *saakshi*. That is a wrong perception. 'I am called *chidhaabhaasaa*, when 'I am spread over the mind. When I say 'I am aware of the mind', 'I am myself the *saakshi* in the mind 'illuminating' or 'aware of' the mind. We have coined the two words, *chidhaabhaasaa* and *chith* for the sake of transaction. **I am repeatedly stressing this fact**, since some students mistake that they are two separate Consciousnesses, because of which, they struggle to

experience the *saakshi* separately. We should never do that. Whenever I say "I am aware of the mind", 'I' am the *saakshi*, named *chidhaabhaasaa*. And, when the mind resolves also, 'I' continue to be the *saakshi*; but, I will not be named *chidhaabhaasaa*. When the mind comes, 'I' am named *chidhaabhaasaa*. When the mind is not there, 'my' name *chidhaabhaasaa* goes away. Do not imagine two separate types of consciousness, which are not there".

Reverting to the text, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ तत्र - Under this circumstance,

ॐ तयोः जात्रु अहंता रूपयोः - between the *saakshi chaithanyam* and the mind with *vishaya vrutthi*,

ॐ अवभासक अवभास्य संबन्धः (भवति) - there is the relationship of 'revealer-revealed'.

The word '*bhavathi*' is supplied, to split the sentence, for easier comprehension.

'*jnaathru*' means '*saakshi chaithanyam*' and '*ahanthaa*' means 'the mind with *vishaya vrutthi*'. The relationship between the two is '*avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa*' (revealer- revealed relationship) and not '*guna-gunee sambhandhaa*'.

Proceeding:

ॐ (अवभासक अवभास्य संबन्ध) व्यतिरेकेण - Other than this 'revealer- revealed' relationship (between Consciousness and the mind)

ॐ अन्यत् संबन्धान्तरं न उपपद्यते - no other relationship is there.

When Sureswaraachaaryaa says 'there is no other relationship', what he is keeping in mind is, the 'second' relationship discussed in the earlier session, viz., '*upakaaraka-upakaarya sambhandhaa*' or '*apakaaraka-apakaarya sambhandhaa*'. The *Aachaaryaa* avers that, there is only *avabhaasaka-avabhaasya sambhandhaa* (between Consciousness and the mind).

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to verse 60 :

अहंन्तारूपं तु आत्मसात्कृत्वा अहंकञ्चुकं परिधाय उपकार्यत्व उपकारकत्वक्षमः सन् बाह्यविषयेण उपकारिणापकारिणा वात्मात्मीयं संबन्धं प्रतिपद्यते । तदभिधीयते ।

Appropriating the ego to itself and putting on the coat of ego, the Self assumes the forms of the helped and helper. In connection with external objects, favourable and adverse, it attributes to itself, appropriate relations towards them. This is brought out now:

Now, Sureswaraacharya goes to the revelation of the external world.

To recap our recent discussions: "I am the Consciousness / *chaithanyam*; when 'I' talk about any knowledge, emotion etc., 'I' am aware of my mind. And, when 'I' am aware of the mind, I am called *saakshi*; mind is the *avabhaasyam* / the object of illumination. When 'I' thus get associated with the mind, as the 'revealer' of the mind and 'I' am spread over the mind, 'I' am renamed *chidhaabhaasaa*, just as, on a full moon night, sunlight is re-named moonlight. Moonlight is not a new light. Moonlight is only the reflected sunlight. Similarly, 'I' have been re-named *chidhaabhaasaa*.

"And, thereafter, with the help of the mind (as already indicated, 'I' do not require the help of anything, to reveal the mind), i.e. after illumining the mind, when 'I' join the mind (this does not mean the job of 'joining' is explicitly carried out; when 'I' look at the world, I have already joined the mind), and through the mind, when 'I' reveal / experience the external world, the question 'who is experiencing the external world?' arises.

"To this question, the answer can be presented in two ways. One way is "*Saakshi* experiences the mind and *chidhabhaasaa* experiences the world", as though *saakshi* and *chidhabhaasaa* are two separate things. But, the more appropriate way of replying is: "*Saakshi* experiences the mind ; *saakshi* itself, having the status of *chidhabhaasaa* spread over the mind / *saakshi* itself, with the name *chidhabhaasaa*, through the thought spreading over the world, experiences the world".

This is what Sureswaraacharya also says here. He wants to say: "*saakshi*, with the new name *ahamkaaraa*" (as repeatedly seen earlier, as in the example, 'sunlight' is re-named 'moonlight', in a similar manner, *saakshi* is re-named *chidhaabhaasaa* or *ahamkaaraa*, when in association with the mind). And, that idea he presents as "*saakshi* wearing the overcoat called *ahamkaaraa*".

Reverting to the text,

ॐ (साक्षि) तु - Whereas (the Self),

The subject of the sentence 'saakshi' or 'Self' is supplied.

ॐ अहंन्तारूपं आत्मसात् कृत्वा - claiming this *ahamkaaraa* / *chidhaabhaasaa* status as its own,

'Ahanthaaroopam' means 'ahamkaaraa / chidhaabhaasaa status'. 'Aathmasaath kruthvaa' means 'claiming as its own'.

It should be carefully noted and remembered that the *chidhaabhaasaa / ahamkaaraa* status is not assumed by *saakshi*, through undergoing any modification; just as, in the example, when sunlight is re-named moonlight, no modification has taken place.

The very same *saakshi*, taking the status of *chidhaabhaasaa* and owning that status, अहंकञ्चुकं परिधाय - and wearing the cloak of *ahamkaaraa*,

'*Kamchukam*' means 'cloak / overcoat'. The effect of '*Saakshi* wearing the cloak of *ahamkaaraa*' can be compared to a traffic policeman in his mandatory uniform. When the traffic policeman is in his uniform, he wields enormous power, with all the vehicles on the road, implicitly obeying his signals. But, once he removes the uniform and wears a civilian dress, that power is gone. Similarly, once that *ahamkaaraa / chidhaabhaasaa* status is assumed by the *saakshi*, it acquires the capacity to experience the external world. Without wearing the *aham kanchukam / the chidhaabhaasaa* status, it loses that capacity and cannot experience the world. How can this statement / concept be proved? **Ans:** "By contemplating on the *sushupthi* and *jaagrath avasthaa*-s. In *sushupthi*, the mind is resolved, the *saakshi* does not have *chidhaabhaasaa* status and therefore, does not experience the world. In *jaagrath avasthaa*, 'I' have the *chidhaabhaasaa* status. Therefore, 'I' experience the world".

What happens 'after wearing the cloak of *ahamkaaraa*' by *Saakshi*? Sureswaraacharya says "The moment 'I' get the *chidhabhaasaa* status, and 'I' am ready to experience the world as *ahamkaaraa* ('I' am now named *ahamkaaraa*), 'I' become qualified to be a beneficiary of the world or a benefactor of the world".

Once 'I' get the *ahamkaaraa* status, joining the mind, 'I' become either a beneficiary of the world or a benefactor of the world. But, how? How do 'I' become a beneficiary or benefactor of the world? **Ans:** "When favourable and wonderful things happen to 'me', 'I' become a beneficiary. And, when I become a *karthaa* and join the body and do some actions, I become the benefactor of the world".

The *Saakshi*, which has now become the *ahamkaaraa*, becomes either a beneficiary or a benefactor.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya says, that, *saakshi*, after taking the *ahamkaaraa* status: उपकार्यत्व उपकारकत्वक्षमः (भवति) - becomes fit for being a beneficiary or a benefactor of the external world.

In the place of the word '*sar*', in the text, the word '*bhavathi*' can be supplied, as in the previous sentence, to split this long sentence into two smaller sentences for easier comprehension.

'*kshama:*' means 'fit for'. '*Upakaarayathvam*' means 'nature of being a beneficiary' (of the external world) and '*upakaarakathvam*' means 'nature of being a benefactor' (of the external world). All these happen to the *saakshi* only. But, we will have to carefully add the word 'seemingly', because the whole drama is conducted in the *maayaa* or *moolaavidhya* carpet. That is why, as already pointed out, the *Aachaaryaa* started the paragraph, with the adjective '*avidhyotthasya*' to '*antha:karanasya*'. Therefore, *saakshi* is 'seemingly' the beneficiary or *saakshi* is 'seemingly' the benefactor. To borrow from verse 8 of chapter V of the *Bhagavadh Githaa*: '*pasyan srnunvan sprusan jigran api saakshi naiva kinchith karothi* – "Even while seeing, hearing, touching smelling etc. *saakshi* does not do anything at all". In reality, *saakshi* is neither a beneficiary nor a benefactor. Only 'seemingly', it gets the status of '*upakaaryathvam*' (beneficiary status) or '*upakaarakathvam*' (benefactor status).

And, that is why Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa said in his Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram (verse 8) '*viswam pasyathi kaarya kaaranathayaa svasswaami sambhandhatha: sishya aachaaryathayaa thathaa eva pithru puthraaadhyathmanaa bedatha: svapane jaagarathi vaa ya esha purusho maayaa paribrahmitha:* etc." – "He, who is the Purushaa, **under the delusion of maayaa**, sees in himself, the world of cause-effect, diversely related as possessor and possession, as teacher and taught or as father and son, both in the state of waking and dreaming etc." Saakshi becomes pithaa and puthraa | There is a 'beneficiary-benefactor' relationship between them. Saakshi becomes guru: and sishyaa: Between them, 'beneficiary-benefactor' relationship is there. But, all these relationships are only naatakam – drama. All the sambhandhaa-s are mithyaa sambhandhaa: as forcefully conveyed by Sankara Bhagavdha Paadhaa, by the use of the term '*maayaa paribrahmitha:*' – 'under the delusion of maayaa' |

What happens when these mithya sambhandhaa-s come? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:
बाह्य विषयेण - With the external objects,

आत्म आत्मीयं संबन्धं - the relationship of 'aham' (myself, as an individual) and 'mama' (mine)

In this context, '*aathmaa*' means '*aham*', the individual, and not the *sacchidhaananda aathmaa*. '*aathmeeyam*' means '*mama*' or 'mine'.

उपकारिणा (वा) अपकारिणा वा - either as source of *sukham* or as source of *dhu:kham*
'*Upakaari*' means '*sukha pradha:*' / 'source of happiness' / 'positive influence' and '*apakaari*' means '*dhu:kha pradha:*' / 'source of unhappiness' / 'negative influence'.

प्रतिपद्यते - results.

As an example, to a father, the son can become a source of either happiness or unhappiness, depending on the son's character and behaviour and the father's expectations. When the son is a source of happiness and fulfillment for the father, he is an '*upakaari*' to the father. Conversely, when he is a source of unhappiness and dissatisfaction to the father, he is an '*apakaari*' to the father.

The very *saakshi*, which has now become the *ahamkaaraa* and named as *chidhaabhaasaa*, as *chidhabhaasaa* / *ahamkaara*, is 'seemingly' related to the *baahya vishayaa* – external objects. That relationship is called '*aathma-aathmeeyam sambhandham*' by Sureswaraachaaryaa, meaning '*ahamkaara mamakaara sambhandha:*' | '*Aathmaa*' here, means '*aham*'; '*aathmeeyam*' means '*mama*'.

'*Ahamkaara mamakaara sambhandhaa*' is developed; unfortunately, even though it is a *maayaa sambhandhaa*, the human being forgets the fact "I am the *saakshi chaithanyam*, who is only wearing a 'costume' as a father or a mother, for the sake of drama / entertainment".

The 5th capsule of *Vedhaantha* (as enunciated by *Swamiji*) is to be recollected here: "By forgetting my real *saakshi svaroopam*, I convert life into a burden. By remembering 'my' real nature, I convert life into a drama / an entertainment". Due to the 'forgetting' of 'my' real nature, *maayaa* relationships become real and family

relationship becomes *mahaa* real. And, most of the time, one's worries are centered on one's family only, because of forgetting one's *saakshi svaroopam*.

The *Aachaaryaa* concludes this sentence with the averment '*aathma aathmeeyam sambhandham prathipadhyathe*'. The second *sambhandhaa* between *ahamkaaraa* and the world can be looked upon as '*upakaarya – upakaaraka sambhandhaa*' also, as discussed earlier.

Between *saakshi* and mind, there is only one *sambhandhaa*, viz., '*avabhaasaka avabhaasya sambhandhaa*'. But, between *ahamkaara* and the world, there are two *sambhandhaa*-s, (1) '*avabhaasaka avabhasaya sambhandha*' and (2) '*upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandhaa*' or '*aathma aathmeeyam sambhandhaa*'.

तद् अभिधीयते - (Sureswaraachaaryaa says) I want to present that alone in the *slokaa* (that follows).

Chapter III: Verse 60 –

इदं ज्ञानं भवेत्ज्ञातुर्ममज्ञानं तथाहमः ।

अज्ञानोपाधिनेदं स्याद्विक्रियातोऽहमो मम ॥ (६०)

The knowledge of 'This' arises in the knower and the knowledge of 'Mine' arises in the ego. 'This' is a product of ignorance and 'Mine' is a product of the modification of the nature of the ego thereof.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives two technical names for these two types of knowledge that 'I', the *saakshi*, have. The first knowledge is direct knowledge of my own mind, i.e., 'direct awareness of the mind', as *saakshi*. Sureswaraachaaryaa calls this 'mind awareness' that 'I' have, because of 'I', the *saakshi*, directly revealing the mind, as '*idham jnaanam*'. It is a name given by the *Aachaaryaa*.

ॐ इदं ज्ञानं - 'Mind awareness'

ॐ ज्ञातुः भवेत् - is there for the *saakshi* (when *saakshi*, as *saakshi*, reveals the mind).

'*jnaathu:*' means '*saakshina:*' |

To consolidate: When *saakshi*, as *saakshi*, reveals the mind, *saakshi* has got 'mind awareness', which 'awareness' is called '*idham jnaanam*'.

How does one express that '*idham jnaanam*'? Ans: "By saying, 'experientially, I am aware of the mind. I know I have got *raagha dveshaa kaama krodhaa* etc.' When one is distinctly describing the conditions of the mind, one has got 'mind awareness'.

ॐ तथा - In a similar manner,

ॐ अहमः - for the *ahamkaaraa*,

'*Ahama:*' means 'for the *saakshi chaithanyam* which has taken the *chidhaabhaasaa / ahamkaaraa* status upon the mind'.

The parallel in the example will be: "The sunlight itself, which has taken the moonlight status, when it is upon the moon".

What knowledge comes for that *saakshi*, which has taken the *ahamkaaraa* status?
मम ज्ञानं (भवति)- the awareness of the world 'comes'.

Once again, the verb '*bhavathi*', is to be supplied.

The term '*mama jnaanam*', used in the verse, means 'world awareness', in the form of 'my' house / 'my' wife / 'my' children / 'my' grandchildren etc.

'Mind awareness' is '*idham jnaanam*'; 'world awareness' is '*mama jnaanam*'. This is how Sureswaraachaaryaa is differentiating between 'mind awareness' and 'world awareness'.

Hereafter, the *Aachaaryaa* proceeds to talk about the 'medium', in which the 'revelations' are made. He is about to point out: "*Saakshi*, in *ajnaanam* medium, reveals the mind, whereas, *saakshi*, in the mind medium reveals the world".

171: Chapter III, Verses 60 to 62 (30-01-2010)

In this small portion of diversion from the main topic, Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about two types of *anaathmaa*, in the form of (i) the mind and (ii) the external world. Mind is *anaathmaa*, having all the five features of *anaathmaa*, viz., *dhrusyathvam*, *baudhikathvam*, *sagunathvam*, *savikaarathvam* and *aagamaapaayithvam*. The world is also *anaathmaa*, having the same five features of *anaathmaa*; still, because of the unique status of the mind and the unique subtle nature of the mind, there is a difference between the mind *anaathmaa* and the world *anaathmaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting that difference alone in these three verses, which we saw as five points at the commencement of this topic.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is developing that topic, viz., the difference, in these three verses. In this verse (verse 60), he is showing that mind is first directly illumined by the Consciousness and the world is illumined later. We get the awareness of the mind first, before getting the awareness of the world. We can never get the awareness of the world, without getting the awareness of the mind first.

In the *sushupthi avasthaa*, we have neither mind awareness nor world awareness. Only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, both of them arise.

And, if you study how both of them arise, they do not arise simultaneously; we should have mind awareness first, which is accomplished by the direct illumination of the mind, by the *saakshi*, in the medium of *ajnaanam* or *kaarana sareeram*. The necessity to have this medium of *ajnaanam* for 'mind awareness' is because mind belongs to *sookshma sareeram* and *sookshma sareeram* can be reached only through *kaarana sareeram*. *Saakshi* can reach the *sookshma sareeram* only through *kaarana sareeram*; *kaarana sareeram* is called *ajaana upaadhi* or *moolaavidhyaa* medium. Only through the *kaarana sareeram* or only in the medium of *ajnaanam*, *saakshi* can illumine the mind. And, at that time of illumination, 'mind-awareness' is formed, which 'awareness', Sureswaraachaaryaa calls '*idham-jnanam*'.

Thereafter, i.e. after getting the 'mind awareness', which Sureswaraachaaryaa calls '*idham jnaanam*', *saakshi* puts on the mind as an overcoat (as it were) and becomes the 'revealer' of the external world, resulting in 'world-awareness'. Sureswaraachaaryaa calls 'world-awareness' as "*mama-jnanam*". And, only when

saakshi gets the status of *ahamkaaraa*, the '*mama-jnaanam*' arises. In contrast to *mamakaaraa*, 'I' am *ahamkaaraa*.

But, all these happen only after putting on the overcoat of the mind. There is a significance behind Sureswaraachaaryaa talking about mind-awareness as '*idham-jnaanam*', rather than as '*aham-jnaanam*'. Some students might have been wondering on this, i.e., as to why the *Aaachaaryaa* should call 'mind-awareness' as '*idham-jnaanam*' and not '*aham-jnaanam*'. The reason is this: "At the time when the 'mind-awareness' takes place, mind continues to be an 'object' of awareness, as 'this'. To indicate this fact, that, mind is an 'object' of awareness, he uses the term '*idham-jnaanam*'. And, *after* knowing the mind as an object, only when the mind is put on, as an overcoat, only as the second step, the 'mind-awareness' gets converted into 'I awareness'".

To repeat: 'Mind-awareness' is '*idham-jnaanam*'; that is the first step. Thereafter, in the second step, mind is put on, as the overcoat, by the *saakshi*; after putting on the mind as the overcoat, then alone, the *idham-jnaanam* (mind-awareness) is called 'I-awareness' or *ahamkaaraa*. In other words, a person talks about 'I-awareness', only after putting on the mind cloak. In the *sushupthi avasthaa*, when the mind cloak is set aside, there is no question of 'I-awareness'. It is not there.

Therefore, the first step is *idham-jnaanam*; after 'putting on' the mind as cloak, comes 'I-awareness', which alone is called *ahamkaaraa*. To repeat again (for emphasis): 'mind-awareness' is *idham-jnaanam*; after putting on the mind as cloak, the *idham-jnaanam* itself will be re-named *aham-jnaanam*.

As may be recollected, 'spectacles' has been quoted as an example for this, in earlier contexts. When I take my spectacles from its case and just look at the spectacles, before putting it on, it is only an 'object' of my awareness; at that time, it deserves the pronoun '*this*' and is referred to as '*this* spectacles'; it is not included in the word I. In '*this* spectacles' knowledge, the spectacles is not included in I. But, when I put on the spectacles for the purpose of viewing things clearly, the spectacles is no more '*this*'; it is part of 'me'. Once I put on the spectacles, it has lost the status of '*this*'; it is part of 'me' and, thereafter, can be included in the word I.

Therefore, the first stage is '*idham-jnaanam*'. Then, after putting on the mind cloak, the very '*idham-jnaanam*' becomes '*aham-jnaanam*'. And, once the 'mind-awareness'

has been converted into I, the *ahamkaara* awareness, the world comes in front of me and is 'awared'. That is what Sureswaraachaaryaa says in this verse. He uses the term '*idham-jnaanam*' for 'mind-awareness', which takes place to the *saakshi* first; later, 'world awareness', which Sureswaraachaarya calls '*mama-jnaanam*' takes place to the *saakshi* itself, after the *saakshi* has acquired *ahamkaara* status. This is the idea of the *slokaa*.

The first line of the verse was seen in the earlier session. To recap the first line:

ॐ *Jnaathu:* - For *jnaathaa*, the *saakshi*

ॐ *Idham-jnaanam bhaveth* - 'mind-awareness' arises.

'Mind-awareness' means 'awareness of the mind'. For the *saakshi*, 'mind-awareness' takes place in the beginning, in the form of '*idham-jnaanam*'. The term '*idham-jnaanam*' is a compound word, preferably with a hyphen between '*idham*' and '*jnaanam*', which is missing in the text. The word is *karmadhaaraya samaasam* (of *Sanskrit* grammar), derived as '*idham ithi jnaanam*' = '*idham jnaanam*'.

ॐ *Thathaa* – (Thereafter / in the second stage). In a similar manner,

ॐ *Ahama:* - for the *saakshi* itself, which has taken the *ahamkaara* status,

ॐ *Mama jnaanam (bhaveth)* - 'world-awareness' in the form of '*mama-jnaanam*' (in the form of 'mine' knowledge) arises.

The verb '*bhaveth*' is supplied. The term '*mama-jnaanam*' is also *karmadhaaraya samaasam*, derived as '*mama ithi jnaanam*' = '*mama-jnaanam*'. And, what do you mean by '*mama-jnaanam*'? **Ans:** "The 'awareness' is in the forms 'this is my son / my daughter / my wife / my house / my car / my key / my book' etc".

For whom does this '*mama-jnaanam*' arise? The *Aachaaryaa* says '*ahama:*' meaning 'for the *saakshi* itself, which has now taken *ahamkaara* status, with mind overcoat. '*Ahama:*' means '*ahamkaara roopa saakshina:*' |

After having said this in the first line, the *Aachaaryaa* talks about the mediums in which, the two types of 'awareness' arise, in the second line of the verse:

ॐ इदं स्यात् - (Of these two types of knowledge), '*idham-jnaanam*' for the *saakshi* takes place,

Sureswaraacharya's expression is terse. The word '*idham*' (in the second line of the verse) should be understood as '*idham-jnaanam*' i.e. 'mind-awareness'.

ॐ अज्ञान उपाधिना - through the medium of *ajnaanam*.

The essence of the statement: "'Mind-awareness' takes place for the *saakshi*, through the medium of *ajnaanam* or *kaarana sareeram* or *moolaavidhyaa*". To elaborate: As already pointed out, *sookshma sareeram* can be 'seen' by *saakshi*, only through *kaarana sareeram*, since *kaarana sareeram* is 'interior' to *sookshma sareeram*. This can be understood by visualizing 'I', the *saakshi*, as wearing the *kaarana sareeram* as a vest, the *sookshma sareeram* as a shirt and the *sthoola sareeram* as a coat. Therefore, *saakshi* can 'reach' the *sookshma sareeram* only through *kaarana sareeram*; and, likewise, *saakshi* can 'reach' the *sthoola sareeram* through *sookshma sareeram* alone. Through *kaarana sareeram* alone, awareness can reach *sookshma sareeram*. Through *sookshma sareeram* alone, awareness can reach *sthoola sareeram*. And, only thereafter, is the 'awareness' of the world. Keeping these in mind, the *Aacharya* says "*ajnaana upaadhinaa idham syaath*".

Thereafter:

ॐ मम (स्यात्) - The *mama-jnaanam* or 'world awareness' can be there

Once again a terse term is used by Sureswaraacharya. The word '*mama*' means '*mama-jnaanam*'.

ॐ अहम्: - for the *saakshi*, which is in the form of *ahamkaaraa*, '*ahama:*' (as before) means '*ahamkaara roopa saakshina:*' |

Also, this 'world awareness', in the form of '*mama-jnaanam*' can take place for the *saakshi*, which is in the form of *ahamkaaraa*, only through thought modifications. That is being said:

ॐ विक्रियात : - only through thought modifications.

'*Vikriyaatha:*' here means 'through thought modifications'. That, in turn, means: "Thoughts become the medium for the *saakshi* to know the world". *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* devotes a full chapter in his treatise '*Upadesa Saahasri*' to

convey this same idea very eloquently. As pointed out earlier, this treatise of Sureswaraachaaryaa, *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, is heavily based on the *Upadesa Saahasri* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*. In that treatise, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, in a chapter titled '*budhyarooda prakaranam*', picturesquely avers: "To observe the world, the world has to be mounted on the frame 'mind'".

Only when the world is mounted on the 'mind' frame, you can see the world; somewhat similar to doctors mounting the X-rayed pictures, on a lighted frame, for reading them clearly. *Saakshi* has to mount the whole world on the 'mind' frame and then only 'world experience' is possible. The objective world can be never be experienced unless it is mounted on the frame called mind. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says '*vikriyaatha*:' meaning 'through thought modifications'.

Incidentally, all these were covered by the 'five' points, discussed in the 'introduction' given before commencing this topic, in the text.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 61:

"एकस्यैव ज्ञातुः अन्तर्बाह्यनिमित्तभेदात् अभिन्नेऽपि विषय इदं ममेति ज्ञानं द्वैरूप्यं जायत" इत्युक्तम् । अत्र उपक्रियमाण अपक्रियमाणस्यैव ज्ञातुर्विषये ममप्रत्ययो भवति विपर्यये चेदंप्रत्यय इति कथमवगम्यते । अवगम्यतामन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम् । तत्कथमित्याह ।

In the same knower, two units of knowledge with regard to the object arise as 'This' and as 'mine', owing to the differences of causes internal and external. The object is known as 'Mine', in relation to the knower, supposed to be helped or injured by the object. In the absence of that relation of help or injury, it is simply felt as 'This'. How is this construed? It is construed by rational discrimination. It is this way:

Sureswaraachaaryaa is coming to the fourth point (among the five points) that was discussed during the introduction to these three verses; that fourth point being : "In the case of 'mind awareness', there is only one *sambhandhaa* between mind and *saakshi*, viz., *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* | In the case of world awareness, there are two *sambhandhaa*-s, between world and *saakshi* (in *chidhaabhaasaa* or *ahamkaaraa* form), viz., (1) *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* and (2) either *upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*'. The second *sambhandhaa*, viz., '*upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*' can be combined and jointly referred to, as *kaarya-kaaraka sambhandhaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is raising the questions as to why we insist that the 'world awareness' should have two *sambhandhaa*-s; i.e., why do we insist upon *kaarya-kaaraka sambhandhaa* also, in the case of world awareness, while we say that such a *sambhandhaa* is not required in the case of 'mind awareness'; in other words, the questions are: "Why do you insist that *kaarya-kaaraka sambhandhaa* is additionally required for 'world-awareness'? Why do you say *kaarya-kaaraka sambhandhaa* is *not* required in the case of 'mind awareness'?" The *Aachaaryaa* himself raises these questions and he wants to prove these views, by *anvayavyathirekhaa* logic. And, before asking the questions, the *Aachaaryaa* presents what had been discussed about the two types of 'awareness' in a consolidated form, in one sentence.

ॐ विषये अभिन्ने अपि - "Even though the 'mind' and the 'world' are both *anaathmaa* only / even though both 'mind' and 'world' enjoy the same *anaathmaa* status only,

ॐ एकस्य एव ज्ञातु : - for the one and the same *saakshi*

ॐ द्वैरूप्यं ज्ञानं जायते - two types of 'awareness' take place,

In what forms?

ॐ इदं मम इति - in the form of *idham-jnaanam* and in the form of *mama-jnaanam*,

This is only a repetition of what had already been discussed, viz., "two types of awareness take place for the *saakshi*, one awareness in the form of '*idham-jnaanam*' and another awareness in the form of '*mama-jnaanam*', first one with regard to the mind and the second one with regard to the world. This difference is there, even though both of them happen to be same *anaathmaa* only".

And, what is the reason given? The reason is:

ॐ अन्तर् बाह्य निमित्त भेदात् - because the mind happens to be within the body (*antha:*) i.e. closer to *saakshi* (as it were), and the world happens to be outside the body (*baahyam*)".

Because of the internality of the mind there is '*idham-jnaam*' of the mind and because of the externality of the world, there is '*mama-jnaanam*' of the world, even though *saakshi* is one.

ॐ इति उक्तम् - (*Aachaaryaa* says) "This has been said by me (in the previous paragraph)".

Now, he raises the questions (referred to earlier):

ॐ अत्र - This being so,

ॐ "विषये - "With regard to the external world,

ॐ ममप्रत्ययः भवति - '*mama-jnaanam*' is possible

ॐ ज्ञातुः - for the *saakshi*,

ॐ उपक्रियमाण अपक्रियमाणस्य एव - only when there is additional relationship of *kaarya-kaaraka sambhandhaa*;

'*Upakriyamaana apakriyamaanasya eva*' has to be understood as 'only when there is an additional relationship in the form of *upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa*'. The *Aachaaryaa* does not mention this in explicit form. He conveys the concept in an indirect form, by giving the adjective '*upakriyamaana apakriyamaanasya*' to '*jnaathu:*' | '*Jnaatha*' means '*saakshi*', in this context. '*Jnaathu:*' is the '*shashti vibhakthi*' form of '*jnaatha*'; the compound term '*upakriyamaana apakriyamaanasya*' is also the same '*shashti vibhakthi*' and is used as adjective to '*Jnaathu:*' Through the use of this adjective, *Sureswaraachaaryaa* implicitly conveys the idea that the additional relationship of *kaarya karaka sambhandhaa* (between the world and *saakshi*) is required for '*mama-jnaanam*'. He asserts "This is what my thesis is", by further stressing:

ॐ विपर्यये च - otherwise, i.e., if that additional *sambhandhaa* is not there

ॐ इदं प्रत्ययः (एव भवति) " - the 'awareness' will be only '*idham-jnaanam*' and not '*mama-jnaanam*'".

'*Viparyaye cha*' means 'otherwise'. What does 'otherwise' mean here ? **Ans:** "If that additional *sambhandhaa* is not there". If the second *sambhandhaa* is not there, it

means there is only one *sambhandhaa*. And, what is that one *sambhandhaa*? **Ans:** '*avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa*'.

To condense and simplify this sentence, with its implication: "'*mama- jnaanam*' requires two *sambhandhaa-s* ; '*idham-jnaanam*' requires only one *sambhandhaa*".

Having made the statement, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks:

इति कथं अवगम्यते - How can we logically arrive at this conclusion?

The concept, viz., "'*mama- jnaanam*' requires two *sambhandhaa-s*; '*idham-jnaanam*' requires only one *sambhandhaa*" is so subtle, that even its mere comprehension is difficult. Now, *Aachaaryaa* wants to discuss "What is the logic to say this? How is this known? What is the source for such a perspective?" (which discussion is bound to be more involved).

He answers:

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम् अवगम्यताम् - It can be easily understood through *anvaya* and *vyathirekhaa*.

Then, naturally the student's question will be: " Just by your saying '*anvaya-vyathirekhaa*', how do I understand? You have to tell me how *anvayavyathirekhaa* reasoning must be employed, to know this fact, that *idham-jnaanam* requires one *sambhandhaa* and *mama- jnaanam* requires two *sambhandhaa-s*."

The *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ तत् क्तं इति आह - I will tell you how.

What Sureswaraachaaryaa is going to use are: (i) *jaagrath avasthaa*, where both *aham- jnaanam* and *mama-jnaanam* are present and (ii) *sushupthi avasthaa*, in which neither *aham- jnaanam* nor *mama- jnaanam* is there . That is going to be the study.

Chapter III: Verse 61 –

अनुपक्रियमाणत्वान्न जातुः स्यादहं मम ।

घटादिवदिदं तु स्यान्मोहमात्रव्यपाश्रयात् ॥ ६१ ॥

The ego never presents itself as 'Mine' to the knower, for the pure knower is neither helped nor injured by anything. Since he is covered by ignorance only, it appears as 'This'.

The *Aachaaryaa* says that the *jaagrath avasthaa* can be taken as a case study, to show that the *ajnaanam* medium is actively there and mind medium is also actively there, and we find *idham-jnaanam* taking place in the *ajnaanam* medium and we can see *mama-jnaanam* taking place in the mind medium, with regard to the world. And, we can also clearly experience, that, with regard to the mind, there is only one *sambhandhaa* and we can clearly see that, with regard to the world, two *sambhandhaa*-s are there. All these are *prathyaksha anubhavaa* in *jaagrath avasthaa*.

It was said, that, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, *ajnaanam* medium is active. How do you say that *ajnaanam* medium is active? **Ans:** "In *jaagrath avasthaa*, we clearly say 'I do not know that I am *saakshi*'. This *aathma ajnaanam* is explicit and evident in *jaagrath avasthaa*. Therefore, active *ajnaanam* or active *kaarana sareeram* is available in *jaagrath avasthaa*".

Later, the *Aachaaryaa* is going to say "in *sushupthi*, *ajnaanam* is passive i.e. *kaarana sareeram* is inactive". This is because, at the time of sleep, one does not say "I do not know I am *aathmaa*". Such a statement cannot be made by any one in deep sleep. In other words, ignorance is not expressed in *sushupthi avasthaa*.

To sum up: Active *ajnaanam* is present in *jaagrath avasthaa*; active *ajnaanam* is absent in *sushupthi avasthaa*. The *Aachaaryaa* will be presenting this fundamental point.

Now, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, there is active *ajnaanam*. And:

ॐ अनुपक्रियमाणत्वात् - Since the mind does not add any positive value or negative value to the *saakshi*,

What does this statement "since the mind does not add any positive value to the *saakshi* or negative value to the *saakshi*" mean ? **Ans:** "Mind does not give

happiness or unhappiness to the *saakshi* itself. That, in turn, means there is no *upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka sambhandhaa* between the *saakshi* and mind". We experience this fact in *jaagrath avasthaa*. To repeat: '*Anukakriyamaanathvaath*' means "since we do not experience any positive benefit to the *saakshi* or any negative harm to the *saakshi* from the mind". Mind does not do any good to the *saakshi*; mind does not do any harm to the *saakshi*. Therefore, what relationship is there? **Ans:** "Only one relationship, viz., *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka* relationship". *Upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* is not there. But, on what is this conclusion based on? **Ans:** "Our own *anubhavaa* only".

Therefore:

ॐ अहं - the 'mind awareness'

ॐ जातु: - of the *saakshi*,

In this context, the word '*aham*' refers to the 'mind awareness' or *ahamkaaraa* awareness. (At the moment, we are not getting into the logic behind this statement. The statement is to be taken by the student, on face value))

ॐ मम न स्यात् - will not come under '*mama-jnaanam*,

Since *upakaarya-upakaaraka sambhandhaa* is not there between the mind and the *saakshi*, the 'mind awareness' for the *saakshi* will not come under *mama-jnaanam*. Expressed in a marginally different manner, since mind does not do any *upakaaraa* or *apakaaraa* to the *saakshi*, 'mind awareness' for the *saakshi*, will not come under *mama-jnaanam*.

ॐ गटादिवत् - as it happens in the case of a pot.

With regard to the objective world ('pot' is representative of the objective world), '*upakaaraka upakaarya sambhandhaa*' comes, whereas, when there is 'mind-awareness' rising, '*upakaaraka upakaarya sambhandhaa*' does not happen, unlike in the case of the 'pot' (objective world). Therefore it ('mind-awareness') is not '*mama-jnaanam*'. That is the reason, why 'mind' is always referred to, as 'I'. Rarely does anybody refer to the mind as '*mama*' / 'mine'. We refer to the mind mostly as 'I' only. When emotional turbulence is there, nobody says "my mind has got emotional problems"; instead, the tendency is to say "I am emotionally disturbed".

'Mind' is referred to only as 'I' and not '*mama*', because mind is neither *upakaarakam* nor *apakaarakam* to the *saakshi*.

So, What is the *anvayaa*? **Ans:** "*Anupakriyamaanathvaath 'aham' jnaathu: 'mama' na syaath ghataadhivath*" – "Since mind does not add any positive or negative value to the *saakshi*, 'mind-awareness' of the *saakshi* will not come under '*mama-jnaanam*', unlike awareness of objects like a pot".

In that case, what will be that knowledge? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

तु इदं स्यात् - On the other hand, 'mind-awareness' will be only '*idham-jnaanam*,

Based on what ?

ॐ मोह मात्र व्यापाश्रयात् - which is based on the medium of *ajnaanam* only.

'*Moha:*' means *ajnaanam* / *ajnaana upaadhi* / *kaarana sareera upaadhi* / *moolaavidhyaa upaadhi* / *mayaa upaadhi*.

And, therefore, what? **Ans:** "Only one relationship is there, viz., *avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa*." This is based on our own experience in *jaagrath avasthaa*. This is *anvayaa* reasoning.

Hereafter, the *Aachaaryaa* will give *vyathirekhaa* reasoning, pointing out: "In *sushupthi*, we do not find either happening".

He gives the introduction.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 62:

मोहतत्कार्याश्रयत्वत् जातृत्वविक्रिययोः पूर्वत्रेदंममज्ञानान्वयः प्रदर्शितः । अथाधुना तद्व्यतिरेकेण व्यतिरेकप्रदर्शनार्थमाह ।

It was shown earlier that the knower and the ego, owing to the ignorance and the resulting modifications came to be associated with 'This' and 'mine' respectively, in their knowledge. Now the contrary is pointed out:

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa first points out : "Of the *anvaya-vyathirekhaa* reasoning promised by me, I have given the *anvayaa* argument in the previous *slokaa*, namely,

that, in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, we have got (i) 'mind-awareness' and only one relationship and (ii) 'world-awareness' and two relationships".

ॐ पूर्वत्र - In the earlier *slokaa* (*slokaa* 60),

ॐ इदं मम ज्ञान अन्वयः प्रदर्शितः - I have shown the presence of '*idham-jnaanam*' and '*mama jnaanam*',

Of the two, '*idham-jnaanam*' is with regard to 'mind-awareness' and '*mama-jnaanam*' is with regard to 'world-awareness'.

ॐ जातृत्व विक्रिययोः - for the *saakshi* and *ahamkaaraa* (respectively),

ॐ मोह तत्कार्य आश्रयत्व - based on *ajnaanam* medium and mind medium (respectively).

'*Moham*' means '*ajnaanam*'; '*thath kaaryam*' means 'mind'; mind is a product of *moolaavidhya* and therefore, *Aachaaryaa* refers to it, as '*moha kaaryam*'.

(The students should note that the essence of this sentence, is the second point out of the five points discussed while introducing the three verses, under study.)

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "This has been shown". This is the *anvayaa* argument, based on *jaagrath avasthaa* experience.

ॐ अत अधुना - Hereafter,

ॐ व्यतिरेक प्रदर्शनार्थ - to show that both '*idham-jnaanam*' and '*mama - jnaanam*' become absent,

ॐ तद् व्यतिरेकेण - in the absence of these two relationships (viz., *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* and *kaarya karaka sambhandhaa*),

ॐ आह - the following verse is given.

When both *avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* and *kaarya kaaraka sambhandhaa* are absent, what will you find? **Ans:** "We find both '*idham-jnaanam*' and '*mama jnaanam*' becoming absent".

"When two *sambhandhaa*-s are there, two *jnaanam*-s are there" is *anvayaa* argument. "When two *sambhandhaa*-s are absent, both *jnaanam*-s are absent" is the *vyathirekhaa* reasoning. 'Two *sambhandhaa*-s' refer to (i) *avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* and (ii) *upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandha*. 'Two *jnaanam*-s' refer to '*idham-jnaanam*' and '*mama jnaanam*'.

"*Sambhandhadvaya sathve jnaana dvaya sathvam ; sambhandhadvaya abhaave jnaana dvaya abhaava.*" | '*Sambhandhadvaya sathve jnaana dvaya sathvam*' is *anvayaa* reasoning. '*Sambhandha dvaya abhaave jnaana dvaya abhaava.*' is *vyathirekhaa* argument. "*Thasmaath sambhandhadvayam eva jnaanadvayasya kaaranam bhavathi*". A simple analogy for this : 'When sugar is added, milk is sweet'; this is 'co-presence' argument. And, 'without sugar, milk is not sweet' is 'co-absence' argument. The conclusion: Sugar is the cause of sweetness in the milk".

That is the idea that is going to be told through *sushupthi* experience in the *slokaa*.

Chapter III: Verse 62 –

विक्रियाज्ञानशून्यत्वान्नेदं न च ममात्मनः ।

उत्थितस्य सतोऽज्ञानं नाहमज्ञासिषं यतः ॥ ६२ ॥

In sleep, as the Self is without ignorance and modifications, there is neither 'This' nor 'Mine'. After one wakes up, he reasons out the presence of ignorance on the basis of the fact that he knew nothing in that state.

Now to show the co-absence of the two pairs, Sureswaraachaaryaa is taking the deep-sleep state as the case study.

In deep-sleep state, there is no *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* between the *saakshi* and mind. Why? **Ans:** "The reason is obvious and simple. In *sushupthi*, mind itself is resolved; and, when something is resolved, it is as good as non-existent. For example, when a person dies, it cannot be said that that person is potentially existent. Nobody will say: 'I do not grieve, because, after all, that person is potentially existent'. Even though the dead person's body is there, in the form of *pancha boothaa*, if the question 'Does he exist?' is raised, the obvious answer is 'No, He does not; he is not there'. Similarly, in *sushupthi*, mind is resolved into *kaarana sareera avasthaa*; therefore, mind itself is absent. While it is so, where is the question of *avabhaasya avabhaasakna sambhandhaa* between *saakshi* and mind?"

And, because of what reason, does this happen? **Ans:** "Because *ajnaanam* itself is in a passive state; *ajnaana kaarana sareeram* itself is in a passive state". What does this mean? **Ans:** "It is not active enough to project the mind. In *sushupthi*, *kaarana sareeram* is not active enough to activate the mind".

Therefore, *ajnaanam* is also as good as absent, since, non-functioning *ajnaanam* is as good as non-existing *ajnaanam*. Again an analogy : "Suppose you have got money in the form of bank deposits; but, it is not available for drawing, because of some reason or other; assume it is 'frozen'; under this circumstance, even though the money is in your account, for all practical purposes, you do not have money". In a similar manner, in *sushupthi*, *ajnaanam* is inactive; therefore it is as good as absent. "It is as good as absent" is the right usage; 'It is resolved' is not the right usage.

Ajnaanam is inactive; it is as good as absent. Therefore, *mind* is resolved. Therefore, there is no *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* between *saakshi* and mind. Therefore, *sambhandhaa* no. 1 (of the two *sambhandhaa*-s) is gone. Then, what about *sambhandhaa* no. 2? Is there *upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandha* between *saakshi* and the world? **Ans:** "It is not there. That *sambhandhaa* is also absent. In *sushupthi*, world is not experienced at all. Where is the question of it giving harm or benefit to *ahamkaaraa*?"

Therefore, Sureswaraachaarya also says both the *sambhandhaa*-s are absent. What is the result? **Ans:** There is neither *idham jnaanam* in the form of mind-awareness; since *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka sambhandhaa* is not there (*avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandasya abhaavath*) ; there is no *mama jnaanam* with regard to the world also. Why? **Ans:** "*Upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandha abhaavath*". Therefore, you find the absence of both pairs in *sushupthi*.

So, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ (सुषुप्तौ) - (In *sushupthi*)

This condition, viz., '*Sushupthau*' is supplied.

ॐ विक्रिया अज्ञान शून्यत्वात् - because of the absence of mental modifications and of active ignorance,

'*vikriyaa*' means 'the modifying mind' or 'mental modifications' ; '*ajnaanam*', in this context, means 'active ignorance' or 'active *karana sareeram*'. '*soonyathvam*' means 'absence'. '*Vikriyaaa ajnaana soonyathvaath*', therefore, means 'because of the absence of functioning mind and active *kaarana sareeram*'. And, this should be understood as 'because of the absence of '*avabhaasya avabhaasaka sambhandhaa*' and '*upakaarya upakaaraka sambhandhaa*'.

आत्मनः - for the *saakshi*,

न इदं - there is no '*idham-jnaanam*';

न च मम - nor is there the *mama-jnaanam* .

'*Na idham na cha mama*' means 'neither *idham-jnaanam* nor *mama-jnaanam*'. Because of the absence of active ignorance and functioning mind there is neither *idham-jnaanam* nor *mama-jnaanam*. There is neither *sambhandha dvayam* nor *jnaana dvayam* in *sushupthi*.

If at all you talk about *idham-jnaanam* in *sushupthi*, you do that that only after waking up.

After waking up, you talk about *idham-jnaanam* and *mama-jnaanam*; but, by the time you wake up, *ajnaanam* and functioning mind have become active.

In *jaagrath avasthaa*, the two will be there. In *sushupthi*, both are absent.

172: Chapter III, Verses 62 to 64 (06-02-2010)

In these three verses (verses 60, 61 and 62), Sureswaraacharya is dealing with the topic of the internal difference existing between two types of *anaathmaa*. This is a diversion topic, the main topic being the difference between *anaathmaa* and *aathmaa*. The diversion topic is to point out, that, within *anaathmaa* itself, there are two types of *anaathmaa* and, that, those two are (i) the mind and (ii) the external world.

We have to differentiate these two *anaathmaa*-s, because *saakshi's* / *aathmaa's* 'awareness' of these two *anaathmaa*-s, take place in two different ways.

Saakshi's awareness of the mind / the 'mind-awareness' caused by *Saakshi*, is a direct phenomenon, which takes place in the medium of *kaarana sareeram* or *ajnaanam*. And, therefore, the first thing that I am aware of, is my mind only. In the field of *kaarana sareeram* or *ajnaanam*, the first thing that I become aware of, is 'mind'. The 'mind-awareness' takes place first, which awareness, Sureswaraacharya calls '*idham-jnaanam*'.

And, instantaneously after the mind-awareness, so instantaneously, that I do not even notice the time-gap, I look upon the mind as 'myself'. I become aware of the mind and instantaneously, the very same mind is superimposed on myself; the *idham* mind becomes *aham* mind. The transition between *idham* and *aham* is so instantaneous, that I cannot even know the gap. For instance, I become aware of 'my' happiness; but, the very next moment I say "*I* am happy". If and when I say "I am aware of my happiness", 'happiness' is an object of experience and, at that time, it is '*idham-jnaanam*'. When I am aware of the *priya- modha- pramodha-vrutthi* in the mind, at the time of the awareness of the happiness, that experiential happiness is '*idham-jnaanam*' only; but, instantaneously, instead of saying "I am aware of happiness", I throw the happiness on myself and I say "I am happy". When I thus say "*I* am happy", I have put the mind on as a *kanchukam* and 'I', the *saakshi*, become *ahamkaaraa*.

To repeat: In the statement "I know happiness", the 'awareness' is '*idham-jnaam*'; the next moment, when I say " I am happy", 'I', the *saakshi*, have become *ahamkaaraa*, putting on the mind as an overcoat / *kanchukam*.

Again: In "I am aware of happiness", I am *saakshi* ; in "I am happy", I have become *ahamkaaraa*. The difference is to be perceived carefully.

Not only *dharmi adhyaasaa* has taken place; *dharma adhyaasaa* also has taken place simultaneously. Thus the mind-*sambhandhaa* converts "'me', the *saakshi*", into "'me', the *ahamkaaraa*".

And, before the mind-*sambhandhaa* takes place and before "'I', the *saakshi*" 'become' "'I', the *ahamkaaraa*", the *sambhandhaa* between 'me' and the mind is *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa*; and, at that time, the mind does not make any value addition to 'me', the *saakshi*.

When 'I' and the mind have *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa*, the emotions of the mind can never make a positive addition to 'me'; nor can it cause anything negative. Emotional disturbances cannot disturb 'me', the *saakshi*. Emotional excitements also cannot add anything positive to 'me'. Thus, when there is 'mind-awareness' / when only *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa* is there; *saakshi* can neither be improved by the superior thoughts of the mind; nor can it be degraded by the inferior thoughts of the mind. At the time of *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa*, there is no *upakaarya-upakaaraka-sambhandhaa*. *Upakaarya-upakaaraka-sambhandhaa* is absent, because mind cannot do any *upakaaraa* to 'me', the *saakshi*; mind cannot do any *apakaaraa* also to 'me', the *saakshi*, because *saakshi*, like *aakaasaa* , is *asangha*:| As the famous verses (*Nirvaana shadgam*) of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* declare "*chidhaanandharoopa: sivoam*".

When the mind is an 'object', there is only *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa*; there is no *upakaarya-upakaaraka-sambhandhaa*. 'I' remain as the *asangha Saakshi*. But, the moment 'I' 'join' the mind, which 'joining' is, in reality, an *adhyaasa sambhandha*; 'I' come down to the lower level of *ahamkaaraa*. | Why is it called *adhyaasa sambhandhaa*? **Ans:** "Because 'I' cannot *actually* 'join' the mind, since mind and 'I' (the *aathmaa*), are of two different orders of reality and also since one of the two, viz., the *aathmaa*, is *asangham*". No *real sambhandhaa* between the two is possible; therefore, it is said, 'I' 'join' the mind, through a *sambhandhaa* called

sathya-anritha-mithunikarana-sambhandha: or *adhyaasa-adhishtaana-sambhandha*:| Just as the 'waker' 'joins' the false dream body, 'I', the *sathya saakshi*, join the *mithyaa* mind; and, by joining the *mithyaa* mind, 'I' have come down to the lower level of *ahamkaaraa*. I have taken an *avathaaram*, as it were.

Therefore, when *saakshi* joins the *mithyaa* mind and takes the role of *ahamkaaraa*, *saakshi's ahamkaaraa* is a 'descent' from *paaramaarthika sathyam* to *vyaavahaarika sathyam*.

And, after that 'descent', the *paaramaarthika saakshi* itself, as the *vyavahaarika ahamkaaraa*, reveals the universe. And, when the world is revealed, there is not only *avabhaasya-avabhaasaka-sambhandhaa* ; but, there is *upakaarya-upakaaraka-sambhandhaa* also, and then, arises '*mama-jnaanam*', in the form, 'my' world , 'my' family, 'my' husband / wife, 'my' children etc.

Thus, what is the *Aachaaryaa's* thesis? Ans: "*Yathra yathra sambhandhadvayam thathra thathra jnaanadvayam; sambhandha dvaya sathve jnaanadvaya sathvam; sambhandha dvaya abhaave jnaanadvaya abhaava:*" |

Sureswaraachaaryaa proves this thesis through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* argument, using the two states of '*jaagrath*' and '*sushupthi*', by pointing out, "*jaagrath avasthaayam sambhandha dvaya sathvam, jnaana dvaya sathvam cha | Sushupthi avasthaayam sambhandha dvaya abhaava:, jnaana dvaya abhaava: cha|*"

As a reminder: What are the two *sambhandhaa-s*? **Ans:** "*Avabhaasya-avabhaaska-sambhandhaa* is one and *upakaarya-upakaaraka* or *apakaarya-apakaaraka-sambhandhaa* is the second". And, what are the two *jnaanam-s*? **Ans:** "*Idham-jnaanam* with regard to the mind and '*mama-jnaanam*', with regard to the world".

Reverting to the text: *slokaa* 62 is the concluding *slokaa* of the diversion topic. From the next *slokaa*, Sureswaraachaarya goes back to his main discussion.

In the previous session, the study of the first line of the verse was concluded. To re-cap that study:

ॐ विक्रिय अज्ञान शून्यत्वात् - Because of absence of thought modifications and active
ajnaanam,

ॐ न इत्म् - there is no *idham-jnaanam* or 'mind awareness'

ॐ न च मम - and, there is no *mama-jnaanam* or 'world awareness' also,

ॐ आत्मनः - for the *saakshi*.

In the *sushupthi avasthaa*, the 'active *ajnaanam*' is absent. What is the definition of 'active *ajnaanam*'? **Ans:** "Active *ajnaanam*' is that, in which mind is projected". In *sushupthi avasthaa*, *ajnaanam* is inactive and mind is resolved. Since the 'active *ajnaanam*' is not there (or to express in positive language 'since *ajnaanam* is passive'), the mind and thoughts are also resolved; when the mind and thoughts are thus resolved in the *sushupthi avasthaa*, there is neither the 'mind-awareness' nor the 'world-awareness' for the *saakshi*. 'Mind-awareness' means 'awareness of the mind'. 'There is no mind-awareness' means 'there is no awareness of the mind for 'me', the *saakshi*'. That, in turn, means '*idham jnaanam naasthi*'. And, in *sushupthi*, there is no 'world-awareness' also. '*Mamajnaanam api nasthi*'. There is no 'family' or 'possessions' in *sushupthi*. (In a lighter vein: I am *paramahamsa sanyaasi*, in *sushupthi*). This is what is said in the first line.

Proceeding to the second line of the verse:

ॐ उत्थितस्य सतः - Only for a person who has woken up

ॐ अज्ञानं (अस्ति) - the active *ajnaanam* is there,

ॐ यतः - because of which,

ॐ न अहं अज्ञासिषं - he says "during deep sleep, there was ignorance and therefore, I did not know I am *saakshi* at that time".

"*Na aham ajnaasisham*" is the statement of the 'waker', about the presence of ignorance, in his deep sleep state.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says here: "Only for a person who has woken up, i.e. only in *jaagrath avasthaa*, the active *ajnaanam* is there and therefore, only after waking up, he talks about the presence of ignorance, not only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, but, the presence of ignorance in the *sushupthi avasthaa* also".

There *is* ignorance in *sushupthi*. But, when does anyone talk about that ignorance in *sushupthi*? **Ans:** "Only in *jaagrath avasthaa*". The topic of ignorance is available only in *jaagrath avasthaa*. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*utthithasya satha: ajnaanam (asthi)*" meaning "active *ajnaanam* is there, only for a person who has woken up". This would mean that, in *jaagrath avasthaa*, mind is also there, and, therefore, the 'waker' says "*na aham ajnaasisham*" meaning "In deep sleep state, there was ignorance and therefore, I did not know that 'I', the *saakshi*, was there".

But, this he says only in *jaagrath avasthaa*. And, in *jaagrath aavsthaa*, when active ignorance comes, mind also comes. Once the mind comes, *idham-jnaanam* comes ; *mama-jnaanam* also comes.

With this statement, the diversion topic is over. If any student feels that this topic is too technical, suffice it for him to note only the essence of the diversion portion, which is as follows: "'I', the *saakshi*, know the mind directly and 'I' the *saakshi*, know the world indirectly, through the mind. And, also, that, both of them, the 'mind' and the 'world' are 'objects of knowledge' only and therefore, *anaathmaa* only".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 63:

आत्मानात्मविवेकस्य इयत्ता प्रदर्शनार्थमाह ।

The culmination of the discrimination between the Self and non-self is brought out:

The diversion topic is over. Now, Sureswaraachaarya comes to his main topic. What is the main topic?

The main topic consists of the following:

"*Anvaya vyathirekhaa* enquiry can lead only up to the knowledge "I' am the *aathmaa*, different from the world , the body and the mind'. But, I will never know whether that *aathmaa* is *ekam* or *anekam*, through *Anvaya vyathirekhaa* enquiry.

"To know that, viz., that, '*aathmaa* is *advaitam*', that, "I' am the *advaita adhishtaanam*', we require *mahaa vaakyam*. Without *mahaa vaakyam*, *anvaya vyathirekhaa* will give only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*. The *saamaanya aathma jnaanam* can be converted into *visesha aathma jnaanam* only through *mahaa vaakya vichaara*".

The terms '*saamaanya aathma jnaanam*' and '*visesha aathma jnaanam*' had been explained, in detail, in earlier sessions.

It was also pointed out earlier, that even *yoga saasthra samaadhi* / *yogic samaadhi* can help the aspirant only to 'abide' in *aathmaa*; but, the aspirant will never know in *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, the crucial fact "'I', the *aathmaa am advaitham*". That is why, practitioners of *yogic nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, never arrived at *advaitam*. *Advaita jnaanam* can never come through *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, proved easily by the fact, that *Yoga* people who practice *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* never come to *advaitam*. They talk about '*dvaita aathmaa*' only.

Both *anvaya vyathirekaa* logic and *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* can give only *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*. Granted that, 'abiding in *nirvikalpaka aathmaa*', the result of '*nirvikalpaka samaadhi*', *is* a wonderful *saadhanaa*, which will give *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*. But, if the aspirant desires *visesha aathma jnaanam*, namely, "*advaita adhistana aathmaa aham asmi*", he has to get out of the *samaadhi* and resort to *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*. Through *mahaavaakyam* alone, the *saamaanya aathma jnaanam* can be converted into *visesha aathma jnaanam* viz., "*advaita adhishtana aathmaa aham asmi*".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ प्रदर्शनार्थ - To reveal

ॐ आत्म अनात्म विवेकस्य इयत्ता - (that) the result of *aathma-anaathma* enquiry, through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic is only this much / limited,

ॐ आह - the following *sloka* is given.

The term '*iyatthaa*' means 'this much' / 'so much' / 'fixed measure or quantity' / 'limitation' etc. By using this term, in the meaning 'this much only', the *Aachaaryaa* stresses that *saamaanya aathma jnaanam* **alone** is possible by logic and that, *visesha aathma jnaanam* cannot come through mere logic.

Verse 63 – Chapter III:

वाक्यप्रत्यक्षमानाभ्यां इयानर्थः प्रतीयते ।

अनर्थकृतमोहानिः वाक्यादेव सदात्मनः ॥ ६३ ॥

Through scriptural statements (not *mahaavaakyaani*) and perceptual evidence, this much is known. The Self is distinguished from all else. But, the ignorance of the real Self, which is the source of all evil, is destroyed only by the *Vedhaanthic* proposition.

ॐ वाक्य प्रत्यक्ष मानाभ्यां - With the help of *saasthra vaakyam* and *anvaya vyathirekaa* reasoning,

Vaakyam refers to the relevant *sruthi pramaanaa*, which will help in differentiating *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*. And, what are the relevant *sruthi pramaanaa*-s? **Ans:** The famous *Thaithreeya Upanishad* statements - : "*anyonthara aathmaa praana maya:/ anyonthara aathmaa manomaya:/ anyonthara aathmaa vijnaana maya: / anyonthara aathmaa aanadamaya:*" is an example. The *pancha kosa vivekaa* of this portion of *Brahmavalli* of *Thaithreeyopanishad*, helps in differentiating *aathmaa* from *anaathmaa*.

ॐ And, in this context, the word '*prathyaksha*' refers to the *anvaya vyathirekaa* reasoning, since the *anvaya vyathirekaa* reasoning is based on *avasthaathraya anubhavaa* (*prathyakshaa*).

ॐ इयान् अर्थः प्रतीयते - this much information / knowledge alone is possible.

"This much knowledge" refers to what we have been terming "*saamaanya aathma jnaanam*", in our discussions. Through these two *pramaanaa*-s, namely (i) certain *saasthra vaakyaani* and (ii) *anvaya vyathirekaa* logic, the aspirant will get *saamaanya aathma jnaanam*, viz.: " 'I' am *saakshi*; 'I' am *chaithanya svaroopaa*.; 'I' am *nithya*.; 'I' am *sarvagatha*.; 'I' am different from the world, body and mind etc."

An aspirant can get to know all these with the help of certain *saasthra vaakyaani* (other than *mahaavaakyaani*) and *anvaya vyathirekaa / avasthaa thraya vivekaa* reasoning. But, the question is: "Is this much knowledge sufficient for liberation?" Sureswaraachaaryaa firmly answers: "No. It is not sufficient".

It is worthwhile to analyze independently also, as to why he says so.

The *Yoga* philosopher also has arrived at these facts, namely, that "'I' am *saakshi*; 'I' am *chaithanya svaroopaa*.; 'I' am *nithya*.; 'I' am *sarvagatha*.; 'I' am different from

the world, body and mind etc." But, ironically, he holds that, the *nithya-sarvagatha* 'Consciousnesses-s' are many i.e. he is of the opinion that there is 'plurality'. 'Plurality' does not get negated by knowing "'I' am *nithya sarvagatha chaithanyam*". That this knowledge (*saamaanya aathma jnaanam*) will not eliminate 'plurality' is proved by the example of the *yoga* philosopher, who has this knowledge and yet believes in 'plurality'.

Further, in addition to this knowledge being incapable of elimination of the concept of 'plurality', this knowledge will also never tell the aspirant, that, 'I' am of a higher order of reality, while the *prapanchaa* is of a lower order of reality. That knowledge about the different orders of reality also, will never come through *anvaya vyathirekhaa*. The aspirant's wrong conclusion (based on mere *anvaya vyathirekaa* logic or *yogic samaadhi*) will be "*saakshi* is also *sathyam*; the *prapanchaa* is also equally *sathyam*; *Purushaa* is also *sathyam*; *prakruthi* is also *sathyam*". And, as long as this wrong notion of '*jagath sathyathvam*' is there for the aspirant, he / she can never be liberated.

An interesting thought on this fact has been discussed in earlier sessions and other contexts also, namely, that, even God cannot be 'liberated' if He considers the world as 'real'. This is because God will be worried about the sufferings of his devotees, since, when the world is believed to be 'real', His devotees' sufferings will also be real. Therefore, *Bhagavaan* Himself will not be able to rest peacefully. Lord Vishnu may have all physical comforts in His abode, *Vaikuntaa*; He may not have any problem of His own. But, He cannot avoid worry, if His devotees' sufferings are 'real'. As long as the world and the sufferings are *sathyam*, there is no way of getting *mokshaa* for anyone, including *Bhagavaan*. Even in *pralayam*, the *sathya dhu:kham* will not go away. It will be waiting in a dormant state. And, *Bhagavaan* cannot stop creating the world also, because as long as the *karmaa-s* are there, *Bhagavaan* has to helplessly create the world, helplessly create sorrow also and helplessly watch His devotees suffer, with a heavy heart. *Bhagavaan*, being omniscient, will also intimately see all the sufferings of all His devotees and suffer *samsaaraa*.

So, it should be remembered that "mithyaathva jnaanam vinaa jeevasya api moksha: naasthi; Isvarasya api moksha: naathi". If Iswara is muktha:, it is because He knows "aham sathyam jagan mithyaa". As Kaivalyopanishad (manthraa 22) declares: "na punyapaape mama naasthi naasa: na janmadehendriya buddhirasthi | na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasthi na chaanilo mesthi na chaambaram cha" – "Punyaa

and paapaa are not there for me; death is not there for me. Birth, body, sense organs and intellect are not there for me. Earth and water are not there for me. Fire is not there for me. Air is not there for me. Space is also not there for me".

The 'saamaanya aathma jnaanam' will not reveal 'jagan mithyaathvam' and 'advaita aathma adhistaanthvam'. Then, what is required for that? **Ans:** "Mahaa vaakyam is required to get the firm conviction 'aham sathyam Brahma asmi; jagath mithyaa asthi'".

'Jagath sathyathvam' is the cause of samsaaraa. And, as long as I am ignorant of that fact, that ignorance is the cause of all problems. Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, calls that ignorance 'anarthakruth thama:' |

ॐ अनर्थकृत् तमो हानिः - The destruction of the ignorance, which is the cause of all the problems,

'thama:' means 'ignorance' ; and, what type of ignorance ? **Ans:** 'anartha kruth'. 'Anartha kruth' means 'which is the cause of all the problems'. 'Anartha kruth thama:' means 'the ignorance which is the cause of all problems'.

What is that ignorance? **Ans :** "Ignorance of the fact, that 'I' am *sathyam* and the world is *mithyaa*". This ignorance is called by the *Aachaaryaa* as '*anartha krutthama:*' | '*Thasya haani:* (destruction)' is 'अनर्थकृत् तमो हानिः ' |

ॐ वाक्यादेव (भवति) - is possible only through *mahaa vaakyam*,

ॐ आत्मनः - for the aspirant

ॐ सदा - at all times / always.

Without destruction of this ignorance, I will say I am *saakshi* of the world, but, which world, I will look upon as *sathyam*. And, as long as I look upon the world as *sathyam*, what will be my concept of *mokshaa*? (We have repeatedly discussed this also). **Ans:** "As long as I look upon myself as *saakshi* and the world as *sathyam*, my concept of *mokshaa* will be 'somehow getting out of the world'".

Such a wrong notion (that the world is *sathyam*), will result in the aspirant trying to 'escape' from the world, to *Vaikuntaa* or *Kailaasaa*. *Vedhaantha* wants to advise such 'ignorant' aspirants: "With this notion, even if you 'escape' from the world to *Vaikuntaa* or *Kailaasaa*, there is no escaping '*anaathmaa*', since *anaathmaa* is all over, even in *Vaikuntaa* and *Kailaasaa*. And, wherever *anaathmaa* is there, '*dvaitham*' is there. And, the famous *sruthi* declaration is "*dvitheeyath vai bhayam bhavathi*" meaning "Indeed 'fear' results from 'duality'". 'Running away from *anaathmaa*' does not exist. Therefore, better be amidst *anaathmaa*; but, falsify *anaathmaa*. Drop the concept of running away from *anaathmaa*, but, 'falsify' it. Now you think the world is 'real', because of ignorance. That ignorance should go by *mahaa vaakyam* and you should say 'I am not afraid of the world even if I am going to live forever, or even if I am going to take another million births. The fact is "*maayeva sakalam jaatham*" – "Everything is born in 'me' alone" (*Kaivalyopanishad – manthraa* 19). Then, why should I think of running away or why should I be afraid of the world's continuity? This is the *mokshaa* and this *mokshaa* will 'come' only when you see the *mithyathvam* of the universe. You do not know *jagath* is *mithyaa*, because of 'ignorance'. That ignorance has to go away by *mahaa vaakyam* only".

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa says in this verse "*Anartha kruth thamo haani: vakaayadeva (bhavathi) aathmana: sadhaa*" meaning "the elimination of the ignorance, which is the cause of all problems, always results only through *mahaa vaakyam*".

Even *Bhagavaan* has to enjoy 'freedom' only by seeing the *mithyaathvam* of the universe. That is why He said (*Srimadh Bhagavadh Geetha* – Ch. IV – verse 6) "*ajopi san avyayaayaathmaa bhoothaanam Isvaro api san prakruthim svaam adhishtaaya sambhavaamyathmamaayayaa*" – "Even though I have no birth and no death, even though I am the Lord of all beings, still, I come into being through My own *Maayaa*, by resorting to My own *Prakruthi*".

What *Bhagavaan* implies by using the contradictory terms '*aja: sar*' (though I am birthless) and '*sambhavaam*' (I come into being), is that His birth is very unreal. "Without being born, I am born" means "seemingly I am born". That means "My (*Bhagavaan's*) *sareeram* is *mithyaa*; *avathaaram* is *mithyaa*". *Bhagavaan's* own *avatharaa* would have become a serious problem for *Bhagavaan*, if it were real. *Bhagavaan* says "Since I know that my *avathara sareeram* is *mithyaa* and *jagath* is *mithyaa*, I do not mind appearing again and again".

If, thus, *Bhagavaan* is not afraid of His *avathaaram* because the *avathaaram* is *mithyaa*, why should we be afraid our own *avathaaram-s* (!)? They are also *mithyaa*.

(*Swamiji* comments in a lighter vein: "After listening to all this, at the end of the class, a student may walk up to me and ask me '*Swamiji!* Will I ever get *videha mukthi?*' This is because *Jeevan mukthi-videha mukthi* division has become such an obsession with some students, that they are not able to get out of it. But, they should know that the '*Jeevan mukthi-videha mukthi* division' is only a temporary / provisional concept in the *Vedhaanthic* study. Real '*mukthi* is this, viz., 'I am not afraid of *anaathmaa*'").

"The elimination of ignorance" Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts "is through *mahaa vaakyam*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa proceeds to enter into another big discussion.

Samabhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 64:

द्वितीयाध्यायादौ श्रोतृचतुष्टयमुपन्यस्तम् । तत्र कृत्स्नानात्मनिवृत्तौ सत्यां यः
प्रत्यगात्मन्यवाक्यार्थतां प्रतिपद्यते स क्षपिताशेषान्तरयहेतुरिति न तं प्रति वक्तव्यं
किञ्चिदप्यवशिष्यते ।

At the commencement of the second chapter, four classes of pupils were mentioned. Among them, he who comprehends the inmost Self, the entire world of non-Self having disappeared for him, has no trace of the cause of evil still remaining. Nothing more need be said about him.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is giving a big introduction to a marginally different topic. Before entering the text, it is worthwhile to go through a gist of what he wants to discuss. He had already pointed out: "(i) *Saamaanya jnaanam* is "I am *chaithanyam*. (ii) *Visesha jnaanam* is "I am *advaita-sathya-adhishtaana-chaithanyam*. (iii) *Mahaa vaakyam* alone will give *visesha jnaanam*".

When it is said that *visesha jnaanam* is "I am *advaita-sathya-adhishtaana-chaithanyam*", the word '*adhistaanam*' is a loaded word. The word indicates that 'I am like the screen in a movie, while the creation is like the movie. The concept presented by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram*

(verse 1), "*Viswam dharpana-dhrusyamaana nagaree thulyam*" – "The universe of names and forms, like a city seen in the mirror" is conveyed by the word *adhishtaanam*.

We talked of *visesha jnaanam* being the knowledge "'I' am *advaita-sathya-adhishtaanam-chaithanyam*". Conversely, the ignorance of this special fact, viz., "'I' am *advaita-sathya-adhishtaanam-chaithanyam*", is called *visesha ajnaanam*. And, this *visesha ajnaanam* is *samsaaraa kaaranam*. And, it is *mahaa vaakyam*, that attacks and destroys this *visesha ajnaanam*.

That means, after *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*, the aspirant will be able to claim confidently "I am the *jagadh-adhishtaanam*". He will be able to remember (what we have been referring to, as the 5th capsule of *Vedhaanthaa*, namely) "The whole world is a *mithyaa* entertainment, provided by 'me', by 'my' own *maayaa*. Therefore, whatever happens, 'I' am not going to be affected". This binary format can happen only through *mahaa vaakyam*. Thus, *mahaa vaakyam* is *visesha ajnaana nivarthakam* and 'binary format' *praapakam*.

Sureswaraacharya wants to talk about the *visesha ajnaanam* and its mysterious nature. He will do this later. But, before talking about *visesha ajnaanam* itself, since this mysterious *visesha ajnaanam* is going to be eliminated by *mahaa vaakyam* i.e., due to *mahaa vaakya sarvanam*, the *Aacharya* wants to talk about the *mahaa vaakyam*. Then, to talk about *mahaa vaakyam*, he wants to talk about the listener of the *mahaa vaakyam*. In talking about the listener of the *mahaa vaakyam*, he wants to talk about four types of students. Out of the four types, he starts with one type of student. This is the route map that the *Aacharya* plans to follow.

To trace the 'route map' in brief:

- ॐ Four types of seekers.
- ॐ Out of them, one type
- ॐ The first type of seeker listening to *mahaa vaakyam*.
- ॐ The fact of *Mahaa vaakyam* removing the *visesha ajnaanam*, and, finally,
- ॐ The mysterious nature of the *visesha ajnaanam*.

Reverting to the text, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ द्वितीय अध्याय आदौ - In the beginning of the second chapter,

ॐ श्रोतृ चतुष्टयम् उपन्यस्तम् - four types of students were introduced.

We are now in the third chapter of the treatise. In the beginning of the second chapter of the treatise (in verses 2, 3 and 4 of the second chapter) four types of students / seekers are introduced by a *poorva pakshin*.

And, when the *poorva pakshin* introduces the four types of seekers, his aim is to show that *mahaa vaakyam* is not compulsory for *jnaanam* and *mokshaa*. This *poorva pakshin's* view is that, even without *mahaa vaakyam*, *jnaanam* and *mokshaa* are possible. To establish his view, he introduces the four types of students.

The first type of student he talks about, is one who gets 'knowledge' by mere 'intuition'. This type of student, according to the *poorva pakshin*, gains the 'knowledge' by just silencing the mind, without *mahaa vaakyam*. Dayananda Swamiji jocularly refers to this, as the '*bodhi* tree approach', since the founder of *Buddhism*, *Shri Gauthama Buddhaa* was supposed to have sat in meditation under a *bodhi* tree and got 'enlightenment'. There are several other examples also. The example given by the *poorva pakshin* is *Brahmajji*. In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (Chapter 1 – *Brahmanam* 4), and also in many *Puraanaa-s*, it is mentioned that *Prajaapathi* / *Brahmaaji* arose from the navel of Lord Maha Vishnu, and as soon as he appeared, *Brahmaaji* was frightened because of his 'loneliness'; and, he was also 'ignorant'. Thereafter, he 'meditated' and, through the meditation, got *jnaanam*. The *poorva pakshin* quotes this example of *Brahmajji* in the scriptures, for 'a person who silences the mind and gains the *visesha jnaanam*'. For the purpose of our study, this case may be called '*vaakya asravanena jnaanam*', where '*asaravam*' means 'not listening'.

The second type of student is a person who listens to *mahaa vaakyam* and gains 'knowledge'. We may refer to this case, as '*vaakya sravanena jnaanam*'.

The third type of student is a person who listens to the *vaakyam*, but does not understand its import during the *sravanam*. But, he takes the trouble of repeatedly 'thinking' / 'ruminating' on what he has heard, and after a length of time – a few hours or a few days or few weeks - suddenly the import of the *vaakyam* 'flashes' and

he 'understands' it. *Swamiji*, in a lighter vein, refers to this type of student as the 'tube light student', a common usage in mundane life. Quite often, tube lights do not work immediately on switching them on; but, take some time to 'light up'. We do come across people, who are slow on the intake, similar to the tube-lights . In *Vedhaantha* also, there *are* such students. This case may be referred to as '*vaakya smaranaath jnaanam*'. For such a student, it is '*vaakya smaranam*' that produces the knowledge – not the *vaakyam*. *Smaranam* produces the knowledge and not *vaakyam*, because, when this type of student 'understands' later, after a length of time - at that time of 'understanding', *vaakya sravanam* is not there. This '*smarenana jnaanam na thu vaakyaath*' is the third case.

What is the fourth case? **Ans:** "'*Vaakya smaaranam*'. Such a student gets *jnaanam*, not by his own exercise of 'recapitulating' or 'repeated thinking', but, because of the 'drilling' that he receives from his *guru*, who literally 'dins' at him, with repeated exhortations of the '*thath thvam asi mahaa vaakyam*'. The repeated reminders of the *guru* is termed '*smaaranam*'. This is the 4th case".

For the 1st type of student '*Vaakya asravanena jnaanam*', the *poorva pakshin* had already given the example of *Prajapathy / Brahmaaji* from the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (Chapter 1–*Brahmanam* 4) and the *Puraanaa*-s.

For the second type of student '*vaakyasravanena jnaanam*', we can have the example of the student in the *Kenopanishad*.

For the third type of student, viz., '*vaakya smaranena jnaanam*, *Advaita Aacharya*-s give the example of *Bhrigu*, from the *Thaithreeyopanishad*. To recount the relevant episode in brief: "*Bhrugurvai vaaruni varunam pitharam upasasaara/ adeehi bhagavo brahmethi*" (*T.U. Bhrugu Valli- manthraa*-1) - "The great sage *Bhrugu*, the son of *Varunaa*, approached his father *Varunaa* and asked 'Oh, Lord ! Give me the knowledge of *Brahman*". He heard the *vaakyam* from *Varunaa*, and went away to 'enquire' independently on the lines given by *Varunaa*. He, himself, reflected repeatedly / over and over, and ultimately '*aanando Brahmethi vyajaanaath* – 'concluded (got the 'knowledge') that *Aaanandaa* is *Brahman*'. *Bhrigu* is, thus, the example for '*vaakya smaranena jnaanam*'.

For the fourth type of student, '*vaakya smaaranena jnaanam* – "knowledge' through repeated reminders', the natural example is that of *Svethakethu* of the *Chaandoghya*

Upanishad. He was repeatedly assailed by his father *Uddhaalaka Aaruni* with the exhortation '*thath thvam asi*'.

From these four cases, the *poorva pakshin* wanted to establish (in chapter 2 – verses 2 to 4) that *vaakyam* is not compulsory. But, Sureswaraacharya, did not yield ground. He forcefully pointed out: "Whether a person gains knowledge by *sravanam* or *smaranam* or *smaaranam*, what is common to all? It **is** *Vaakyam* that is involved. Even though you understand the import of the *vaakyam* only after many days, even though guru is not present at that time, to whom does the credit for your 'understanding' go? Obviously, the credit goes to the *mahaa vaakya upadesaa* only".

Thus, Sureswaraacharya answered (in the second chapter) that *mahaa vaakyam* alone gives the knowledge, whether the knowledge comes immediately or whether the knowledge comes later, or whether the knowledge comes in the next *janmaa*. He firmly asserted: "Even if someone obtained the knowledge under a *bodhi* tree, that knowledge could not have been gained except through *vaakyam*, received a day before, or five years earlier or even in the *poorva janmaa*. 'Intuition' cannot and does not give 'knowledge'. Knowledge arrives only 'in tuition'. The tuition may be in the *poorva janmaa*, whether it is *Prajapaathy* or whether it is *Vamadevaa*. *Vamadeva* got the knowledge in *garbhaa* (while in his mother's womb) but, through *vaakya sravanam* alone." Thus Sureswaraacharya's answer was "*mahaa vaakyam alone* gives knowledge, either at the time of *sravanam* or later *smaranam* or in *smaaranam* or in the next *janmaa*. *Vaakyam is* the source of knowledge".

This was the topic in verses 2 to 4, of the 2nd chapter. In that context, Sureswaraacharya, through a *poorva pakshin*, had introduced four types of students. Out of those four, he wants to refer to one particular student here - the one who listens to the *mahaa vaakyam* again and again i.e. the *smaaranam* type of student or the fourth type. This student listens to *mahaa vaakyam* repeatedly and it removes *visesha ajnaanam*. Sureswaraacharya wants to analyze as to how the 'removal' of the *visesha ajnaanam* is achieved and also the nature of that mysterious ignorance.

173: Chapter III, Verses 64 to 64 (13-02-2010)

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 64:

द्वितीयाध्यायादौ श्रोतृचतुष्टयमुपन्यस्तम् । तत्र कृत्स्नानात्मनिवृत्तौ सत्यां यः प्रत्यगात्मन्यवाक्यार्थतां प्रतिपद्यते स क्षपिताशेषान्तरायहेतुरिति न तं प्रति वक्तव्यं किञ्चिदप्यवशिष्यते । योऽपि वाक्यश्रवणमात्रादेव प्रतिपद्यते तस्याप्यतीन्द्रियशक्तिमत्वान्न किञ्चिदप्यपेक्षितव्यमस्ति । यश्च श्रावित तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यः स्वयमेवान्वयव्यतिरेकौ कृत्वा तदवसान एव वाक्यार्थं प्रतिपद्यतेऽसावपि यथार्थं प्रतिपन्न इति पूर्ववदेवोपेक्षितव्यः । यः पुनरन्वयव्यतिरेकौ कारयित्वापि पुनःपुनर्वाक्यं श्राव्यते यथाभूतार्थप्रतिपत्तये तस्य कृतान्वयव्यतिरेकस्य सतः कथं वाक्यं श्राव्यत इति । उच्यते ।

At the commencement of the second chapter, four classes of pupils were mentioned. Among them, he who comprehends the inmost Self, the entire world of non-Self having disappeared for him, has no trace of evil still remaining. Nothing more need be said about him. He, who, on hearing the scriptural statement, understands Reality at once, has supersensible power and therefore, is in need of nothing more. He, who is instructed by a preceptors in the texts like 'That thou art', and engages in rational discrimination by himself, understands the import of the proposition, as the discriminative process reaches its culmination in him. He understands it aright and there is no more concern about him. But, he, who is conducted through the discriminative process and is made to listen to the proposition again and again, for being induced to the apprehension of truth, occasions further enquiry. He has already gone through the rational process of discrimination. How is he taught the proposition? The question is answered:

With the 63rd *sloka*, Sureswaraachaaryaa has concluded the small diversion topic, in which he sub-divided *anaathmaa* itself into two, the 'mind' being one and the 'world' being the other. The 'mind' is directly illumined by the *saakshi*; the 'world' is indirectly illumined by the *saakshi*, through the mind. That topic is now over.

Now, from the 64th verse onwards, what the *Aachaaryaa* is emphasizing is: "*mahaa vaakyam* alone has the capacity to eliminate *moolaavidhyaa*".

Moolaavidhya can be eliminated only through *mahaa vaakyam*; *anvaya vyathirekaa* will only prepare the ground for that (i.e., elimination of *moolavidhya*); but, without *mahaa vaakyam*, *avidhya nivrutthi* will not take place. Actually, this was the topic that Sureswaraacharya was dealing with, before this diversion also; after the diversion, he comes back to the same topic, which he is going to emphasize through the example of the well-known 'tenth man' episode or '*dhasama dhrishtaanthaa*'.

As an introduction to this topic, he is reminding us of four types of students of different levels of preparation. And, depending upon the levels of preparation, the *jnaanam* also will also take place in different modes. But, what Sureswaraacharya wants to emphasize is: "In all cases, *mahaa vaakyam* is the common underlying factor that can never be doubted or questioned".

Sureswaraacharya had talked about the four types of students in the beginning of the 2nd chapter. There, in verses 2, 3 and 4, he introduced the four types of students, details about whom were discussed in the earlier session.

To briefly recap those discussions: The first type of student is one, in whom 'knowledge' arises, even without his listening to *mahaa vaakyam*, the phenomenon, briefly referred to as '*vaakya asravanena jnaanam*'. The process of acquiring knowledge by the second type of student was referred to as '*vaakya sravanena jnaanam*', the process of acquiring knowledge by the third type of student as '*vaakya smaranena jnaanam*' and that of the fourth type as '*vaakya smaaranena jnaanam*'.

Examples were also given, for each type of student. For '*vaakya asravanena jnaanam*', we discussed two *saasthric* examples. The first was *Prajaapathy*, in the *Brahadhaaranyakaa Upanishad* (Chapter I – Section 4), where, *Prajaapathy* is said to have gained 'knowledge', by meditation. The relevant *manthraa* (I.iv.2) runs: "*Sa: abibheth / Thasmaadekaaki bibhethi / Sa haayameekshaam chakre yanmaadanyannaasthi kasmaanu bibhemeethi, thatha evaasya bhayam veeyaya, kasmaadbhayabheshyat? Dvitheeyaadvai bhayam bhavathi*" – "He (*Prajaapathy*) was afraid. Therefore, still people are afraid to be alone. Then he reassured himself: 'If there is nothing else but me, what am I afraid of?'. From that alone, his fear was gone, for what was there to fear? It is from a second entity that fear comes". *Prajaapathy* himself saw the 'truth', that, "there is no second one, other than 'me'"; *guru upadesaa* is not mentioned here. So, *Prajaapathy* is one *dhrushtaantha*: |

The second *dhrushtaantha* for '*vaakya asravanena jnaanam*' is *Vaama Deva:* , who , even as he was within the womb of his mother, without any *sravanam*, declared '*aham manurabhavam aham soorya: cha*' (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – I. iv.10) – 'I am *Manu* and the sun'. He attained this '*sarvaathma bhaavaa*', in his mother's womb itself, without undergoing any *sravanam*. *Prajaapathy* and *Vamadeva* are examples for '*vaakya asravanena jnaanam*'.

The second type of student is the one who attains '*vaakya sravana maathrena jnaanam*'. For this group of students, *Sureswaraachaaryaa*, in the second chapter, gave the example as '*Pisaachakaa*'. This word used by him, '*Pisaasachakaa*', does not mean a ghost. According to the commentators, '*Pisaachakaa*' is the name of a person, who gained knowledge by **casual** *sravanam* of the *mahaa vaakyam*. The narration goes, that, the person, *Pisaachakaa*, was moving around in the forest, on some errand, when he chanced upon a *Vedhaanthic guru* and a student, discussing *Vedhaantha*. The teacher was addressing the student. '*Pisaachakaa*' overheard the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thaththvamas!*', addressed by the *guru* to his student and immediately grasped the import of the *vaakyam*, while the original student did not.

(*Swamiji*, in this context, referred to *Dayaananda Swamiji* once saying "I passed my examinations, by overhearing my neighbor reading aloud, while, my neighbor himself failed in the exams". In a similar manner '*Pisaachaka:, aranyam gatha:, thathvamas!*' *ithi sravana maathrena jnaanam avaapthavaari*).

The third type of student is '*vaakya smaranena jnaanam aapthavaari*'. This student does not achieve 'knowledge', at the time of *sravanam*. He repeatedly 'works' on the *mahaa vaakyam* and then, contemplating on the *mahaa vaakyam*, he himself arrives at 'knowledge', without the express help of the teacher.

The example for this type of student is Sage *Bhrugu:* of *Thaithreeyopanishad* – *Bhruguvalli*. Sage *Bhrughu* appealed to his father and *guru*, *Varunaa*, "*Adeehi bhagavo Brahma*" – "Oh Lord! Give me the knowledge of *Brahman*". In response, *Varunaa* "*thasmai ethath provachaa | annam praanam chakshussrothram mano vaachamithi*" - "taught the following, to that *Bhrugu* – *annam, Praanaa, manas, eye, ear and speech*" and further exhorted him : "*Yatho vaa imaani bhoothaani jaayanthe , yena jaathaani jeevanthi, yathprayanthi abhisamvisanthe, thadh vijjaasvasva | Thadh Brahma*" – "Seek to know That, from which, indeed, all beings are born, by

which, all the born-beings exist and unto which they go back, while resolving. That is *Brahman*". Thereafter, *Bhrugu* "*thapa: athapyatha*" – "conducted 'enquiry' " and ultimately "*Aanando Brahmethi vyajaanaath*" – "Concluded that *aanandhaa* is *Brahman*". The *guru*, *Varunaa*, did not give this 'conclusion' to *Bhrugu*. *Bhrugu* himself arrived at it, by reflections over the '*thvam padha vaakyam*' and also the '*thadh padha vaakyam*', given by *Varunaa*. '*Thvam padha vaakyam*' is '*annam praanam chakshusrothram mano vaachamithi*' and the '*thadh padha vaakyam*' is '*Yatho vaa imaani bhoothaani jaayanthe, yena jaathaani jeevanthi, yath prayanthi abhisamvisanthi thadh Brahma*'| *Varunaa*, the teacher gave the student only *thadh padhaa* independently and *thvam padhaa* independently. Based on them, *Bhrugu* 'worked' and finally arrived at '*aanando Brahmethi*'. This is the example of *vaakya smaranena jnaanam*.

Then comes the fourth case, namely, '*vaakya smaaranena jnanam*'. In such cases, when the teacher gives the *mahaa vaakyam* to the disciple, the student is unable to comprehend the *vaakyam*, the first time. The *guru* realizes the student's problem and, therefore, repeats his teaching, with many *dhrushtaantha*-s. A typical example for such a student is *Svethakethu*, mentioned in the *Chaandhogya Upanishad* (Chapter VI). *Svetakethu's* father and *guru*, *Uddhaalaka Aaruni*, goes on and on with his teaching, giving *madhu dhrishtaantha*, *vruksha dhrushtaantha*, *thaskara dhrushtaantha*, *lavana dhrushtaantha* etc. Totally nine examples were given by him, and after each example, he says "*eithadhaathmyam idhagum sarvam thathsathyam sa aathmaa thaththvmasi Svetaketho*" – "All this has got That as the Self. That is the Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That, Oh *Svetakethu*!"| As could be seen, *Svethakethu*, the *sishtyaa* could not / did not contemplate on the teaching himself; therefore, the *guru* had to do the teaching repeatedly. This 'repeated teaching / reminding' by the *guru* is called '*smaaranam*'. So, for the fourth type of student, '*Svethakethu*' is a typical example.

Thus, four types of students were talked about, with examples for each type also - *vaamadeva dhrushtaantha*., *Pisaachaka dhrushtaantha*., *Bhrugu dhrishtaantha*., and *svetakethu dhrishtaantha*., respectively. In these four cases, 'knowledge' take place in different ways / modes.

And, Sureswaraacharya's contention is: "Whatever be the type of the 'rise of knowledge', the common factor in all the cases, is *mahaa vaakyam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is involved in every case. Even in the case of *Vaamadeva*, granting that he did not

do the *sravanam* in his mother's womb, he must have done the *sravanam* in his *poorva janmaa* and because of some obstacle in that *janmaa*, he did not achieve '*jnaanam*', which he achieved as *Vaamadevaa*, even before he was born".

Verses 37 to 45 of the 6th Chapter of *Srimadh Bhagavadh Geethaa* are relevant here. Arjuna asks (Verse 37): "*ayathi: sraddhayopetha: yogaacchalithamaanasa: apraapya yogasamsiddhim kaam gathim Krishna gacchathi*" – "Oh Krishna! Suppose there is one, who is endowed with faith, but whose effort is insufficient and whose mind has strayed away from *Dhyaanayogaa*. Having not attained the result of *Dhyaanayogaa*, what goal does he attain?" His doubt is "The student listened to the *gurus* teaching and was practicing *nidhidhyaasanam* also. But, because of some obstacle, he could not complete the journey. He could not come to 'binary' format. When such a person dies, what will happen to him?" And, Krishna assures Arjuna: "With that condition, he will be re-born in circumstances more conducive to spirituality; and for him, only a casual *sravanam* will be required or sometimes even some other mild trigger will be more than enough, to achieve *jnaanam*".

Therefore, in the case of *Vaamadeva*, the *Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaas'* assertion is: "*Mahaa vaakyam* must have been involved in his case also, if not in the current *janmaa*, certainly, in his *poorva janmaa*".

Students of the type of *Prajaapathy* and *Vamadevaa* are very rare. But, the main message, even in such cases is: "*Mahaa vaakyam* alone will remove *moolaavidhyaa*. *Moolaavidhyaa nivrutthi: mahaa vaakayaadeva*". Reverting to the text:

ॐ द्वितीय अध्याय आदौ - In the beginning of the second chapter,

ॐ श्रोतृचतुष्टयं उपन्यस्तम् - four types of students were mentioned.

ॐ तत्र - Among the four,

ॐ यः - that extra-ordinary student (who),

'*Ya:*', here, refers to the first type of student, who has listened to the *mahaa vaakyam* in the previous *janmaa* (like *Vaamadevaa*) or even in the previous *srushti* (like *Prajaapathy*). In the case of *Prajaapathy*, what he 'realized', on appearing on a lotus from the navel of *Maha Vishnu*, was what he had already known in the previous *srushti*. When *Brahmaaji* comes on the lotus, out of the navel of Lord

Vishnu, he need not do *sravanam* or *mananam*. Lord Vishnu had already 'blessed' him with all the 'knowledge'. *Manthraa* 6.18, of the *Svethaasvatharopanishad* talks of this fact : "*yo Brahmaanam vidadhaathi poorvam yo vai vedaamscha prahinothi thasmai tham ha devam aathmabuddhiprakaasam mumukshurvai saranam aham prapathye*"- "He, Who, at the beginning of creation, projected *Brahmaaji*, Who delivered the *Veda*-s unto him, I go for refuge to that Effulgent One, whose light turns the understanding towards the *Athman*, while seeking liberation." *Brahmaaji*, the *Hiranyagarbhaa*, will automatically remember *sarva veda jnaanam*, based on his *sarvajnathvam* of the previous *srushti*. As for *Vaamadevaa*, who achieved '*jnaanam*' before birth, it was because of the *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani* of his *poorva janmaa*. '*Ya*:', here, refers to such extraordinary or unique students.

ॐ अवाक्यार्थतां प्रतिपद्यते - attains the knowledge of non-duality,

The word '*avaakyarthataa*' is a technical word, discussed in detail, in an earlier context and, therefore, not proposed to be discussed now. Suffice it to understand that the term means 'the knowledge of non-duality'. '*Prathipadhyathe*' means 'attains'.

ॐ प्रत्यक् आत्मनि - with regard to the inner Self, the *advaita aathmaa*,

ॐ कृत्स्न अनात्मनिवृत्तौ सत्यां - when the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* / *thriputi* disappears for him,

For such extra-ordinary students, of the likes of *Brahmaaji* or *Vaamdevaa*, the entire *anaathma prapanchaa* 'disappears' in a moment of silence / thoughtlessness / quietude, because of their *saadhanaa*-s in *poorva janmaa* / *srushti*.

Who attains the knowledge of non-duality? **Ans:** "That extra-ordinary student".

ॐ स : - that extra-ordinary student

What is the glory of such a student? The *Aachaaryaa* says "He has exhausted all the obstacles in his path to the 'understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam*":

क्षपित अशेष अन्तरायहेतु : - is free from all the obstacles / has exhausted all obstacles in his path to the 'understanding' of the *mahaa vaakyam* / has no trace of the cause of evil still remaining in him.

'*Antharaaya:*' means '*prathibandha:*' | '*hethu:*' means 'cause'. '*antharaaya hethu:*' means '*prathibandha kaaranam*'; '*prathibandha kaaranam*' means '*paapam*'; '*antharayaa hethu:*', therefore, means '*paapam*'. '*Asesha*' means 'complete' / 'all'. '*Kshapitha*' means 'free from'. And, it was this *paapam*, which was obstructing the knowledge at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, in the *poorva janmaa*.

This (extra-ordinary) student was doing *mahaa vaakya sravanam* in the *poorva janmaa* and he received the knowledge; but, the knowledge remained only as academic knowledge. What is the proof? He remained in triangular format; he did not have the courage to come to binary format, even though 'knowledge' was crystal clear. What obstructed him from shifting to binary format ? There was no visible obstacle. When visible obstacles are not there, there must be invisible *paapa prathibandha:* | For exhausting the *paapa prathibandha:*, he required another *janmaa*. And, in the next *janmaa*, when the *prathibandha:* goes away, the *mahaa vaakyam*, which is in his own sub-conscious mind, suddenly 'flashes'. '*Kshapitha*' means 'free from'. He has exhausted all the obstacles or is freed from all the obstacles, resulting in '*jnaanapraapthi:*' |

Obviously, such students are 'exceptions' and, naturally, it is not given to every student to follow the path of such unique students.

ॐ इति तं प्रति किञ्चित् अपि वक्तव्यं न अवशिष्यते - Therefore, I do not want to say anything about him.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "I do not want to say anything about that extraordinary first type of student", since his interest is in dealing with the fourth type.

So much for the first type of student. What about the second type? The *Aachaaryaa* says: "I do not want to comment anything on him also". And, who is the second student? **Ans:** "*Vaakyasravanena jnaanam aapthavaan*" – "One who attains instantaneous *jnaanam* through *vaakya sravanam*". Who is the example? **Ans:** *Pisaachakaa* /

Reverting to the text:

- ॐ यः अपि वाक्यश्रवणमात्रात् एव - He also, who, on just listening to the *Mahaa Vaakyam*,
 ॐ प्रत्पध्यते - understands the import of the *vaakyam* at once,
 ॐ तस्य अतीन्द्रिय शक्तिमत्वात् - because of his extraordinary / super-sensuous capacity,
 ॐ किञ्चित् अपि अपेक्षितव्यं अस्ति - is not in need of anything more.

(Swamiji remarks in amazement:

"What an extraordinary case? This student listens to the *mahaa vaakyam* 'thathvamasi' **once** from the teacher, grasps its import immediately, thanks the teacher and leaves. The word 'maathraath', in the term 'vaakya sravana maathraath', is significant. The teacher does not even broach to this student, any of the *Vedhaanthic* terms, such as *jahathi lakshanaa*, *ajahathi lakshanaa*, *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa* etc. Nor of 'vaachyaarthaas and lakshyaarthaas. Nor of *anvaya vyathirekhaa*, *anyonthara aathmaa praana maya: manao maya:* etc.

"The teacher does not point out to the student, 'thadh padha lakshyaarthaas is pure Existence; thvam padha lakshyaarthaas is pure Consciousness ; and, pure Existence and pure Consciousness are one and the same'.

"The student comes; asks for *Brahma Vidhyaa*; the *guru* says 'thathvamasi'; *sishyaa* understands instantaneously, does *namaskaaram* and goes away!").

And, what is the cause for this *sishyaa*'s immediate grasping of the *vaakyam*? The *Aachaaryaa* explains : 'atheendriya sakthimathvaath', meaning 'because of super-sensual capacity'. And, we should remember that this 'extraordinary / super-sensual capacity' is also not because of fluke or chance. Whenever we talk about any power in anyone, we should remind ourselves, that, nothing results without a legitimate cause. If *Bhagavaan* gives an extraordinary capacity to a student of *Bhagavaan*'s choice, that *Bhagavaan* will be accused of a big *dhoshaa*. This is discussed in the

Brahma Soothra-s. If *Bhagavaan*, of *His own* volition and choice, gives a special power to a few selected students, that *Bhagavaan* will be accused of a *dhosha*, termed '*Vaishamya naigrunya dhosha*.' | *Bhagavaan* will be charged of 'partiality'. Therefore, it should be understood, that if a student has *atheendriya sakthi*, the student must have worked for it, in his *poorva janmaa*. *Atheendriya sakthi: poorva janma prayathna siddham eva* / That is why, it is said, that if an individual listens to *Vedhaantha* even in his 99th year, it is worth it, because it will be carried forward, to his next *janmaa*. *Sravanam* will not go waste, even if not understood now. Whatever be the student's current mental or intellectual condition, the 'exposure' will 'click' sometime in the future. That is the most encouraging note in *Vedhaantha sravanam*. Unfortunately, many students are not convinced about this.

Obviously, such students do not remember that Lord Krishna Himself gives the assurance in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (chapter IV – verse 38): "*Yogasamsiddha: kaalena aathmani vindhathi*" – "Prepared through *Yoga*, the aspirant attains 'knowledge', in time".

Reverting to the text, talking of the second type of student, Sureswaraachaarya concludes: "*kimchith api apekshithavyam asthi*" - "Nothing is to be discussed".

He proceeds to the third type of student (exemplified by *Bhrugu*). He says:

ॐ यः च श्रावित तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्य : - That student also, who is instructed by a preceptor in the *mahaa vaakyaani* like 'That thou art',

'*Sraavitha: thaththvamsyaadhi vaakya:*' is a beautiful compound term, derived as '*sraavitham thaththvamsyaadhi vaakyam yasmal sa:*', meaning 'that student who has been made to listen to the *mahaa vaakyaani* such as '*thathvamasl*', by the teacher'.

The reference is to the third type of student. This is clear by the description about him that follows:

ॐ स्वयं एव अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ कृत्वा - then, engages in rational discrimination by himself,

This third type of student is not as great as the second student, who understood the import of the *mahaa vaakyam* instantaneously. In contrast, this third student requires repeated introspection. He has to ask himself: "How can *I* be *Brahman*? I am born on a given day, I undergo all sorts of changes (*shadvikaaraani*) and I am subject to positive death sooner or later, whereas *Brahman* is said to be changeless and eternal."

It may be recollected that *Bhrugu* was given as example for this type of student. As the *Upanishad* (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhruguvalli*) narrates the episode, *Bhrugu* first tested the *mahaa vaakyam* with *annamaya kosaa* and found that, with regard to *anna maya kosaa*, the *mahaa vaakyam* will not apply. He went back to the *guru*, *Varunaa*, who only told him "You are moving in the right direction. Go back and continue your enquiry". Thereafter, *Bhrugu*, by himself, did *anvaya vyathirekaa*, eliminating *praana mayaa*, *mano mayaa*, *vijnaana mayaa* etc., one by one. *Bhrugu*, by himself, conducted the enquiry. What was the role of the *guru*, *Varunaa*? **Ans:** "He did not teach him directly. He only said '*Thapasaa Brahma vijijnaasasva. Thapo Brahma*' – 'Seek to know *Brahman* through enquiry. Enquiry is *Brahman*'. The *guru*, *Varunaa*, said only that much. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says about such students: '*svayam eva anvayavyathirekau kruthvaa*'.

ॐ तद् अवसान एव - and, at the end of the long enquiry,

'*Avasaanam*' means 'conclusion / termination'. '*Thad*', in this context, means '*thasya anvayavyathirekasya*'. '*Thasya anvayavyathirekasya avasaanam*' is '*thadh avasaanam*'.

ॐ वाक्यार्थं प्रतिपद्यते - understands the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*,

ॐ This third student also understands the '*eiikyam*' without requiring the *guru*'s teaching a second time. The *Guru* taught him only once; thereafter, 'teaching a second time' was not involved. But, 'knowledge' was achieved by the student, only after a thorough enquiry by himself. That is why, we call it, '*vaakya smaranena jnaana praapthi*.' |

ॐ असौ अपि यथार्थं प्रतिपन्नः इति - because of his having understood the true import of the *mahaa vaakyam*,

This third student also is an extraordinary student, even though less endowed, than the previous two; but, still this student also must be great, since he underwent *sravanam* only once and achieved *jnaanam* by dint of his own hard work. '*Yathartham*' means 'right import' and '*prathipanna:*' means '*jnaathavaar*'.

And, what does Sureswaraachaaryaa want to comment on him? He says "with regard to this third type of student, viz., '*vaakya smaranena jnaana aapthvaar*' also, I have nothing to comment".

ॐ पूर्णवत् एव - similar to the previous two types of students,

ॐ उपेक्षितव्यः - can be ignored / need not be concerned about.

The *Aachaaryaa* says : "This student also has understood the *mahaa vaakyam* aright and therefore, there need not be any more concern about him".

The *Aachaaryaa*, thus, leaves out the first three types of students, without any comment, since he wants to focus on the fourth type of student, who has the need to undergo repeated *sravanam* for achieving *jnaanam*. This is what he is going to say.

ॐ यः पुनः अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ कारयित्वा अपि - But, he, who, though conducted through the discriminative process,

The current discussion is about the fourth type of student like *Svethakethu*, in the 6th chapter of the *Chaandogya Upanishad*. A revision of the concerned portion in the *Upanishad*, will show, that, the *guru*, of course, gives the *mahaa vaakya upadesaa*; but, starts it only in the 8th section . From the 8th section to the 16th section, the *mahaa vaakyam* is given 9 times. But, **before** the *Upadesaa* is given, in the first seven sections, the *guru* does *anvaya vyathireka vichaaraa*.

In this initial portion, the *guru* addressing the *sishyaa* (VI. 5. 4) says: "*annamayagum hi saumya mana: aapomaya: praana: tejomayee vaak*" – "O good-looking one ! Mind is purely made of food, vital force is made of water, speech is made of fire". The *guru* asks the *sishyaa* to give up food for fifteen days (he allows him plenty of water though) and to find out what happens. He commands: "*pancha*

dhasa ahaani maa aasee." (VI. 7. 1) – "Do not eat for fifteen days". The *sishtyaa*, *Svethakethu*, obeys; and finds that, after fasting for fifteen days, his mind is not able to recollect the *manthraa*-s he had learnt earlier and was adept in. So, what was the purpose of this study? **Ans:** "To establish that food and mind have got relationship. Both are *baudhikam* and both are *jadam*. ('I' am *chethanam*; therefore, 'I' am not the mind) ".

This and similar '*anvaya vyathirekaa*' discussions by the *guru*, are covered in the first seven sections of the 6th chapter of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, to arrive at "what is *saakshh?*" This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa refers to by the term "*anvayavyathirekau kaarayithvaa*".

ॐ पुनः पुनः वाक्यं श्राव्यते - (thereafter) is made to listen to the *mahaa vaakyam* again and again,

In this portion of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*, after *anvaya vyathirekaa* discussions up to the 7th section, the *guru* does a detailed analysis of the *sushupthi avasthaa*. Then follows the famous *upadesaa*: "*Eithadhaathmyam idhagum sarvam sa aathmaa thath thvam asi Svetaketho*" - "All this has got That as the Self. That is the Truth. That is the Self. Thou art That, O Svethakethu" (VI. 8. 7).

If *Svethakethu* had been like *Bhrugu*, the third type of student, the *guru* would have stopped with this and sent the *sishtyaa* away. If the student is of the 'extra-ordinary' type, a single teaching of '*thath thvam asi*' would have been enough for him.. But, what do we find? The teaching is repeated by the *guru*, nine times. That is what is referred to, here, by the *Aachaaryaa*, by the term '*puna: puna: vaakyam sraavyathe*'.

This statement "*Eithadhaathmyam idhagum sarvam sa aathmaa thath thvam asi Svetaketho*" containing the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*' is repeated by the *guru* nine times, with various *dhrushtaantha*-s. With what purpose? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ यथाभूतार्थं प्रतिपत्तये - for inducing the 'understanding' of 'Reality'.

'*prathipatthi*.' means 'understanding'. Of what? **Ans:** "'*Yathaa boothaartha*' meaning 'the right / exact message'". What is that right message? **Ans:** "'I' am *Brahman* and *Brahman* is 'me'. 'I' am of the higher order of 'reality' and the world is of a lower order of 'reality' ".

ॐ तस्य अन्वयव्यतिरेकस्य सतः - With regard to this student, who has gone through the rational process of '*anvaya vyathirekaa* ,

ॐ कथं वाक्यं श्राव्यते इति - it has to be enquired as to why the teacher subjects him to repeated *mahaa vaakyasravanam* .

Sureswaraacharya asks himself: "With regard to this fourth category of student, why does the teacher make the student listen to the *mahaa vaakyam*, again and again? What is the purpose?"

The word '*katham*' normally means '*kena prakaarena* –'by what method?'. But, in this context, it means '*kasmaath hetho:*' – 'for what purpose?'

ॐ उच्यते - This is being explained.

The *Aacharya* says: "*Ithi uchyathe*" – "For that, the answer is going to be given".

The idea is, that, in the case of the fourth student, his *ajnaanam* does not go away easily. Such *ajnaanam* is comparable to cancerous cells. For eradicating cancerous cells, different treatments are given, such as Chemotherapy, radiation etc. In certain cases of the dreaded disease, the cancerous cells are eradicated in a few sessions of treatment; but, in certain other cases, they are so recalcitrant / adamant, that, whatever is done, those cells refuse to disappear or if they disappear, they re-appear. In such case, the treatment has to be repeated over and over. Similarly, *ajnaanam*, like some cancerous cells, is so firmly rooted in this fourth type of student that the 'treatment' has to be repeated. What is the treatment in this case? **Ans:** "The teaching of '*thath thvam asi*'". The redeeming factor is that, in the treatment of cancer, there might be side-effects for the various therapies and the 'repeated' sessions, whereas, in treating *ajnaanam* through repeated *mahaa vaakya upadesam*, there are no side-effects.

Ajnaanam is very, very strong in some cases because of several reasons. The reason can be *dhrushta prathibandha:* or *adrushta prathibandha:* | By the term "*Ithi uchyathe*", the *Aachaaryaa* says "that is going to be clarified". For the purpose of this clarification, he uses an example, the famous 'tenth man' example.

Chapter III: Verse 64 –

नवसंख्याहृतज्ञानो दशमो विभ्रमाध्यथा ।

न वेत्ति दशमोऽस्मीति वीक्षमाणोऽपि तान्नव ॥ ६४ ॥

It is similar to the case of the tenth man, who, counting only the other nine men, does not count himself as the tenth, in sheer delusion, though he is looking round carefully on the nine others.

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa assumes that the story of the 'tenth man' is very well known to all people.

The story is, briefly, as follows:

Ten *Brahmachari-s*, students of a *gurukulam*, wanted to attend a function in a close-by town. Though the *guru* was initially not inclined to permit the students, they pleaded with him, got his permission and left the *gurukulam* for the town. They had to cross a river to reach the town. All the ten boys swam across. And, after crossing the river, the leader of the group wanted to make sure that all the ten have arrived at the other bank safely, since he was responsible for them and answerable to his *guru*, who, in turn, was answerable to the *Brahmachari-s'* parents. And, what did he do? He asked all the other boys to stand in a row and counted them. He counted only nine and started wondering "what happened to the 10th man?" He thought: "Perhaps I did not count properly; let me count from the other end of the row". But, he again counted only 'nine'. In whatever way he did the counting, he could arrive only at 'nine', since he failed to count himself every time. He was frantically looking / searching for the 10th man. None of the other *Brahmachari-s* also could spot the mistake of the leader. At that time, a stranger happened to pass by. Noticing the distraught state of the group because of the 'missing' tenth man and the failure of the leader in not counting himself, he told the leader "You will not find the 10th man, where you are looking, because that 10th man (*dhasama:*) is none other than you, yourself – '*thath thvam asi* '".

But, even though that was the truth / even though the passer-by, who made the statement '*thath thvam asi*' was giving a valid knowledge / even though that *vaakyam* is a *pramaanam*, the 10th man, the leader of the group, was not convinced. He did not get the 'knowledge', because of an obstacle.

The obstacle was, that, even as the 'passer-by' was giving him the right 'knowledge', his mind was not abiding in himself as the 10th man, because of his preoccupation or absorption in the '*nava samkyaa*' – his 'counting of nine *Brahmachari-s*'. He received the stranger's message 'mechanically', because of this pre-occupation and, therefore, did not get the 'relief' that should have come with the identity of the 10th man.

He would, therefore, never claim "I am the 10th man" and achieve the consequent relief.

Sureswaraachaaryaa's fourth type of student is similar to this 'leader of the *Brahmachari* group' in this story. Even though the *guru* has taught him '*thath thvam asi*', from the most valid source, the *Sruthi*, this type of student would still only say : "I have understood the *mahaa vaakyam*. But, I am yet to 'realize' it. I am yet to get 'enlightenment' / *saakshaathkaaraa*. I am, therefore, still only a *mumukshu* / a *saadhakaa*".

How come 'understanding' is there for him; but, 'relief' is not there? **Ans:** "Like the leader of the *Brahmachari* group in the story, losing sight of the fact mentioned by the passer-by, because of his pre-occupation with the *nava samkyaa*, the mind of this *Vedhaanthic* student also is pre-occupied or obsessed with the *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of profession, possessions, family, body and mind. This student's mind is absorbed in these; '*aham Brahma asmi*' appears to him, as a dummy or blank statement, because his mind is still preoccupied with / obsessed with / distracted by '*anaathmaa*'. This is the first problem. There is a second problem also, in the case of this student.

What is that second problem? *Mahaa vaakyam* being a valid source of knowledge, and *mahaa vaakyam* alone being the valid source of knowledge , with no other *pramaanam* either to prove or contradict this fact, and, therefore, should be taken as the final source of knowledge, when the *mahaa vaakyam* says that 'I' am the *adhishtaanam* of the universe, as even as the aspirant receives its message, he

should take it as the fact. After receiving this knowledge, he should accept it as the fact and should never look for proving that knowledge through some other means, such as sitting in meditation and looking for a mysterious experience in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* etc. If he does so, he is 'testing' the message of *mahaa vaakyam*, through some other method. He thinks meditation is another *pramaanam*, which will validate his *sravanam*. But, there is **no** *pramaanam*, other than *mahaa vaakyam*, to prove '*thath thvam asi*' or '*aham Brahma asmi*'. Unfortunately, this aspirant, this fourth type of student, does not have sufficient *sraddhaa* in the *mahaa vaakyam* to instantaneously claim "'I' am *muktha*: is the fact".

In the *Bhagavadh Geethaa*, Lord Krishna refers to this unfortunate individual, using a strong term '*vinasyathi*' (Verse 40 – Chapter IV): "*Ajnascha asraddhadhaana: cha samsayaathmaa vinasyathi*" – "The ignorant, **who has no faith** and who has a doubting mind '**is ruined**'".

This *asraddhaa* with regard to *mahaa vaakyam* is the second obstacle. As it had been pointed out in an earlier session, when the *Karma Kaandaa* of the *Sruthi* proclaims "*Bhagavaan* is your savior", generally, the proclamation is accepted with *sraddhaa*. But, when *Jnaana Kaanda* of the same *Sruthi* declares "'You' do not require any savior", there is a lot of reluctance to accept it. In other words, we find, that, the amount of *sraddhaa* that *Karma Kaandaa* commands, the *Jnaana Kaanda* does not command, though, in reality, *jnaana kaandaa* is a superior *pramaanam* from the standpoint of *karma kaandaa*.

How do you say that *jnaana kaandaa* is a *pramaanam* superior to *Karma Kaandaa*?

Ans: "It is because the *dvaitham* talked about in *karma kaandaa* is negated by the *advaitam* of the *jnaana kaandaa*. Since thus *jnaana kaandaa* confidently negates *karma kaandaa*, it can be understood as the more powerful of the two".

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa asserts somewhere, that, *jnaana kaandaa* is a greater well-wisher than thousands of mothers and thousands of fathers. *Vedhanthaa* is the greatest well-wisher. But, somehow, the student feels 'understanding' is not enough. The day *sraddhaa* comes, he will take his 'understanding' as the final.

And, therefore, what is the problem with this fourth type of student? **Ans:** "Either 'distraction' with *anaathmaa* or lack of *sraddhaa*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the *dhrushtaanthaa* of the well-known *dhasama purusha:*, to bring out this truth.

Reverting to the text:

ॐ दशमः - The 10th man,

ॐ वसंख्या आहतज्ञानः - with his mind distracted by the counting of (the other) nine,

'jnaanam', in this context, is to be taken to mean 'mind'/ *antha:karanam* / *buddhi:* / *'Samkya'* means 'counting'. *'Nava'* means 'nine'.

ॐ विभ्रमात् - because of that delusion and ignorance,

ॐ *'vibrahma:'* means 'ignorance' and 'distraction' together.

ॐ 'दशमः अस्मि' इति न वेत्ति - does not claim 'I am the 10th man',

ॐ तान् नव वीक्षमाणः अपि - even though he is clearly observing the other nine *Brahmacharin-s*.

The very fact that he is observing 'nine' *Brahmacharin-s* is the proof for the existence of the 10th 'observer'. It should be evident to him. An analogy: "Whenever I look at the photograph of a group of people, I know there is a person, apart from the group, who is 'clicking' the photograph. Even though the 'clicker' is not 'clicked'/ the 'clicker' does not appear in the photograph, his existence will be understood". But, in this story, the 'evident observer' (himself) is missed by the 10th man.

174: Chapter III, Verses 64-66 (20-02-2010)

Sureswaraacharyaa, in these verses, wants to establish that *mahaa vaakyam* alone will eliminate the '*moolaavidhya*' or 'self-ignorance'. By the word '*moolaavidhya*', we mean 'the ignorance regarding the true nature of the *saakshi*', '*saakshi*' being the '*adhistaanam*' of the whole universe.

He wants to point out the following:

"By *anvaya vyathirekaa* method, the student can arrive at the *saakshi*. That is possible; i.e. the student can know 'I' am the Consciousness principle. That is possible. The student can know that 'I' am different from the *pancha kosaa*-s or *sareerathrayam*. That also he can know and he may perhaps even know that the Consciousness is all-pervading, because, the limitations belong to the 'observed' body and not to the observer 'I'. The student may also, therefore, arrive at the fact "I' am the limitless Consciousness; not only am 'I' free from spatial limitation; 'I' do not have limitations of time also". The student may arrive at even this fact, based on the experience that the time-wise limitations appear when he uses the physical body in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, while, in *sushupthi*, when he does not identify with the physical body, he does not experience even time. Thus, by using *anvaya vyathirekaa* method, the student can gather, "I' am *desa pariccheda rahitha saakshi; kaala pariccheda rahitha saakshi; sarva gatha saakshi; nirguna saakshi*"

"But, that 'knowledge' is not complete, because, the student will never get to know, whether this *saakshi* is *ekam* or *anekam*, if *mahaa vaakyam* is not there. Without the application of *mahaa vaakyam*, he will commit the blunder that the *Yoga* philosopher has committed. The *Yoga* philosopher also arrives at the 'eternal, all-pervading' Consciousness; but, wrongly considers it as 'pluralistic'; i.e. the *Yoga* philosopher says that there are *many* Consciousnesses, each Consciousness being eternal and each Consciousness being all-pervading. In the same manner, the student will never drop the 'pluralistic' idea, by the use of the *anvaya vyathirekaa* method alone.

"And, again, if the *mahaa vaakyam* is not used, the student will never know that, 'I', the Consciousness, am of a higher order of reality, in comparison to the entire universe. There is no way of knowing this fact also. By any amount of 'experience',

the student will never get to know "I am of a higher order of reality, than the world". He can never know this, by logic. No modern science also can prove that Consciousness is of a higher order of reality. 'Awareness' or 'realization' of this fact will necessarily require the employment of *mahaa vaakyaa*.

" Without the *mahaa vaakyam*, the student will never get the knowledge " 'I am *eka*;; 'I am of the higher order of reality; and, the entire world, the *anaathmaa*, the matter, including the very body-mind complex itself, is of a lower order, termed *mithyaa*". We can never arrive at these three important facts, viz., (i) *saakshina: ekathvam* (ii) *saakshina: paaramaarthika sathyathvam* and (iii) *anaathmana: mithyaathvam*, by *anvaya vyathirekaa* or by logic or by modern science or by *nirvikalapaka samaadhi anubhavaa*. None of these four methods will help. This knowledge can be arrived at, only through *mahaa vaakyam* / "*moolaavidhyaa nivarthaka mahaa vaakya pramaana moordhanyena eva jnaanam sambhavathy*". "*Pramaana moordhanyam*" means the highest *pramaanam*".

We call the ignorance of these three basic facts, namely, (i) *saakshi eka*: (ii) *saakshi paaramaarthika sathya*: and (iii) *jagath mithyaa*, as 'self-ignorance' or *moolaavidhyaa*.

This *moolaavidhyaa* itself has got two components. One component is concealing the nature of *saakshi*, viz., the *paaramaathika sathyathva* nature and the *adhvitheeyathva* nature. This 'concealing' is one function / power of *moolavidhyaa* and is called the '*aavarana sakthi*' of *moolaavidhyaa*.

The second function / power of *moolaavidhyaa* is 'distracting our attention towards *anaathmaa* and making us get obsessed with the *mithyaa anaathmaa*'. This 'obsession with *anaathmaa*' is of such a large magnitude, that the *paaramaarthika sathyathvam* of *aathmaa* is ignored. This 'distraction' is otherwise called '*vikshepaa*', otherwise called '*moha*:', otherwise called '*bhraanthi*:' This *vikshepa sakthi* of *moolaavidhyaa* keeps us busy/ occupied with *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of possessions, profession, family, body and mind

Thus, the two functions of *moolaavidhyaa* are (1) 'Concealment of 'my' *paaramaarthika sathyathvam*', termed '*aavaranaa*' and (2) 'causing Obsession with *anaathmaa*', termed '*vikshepaa*'.

Now, between this 'concealment' and 'obsession', it is very difficult to identify as to which is the cause and which is the consequence. In other words, the doubt is: "Is it because of my obsession with *anaathmaa*, that I am forgetting my Self or is it because I am forgetting my Self, I am obsessed with *anaathmaa*?"

Both are true. "Because of my self-ignorance, resulting from 'concealment', I am obsessed with the world" is correct. "Because I am obsessed with the world, I ignore my nature" is also correct, as eloquently brought out by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Bhaja Govindam* (verse 7) : "*Baalasthaavath kreedaasktha: ; tharunasthaavath tharunee saktha: vrudhasthaavath chinthaasaktha: pare Brahmani kopi na saktha:* " – "Childhood passes away in play. Thoughts of love engage the youth. The old age is spent on worrying. At no stage, does a man turn his mind towards God". The 'concealment' of the true nature of the Self' and 'obsession with *anaathmaa*' are mutually cause and consequence.

Even though, technically, we say *aavaranaa* is cause for *vikshepaa*, on enquiry, we find that each one reinforces the other.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to talk about this idea – this two-fold adverse consequences caused by *moolaavidhya*. For that purpose alone, he has introduced the *dhasama dhrushthaantha*, where the *dhasama:*, the 10th man, is ignoring himself because of his obsession with the other nine people. The obsession with the nine people is the cause of self-ignoring and, conversely, self-ignorance has caused the obsession with the nine people. Thus, both get reinforced mutually. What is the result? **Ans:** "*Samsaara:* is the result". That is said here.

Going back to the 64th *slokaa* (that was completed in the earlier session), the term "*thaan nava veekshamaana: api*" indicates, that, the very fact that the 10th man is observing the other nine people should be ample proof to convince him "I, the observer, am different from the nine and if I am different from the nine, I am the 10th person and I do not requires any other proof for that. The other nine members require proof; I have to 'observe' them; but, I, the 'observer' and the 'person doing the counting of nine' do not require any proof". But, even though the 10th man is thus evident, without the need for any proof, this 10th man manages to ignore himself as the 10th man, as he is 'lost' in the 'nine men'. As a consequence he worries and complains "I have not yet got what I wanted".

The plight of the 'self-ignorant' / *moolaavidhyaa*-afflicted individual is similar. The peace of mind that he is searching / looking for is 'his' *svaroopam*. But, that is missed, because of obsession with *anaathmaa*. And, that is the success of *moolavidhyaa*.

Moolaavidhyaa is laughing every time we are crying. Every time we cry, *moolaavidhyaa* is having a hearty, loud laughter, because we have managed to miss the most evident fact "*Aham aanando Brahma asmi*". It requires somebody (a *guru*) to come and tell us this message "*aanando Brahma; thath thvam asi*", similar to the passer-by in the story, telling the 10th man, "*sa: dhasama: thvam asi*".

But, the problem is, even when the *guru* is saying this, the student is so preoccupied with the *pancha anaathmaa*, that, he does not listen to the teaching, again, similar to the *dhasama*: in the story, who does not listen to the passer-by, since he is preoccupied with counting one or two or three or nine. The entire life is 'missed', missing the 'tenth'.

Just as the 10th man in the story , "*nava samkyayaa aahruthajnaana: dhasama: asmi ithi na vetthi*" - "with his mind distracted by the counting of (the other) nine, does not claim 'I am the 10th man' ", the *moolavidhyaa*-afflicted aspirant, obsessed by the *pancha anaathmaa*, misses the teaching '*thath thvam asi*'.

What to say about the glory of *maayaa*? In his *Maayaa Panchakam*, *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa*, glorifies the power of *maayaa* - "*Tvadh agatitha ghatanaa pateeyasi maayaa*" - "Oh! *Maayaa*! How adept you are, at making even impossible things happen!"

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 65 :

अथ द्रष्टान्तगतमर्थं दार्ष्टान्तिकार्थं समर्पयिष्यन्नाह ।

The point of the analogy is exhibited in the present case:

ॐ अथ - Now,

ॐ समर्पयिष्यन् - extending

ॐ द्रष्टान्तगतं अर्थं - the idea that we saw in the example

ॐ दार्शनिक अर्थ - to the 'original' case (namely, the Vedhaanthic student)

ॐ आह - the author gives the following slokaa.

'The idea that we saw in the example (*dhrushtaanthagatham artham*), the *dhasama dhrushtaanthaa*, was the two-fold problem of the *dhasama*;, consisting of (i) 'obsession with the other nine' and (ii) 'ignoring the 10th man or himself'. As can be recollected, the 'obsession' was termed '*vikshepa*' and the 'ignoring' was termed '*aavaranam*'. Sureswaraachaaryaa is attempting to show, how these two, '*vikshepa*' and '*aavaranam*', are mutually reinforcing each other, in the case of the *mumukshu* missing to see his Self, (which is *Brahman* all the time) as *Brahman*. 'Missing *Brahman*' is 'missing peace of mind' / 'missing *aanandha*.' / 'missing *poornathvam*' / 'missing *saanthi*.' | By missing *Brahman*, we miss all these things, which we consider important in life and which we are running after, all the time. The *Aachaaryaa* points out, that, the only solution to this problem is *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

Verse 65 – Chapter III:

अपविद्धयोऽप्येवं तत्त्वमस्यादिना विना ।

वेत्ति नैकलमात्मानं नान्वेष्यं चात्र कारणम् ॥ ६५ ॥

Though the Self is without a second, one does not understand this single Self, without the help of texts like 'That thou art'. There is no need to search for the cause of this situation.

All the people who ignore the *Saakshi / Brahma thathvam*, do so, because of the two problems that were discussed in detail. In the 'example' (*dhasama dhrushtaanthaa*), the first problem is the obsession with 'counting the nine'. In a similar manner, in the 'original' (*dhaarshthaanthaa*, namely, the *mumukshu*), 'obsession' with either the world or the body-mind *anaathmaa* is the first problem.

The *Yogic* people also rightly believe: "Because I am absorbed in the world, I am missing the true nature of myself". But, based on this *right* perspective, they *wrongly* conclude, that if (i) we negate the *anaathmaa* by *anvaya vyathirekaa* (ii) withdraw from all the thoughts (iii) withdraw from the sense organs also and (iv) abide in *saakshi svaroopam*, we can get *advaita jnanam*. They do not want to resort to *mahaa vaakyam*. Their philosophy is, that, if the entire *anaathmaa* is eliminated, by practicing *aasanaa*, *praanaayaamaa*, *prathyaahaaraa*, *dharanaa* and *dhyaanam*, the aspirant learns to abide as *saakshi*. Since *saakshi* is Self-evident (it is said to be

svayam prakaasa chaithanyam), they think the *svayam prakaasa chaithanyam* will reveal itself, as *paaramaarthika sathyam*. They believe that the *saakshi* will reveal its nature by itself, without *mahaa vaakyam*.

Because of this line of thinking, they attempt to remove the duality of the world, by what they term *samaadhi avasthaa*, which they define as "*thadhaa dhrashtu: svaroope avasthaanam*". This is the definition given in *Yoga saasthraa*. Of course, in *samaadhi*, they *are* able to abide in *saakshi svaroopam*. But, the problem is, even while abiding in *saakshi svaroopam*, at best, they may discover "'I' am the *saakshi*; 'I' am the *chaithanyam*", the *samaanya jnaanam* of the *saakshi*; but, they will never get the *visesha jnaanam*. What is that *visesha jnaanam*? **Ans:** "That *saakshi* is *ekam adhvitheeyam*". *Yoga saasthraa* people never come to know this; they never know *saakshi* alone is **the** *paaramaarthika sathya*: and *jagath* is *mithyaa*. They will never know these three important facts about the *saakshi* and *jagath*, because no *pramaanam* is available in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*.

It should be understood and remembered, that *saakshi*, by itself, can never serve as a *pramaanam* in revealing *saakshi* as *paaramaarthika sathyam*. In *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, though the *Yogic* practitioner does manage to abide in *saakshi*, that *saakshi* can never serve as a *pramaanam* in revealing itself as *paaramaarthika sathyam*. *Saakshi* will not 'whisper' in the *Yogic* practitioner's ears: "This Consciousness, which is free from all the *anaathmaa*, is *advitheeyam*. It is *jagath adhistaanam*. From this alone, the whole *mithyaa* world has come".

Remember *saakshi / Aathmaa / Chaithanyam* is not a *pramaanam*. *Chaithanyam* can never give any knowledge. If *chaithanyam* can give knowledge, all of us would have gained 'knowledge', *janmaa-s* and *janmaa-s* before, since, all of us were blessed with *chaithanyam* in the past and are blessed with *chaithanyam* in the present. Especially during *sushupthi*, which we go through every day, the entire *anaathmaa* is resolved and the *chaithanyam* alone is there. If *chaithanyam* were a *pramaanam*, it would have told us "'I', *chaithanyam*, am *paaramaarthika sathya*:" |

Let it be very clear, that, no doubt, *chaithanyam* is self-evident, but that self-evident *chaithanyam* cannot give the knowledge, that, "the self-evident *chaithanyam* is *paaramaarthika sathyam*". *Chaithanyam* will never say this.

In that case, for getting that knowledge, what do we require? **Ans:** "*Veda pramaanam* is required" What *Veda pramaanam*? **Ans:** "*Vedhaantha pramaanam*". Which *vedhanthaa pramaanam*? **Ans:** "*Mahaa vaakyam vedhaantha pramanam*".

Sureswaraacharya wants to advise: "So, there is no use in 'sitting in *samaadhi* and waiting for *advaita jnaanam*'. Listen to *mahaa vaakyam*. Do not underestimate the importance of *mahaa vaakyam*. Some people say 'I have heard *mahaa vaakyam* sufficiently, let me go to *samaadhi*. What we, *Vedhaanthin-s* are saying is that, you have to reverse the statement, as '*Samaadhi* is enough; let us come to *mahaa vaakyam*'. *Samaadhi* does not follow *mahaa vaakyam*. *Samaadhi* can only be a preliminary *saadhanaa*, to achieve poise of mind. *Mahaa vaakyam* is the ultimate liberating source of knowledge". Therefore, he says:

अपविद्धयः अपि - Even if a person sits in *samaadhi*, as pure *saakshi*, having eliminated the entire *dvaita prapanchaa*,

The term '*apaviddha*' means 'thrown off / dismissed / rejected / freed from / devoid of'. The term is derived 'from the root '*vyadh*', meaning 'to throw away / cast away / toss away' | '*Dhvaya:*' means '*dvaita prapanchaa* / *anaathma prapanchaa* / *thriputi* | '*Apaviddha dhvaya:*', therefore, means 'after eliminating *dvaita prapanchaa*'.

The reference is to a person sitting in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* as *Saakshi*. What type of *Saakshi*? **Ans:** "Self-effulgent *Saakshi* / *chaithanya roopa Saakshi*".

But, even if the person sits in *samaadhi* for a billion *janmaa-s*, he will not achieve '*jnaanam*'. Dayananda Swamiji humorously says about this person, that the only difference is, that, this person was earlier 'turbulently' ignorant and now is 'quietly' ignorant.

The 'turbulence' and 'disturbances' in this practitioner's mind give way to 'peace' and 'quietude'. But, his 'ignorance' does not get eliminated, because *saakshi* is **not** a source of any knowledge. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says, that, even if a person sits in *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*:

ॐ तत्त्वमस्यादिना विना - without the employment of *mahaa vaakyam* from the mouth of an *aacharya*,

ॐ एकलं आत्मानं न वेत्ति - one cannot know the *adhvitheeya, paaramaarthika*
sathyam aathmaa.

'*Ekalam*' means '*adhvitheeyam*'. '*Ekala:*' is the corresponding noun. '*Paaramaarthikam sathyam*' has to be added, though it is not explicitly mentioned by the *Aachaaryaa*. So, according to Sureswaraachaaryaa, *moolaavidhyaa* can never go away without *mahaa vaakyam*.

It should be remembered here, that as discussed earlier, while talking about four types of students, the first type of students, like *Prajaapathi* and *Vaama Devaa*, are 'seemingly' exceptions to this rule. The relevant scriptures do relate that neither *Prajaapathi* nor *Vaama Devaa* underwent any *sravanam*; without *sravanam*, they gained 'knowledge'. But, Sureswaraachaaryaa's contention is, that, in their cases also, though *sravanam* did not take place in their current *janmaa-s*, they also underwent *sravanam* in their *poorva janmaa-s* and that, the *mahaa vaakyam* which was in their subconscious minds in the form of *vaasanaa*, got activated in the current *janmaa-s*. An example was given in our earlier discussions – the 'tube-light'. Some tube-lights do not get activated immediately on their being switched on; only after a few minutes they 'light up'. This does not mean 'switching on' is not required; it has been done earlier; it is the tube that did not get activated immediately. In a like manner, anybody gets 'knowledge' only through *mahaa vaakyam*, listened to, in this year or in the previous year or ten years before or ten *janmaa-s* before. Sureswaraachaaryaa asserts that, *mahaavakyaa* is common to all the *jnaani-s*.

In this context, it may be argued, that, *Gouthama Buddha* got 'enlightened' without *mahaa vaakyam*. While we are not sure whether *Buddha's* 'enlightenment' was '*advaita jnaanam*' or not, we certainly know, that, the 'knowledge' of his followers, the *Buddhists*, is not '*advaita jnaanam*'. None of the four forms of *Buddhism* now available and discussed by *Goudapaadhaachaaryaa* in his *Maandookya Kaarika-s*, believes in the maxim "*Brahma Sathyam Jagan mithyaa Jeevo Brahmaiva naapara:*" The four branches of *Buddhism* are (1) *Southraanthikaa Buddhism* (2) *vaibhaashikaa Buddhism* (3) *Yogaachaaraa Buddhism* and (4) *Maadhyamikaa Buddhism*. All the four consistently miss this truth. What is the reason? **Ans:** "They do not employ *mahaa vaakyam*". Without *mahaa vaakyam*, if an aspirant sits under a *bodhi* tree and gets 'enlightenment', that 'knowledge' will not be '*aham eva sathyamBrahma ; jagan mithyaa*' | Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that, if **that** '*advaita jnaanam*' knowledge has to come, the aspirant should realize the importance of *mahaa*

vaakyam. He says, '*thaththvamasyaadhinaa vinaa ekalam aathmaanam na vetthi* – 'without the help of the *mahaa vaakyaani* such as '*thath thvam asi*', one cannot know *adhvitheeya aathmaa*'. He proceeds:

अत्र कारणम् न अन्वेष्यं - There is no need to look for the cause of this situation / Do not ask more about the cause of this ignorance.

The *Aachaaryaa* says: "Note this much, that, a person does not get 'knowledge' even after sitting in *nirvikalpaka saamdhi*. But, do not ask me too many questions regarding the cause for this".

'*Athra*' means '*ajnaane*'; i.e., 'in missing the *advaita aathmaa*'. By '*kaaranam na anveshyam*' he means 'do not ask about the cause'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa **does** elaborate on the cause later. But, now, he says 'do not ask me what is the cause'. He is making this statement, with the intention to convey a particular idea, in the next *slokaa*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 66 :

नान्वेष्यं चात्र कारणमित्युक्तं तत्कस्मादिति चोदिते प्रत्याहन्वेषणासहिष्णुत्वात् । तत्कथमित्याह ।

That 'there is no need to search for the cause of this' has been asserted because the matter cannot bear investigation. How?

ॐ 'न अन्वेष्यं च अत्र कारणम्' - 'Do not ask me more questions with regard to this (i.e.

- with regard to why people do not gain knowledge
- without *mahaa vaakyam*),

ॐ इति युक्तं- is what was said by me.

Sureswaraachaaryaa quotes here, the fourth quarter of the previous *slokaa*.

तत् कस्मात् इति चोदिते - Suppose a student asks "why do you say that I should not ask for the cause?".

Presumably, this student's doubt is: "Why do you say that I should not ask for the cause? Is not there a cause at all, for that?"

Sureswaraacharya's answer will be: "There *is* a cause. What is that cause? *Moolaavidhya* is the cause for 'self-ignorance' and 'distraction'. But, still, I would say 'do not ask about the cause'".

Why? What is the idea? The idea is this: "There are certain things, which you can generally talk about and comment on. But, when you probe into them, you will get into problems. To convey this, we give an example. Imagine the night time. In the night, there is darkness and because of the darkness, we are not able to see things clearly. Suppose a person asks the question 'why are we not able to see things clearly in the night?' and somebody gives the answer 'it is because of darkness'. Generally, people nod their heads in acceptance, as if they have understood. But, suppose the questioner persists and asks the question 'what is darkness?'. And, suppose, this person wants to clearly 'see' what darkness is, with the help of his eyes. But, when he, thus, tries to 'see' the darkness with the help of eyes, he will not be able to do so, because darkness is that in which eyes do not function. What is the proof? If eyes were functioning in darkness, he would have seen the objects. Eyes do not function in darkness; eyes cannot understand darkness.

"And, suppose, therefore, this person decides 'since eyes do not function in darkness, I will bring lights to study the nature of darkness'. In other words, this person wants to do a research on darkness and he wants to do the research with the help of 'eyes'. But, he discovers that eyes do not function in the presence of darkness. Therefore, for 'functioning of eyes', he wants to bring in the lights. He thinks 'with the help of light, eyes will function. Therefore, using the lights, I will research darkness'; i.e., he wants to employ lights to research darkness. But, what happens? The moment he brings in the lights, the darkness disappears. All these show, that, darkness can never be probed into, either with light or without light. Without light, you cannot probe, because, without light, eyes do not function to do the probing; with the lights you cannot probe darkness, because when the lights come on, darkness goes away.

"Then, what is darkness? It is a mysterious entity which is responsible for non-perception of things, but which cannot be probed into and understood.

"In our tradition, there are books written on 'what is darkness?', and, what is their conclusion? **Ans:** 'We are still in darkness, regarding darkness' ".

At this juncture, Swamiji quotes Swami Chinmayanandhaaji. He says: "Swami Chinmayanandhaaji was a master story-teller. Whenever a topic sounds dry or is difficult to comprehend, he will invent a story and regale his students with the story. He nicely conveys our present topic also in the form of a story. His story is this: 'Somebody went and told the sun-god, that there is a beautiful girl called Nishaa / Miss Night. When he heard this, the sun-god wanted to meet her and marry her. Then he asked the question 'where is this girl, Miss Night?' He was answered 'She is on the other side of the earth'. The sun-god decided to seek and find her out and marry her; but, when, with this intention, he went to the other side of the earth, he found, that, Miss Night had moved to the first side. The sun-god, therefore, went to the first side, only to find that Miss Night had moved to the second side. Even now the sun-god is going round and round the earth for the purpose of meeting / dating/ marrying Miss Nisha'. In Sanskrit, the name 'Nishaa' is (*akaaraantha:*) *sthree linga:* or feminine gender. In contrast, the name 'Surya:' is (*akaaraanatha:*) *pullinga:* or masculine gender. So, Swami Chinmayaanadhaaji's story fits very appropriately."

Thus, what is darkness? **Ans:** "Darkness is a mysterious thing". You cannot probe it either with light or without light. Without light, you cannot probe, because the eyes cannot function; with light, you cannot probe, because once the light comes, darkness disappears.

In a similar manner, 'ignorance' is also a mysterious entity. Just like 'darkness', you cannot probe into 'ignorance' also. In the presence of ignorance, you cannot know things. In the presence of 'self-ignorance', you cannot know the Self. If you want to probe into 'self-ignorance' with a *pramaanam* (comparable to light, in the example), ignorance itself will not be there, because the moment *pramaanam* comes, knowledge comes and ignorance goes away, just as when light comes, darkness goes away. Without any *pramaanam* also you cannot know ignorance. Conclusion: "In the absence of *pramaanam* also you cannot know 'ignorance'; in the presence of *pramaanam* also you cannot know 'ignorance'". But, at the same time, you cannot say it is not there also. Therefore, 'self-ignorance' is a mysterious entity.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa, in his *Viveka Choodaamani* (verse 109) says about *maayaa* or *moolaavidhya* (ignorance): "*sannaapi asannaapi ubhayaathmikaa no*

bhinnaapi abhinnaapi ubhayaathmikaa no saanghaapi anangaa hyubhayaathmikaa no mahaa adhbhuthaa anirvachaneeyaropaa – "Mayaa cannot be said as real or non-existent or combination of real and non-existent. It is not separate nor non-separate from *Brahman* nor combined in nature of separate and non-separate; does not have parts nor is part-less, nor combined in nature. She is a great wonder and cannot be categorically explained".

Therefore, the advice is: "Do not probe into ignorance. Bring in and use the *pramaanam* and know the Self; ignorance goes away.

Based on these facts, Sureswaraachaaryaa himself asks: "Why do I say 'do not ask me more questions about *moolaavidhyaa*'?"; and, explains "If you ask more questions, I will not be giving you any clarity. The more questions you ask, the more, will I add to the confusion. By asking questions, therefore, you will be only adding to confusion.

"Never take a light and try to study 'darkness' with light. And, without light also, you cannot study darkness, because without lights eyes cannot function. When eyes do not function, how can you say 'I am seeing darkness?'"

Darkness is 'non-functioning of the eyes'. This was discussed in another context. In the *Bhaashyam* for the *Bhagavadh Githaa* verse "*Yaa nisaa sarvabhoothaanaam thasyaam jaagrathi samyami yasyaam jaagrathi bhoothaani saa nisaa pasyatho mune.*" (Ch. II – Verse 69), 'darkness' was defined as 'a condition in which eyes do not function'. We can never say 'eyes are seeing darkness'. It is illogical, because, darkness is a state where eyes do not function; eyes can function only in the medium of light.

Exactly like darkness being *anirvachaneeyam*, ignorance is also *anirvachaneeyam*. It is *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*. It cannot be said to be *bhaava roopam*; nor *abhaava roopam* also. It is *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam* like darkness. And, because it is *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam* it is *anirvachaneeyam*. The term '*anirvachaneeyam*' means 'indescribable' or 'mysterious'.

Human intellect can understand any object or situation only when it can categorize the object or situation; i.e. intellect understands only by 'categorization'. And, '*moolaavidhyaa*' is not available for categorization as *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava*

roopam. Therefore, the aspirant should not probe into *moolaavidhyaa*. Then what should he do? He should use the '*thathvamasi pramaanam*' and eliminate the *moolaavidhyaa*. Instead of probing into *moolaavidhyaa*, it should be eliminated, by using *mahaa vaakyam*. That should be the aim / job of the aspirant.

Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*thath kasmaath ithi chodhithe*" – "If a student asks "why do you say that I should not ask for the cause?",

ॐ प्रति आह - I am giving the answer.

What is his answer?

ॐ अन्वेषण असहिष्णुत्वात् - 'Since *moolaavidhyaa* is not available for enquiry'.

Moolaavidhyaa is not available for probing, because it is not subject to categorization. '*Anveshanaa*' means enquiry / probing. '*Asahishnuthvam*' means 'nature of non-availability / non-endurance'. It does not allow itself to be enquired into. In Swami Vidyaaranyaa's *Panchadasi*, there is a very beautiful *slokaa* on this topic: "*chodhyepi yadhi chodhyam syaath thath chodhye chodhyathe mayaa parihaaryam athathas chodhyam na puna: prathichodhyathaam*" |

Swamiji says in a lighter vein: "*Moolavidhyaa* itself is a question mark. Do not put another question mark in front of *moolaavidhyaa*. If you put a question mark in front of *moolaavidhyaa*, what does it mean? It means 'I have put a question mark and you are putting another question mark, asking what is the first question mark'. Then, what will I do? I will put another question mark, in front of your question mark. Thus, we will go on and on. Therefore do not put a question mark in front of *moolaavidhyaa*, because *moolaavidhyaa* itself is a question mark". This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa says, by the term '*anveshana asahishnuthvaath*'.

ॐ तत् क्तं इति आह - 'How it is', is being explained in the *slokaa*, that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 66 –

सेयं भ्रान्तिर्निरालम्बा सर्वन्यायविरोधिनी ।

सहते न विचारं सा तमो यद्वत् दिवाकरम् ॥ ६६ ।

This illusion is baseless and is opposed to all logic. It cannot endure enquiry even as darkness cannot endure the sun.

ॐ सा इयं भ्रान्तिः - That cause for 'self-ignorance' is called '*bhraanthi*:' |

'*Bhraanthi*:' means '*moolaavidhyaa*', which is eliminable by '*thathvamas*' and '*thathvamas*' alone. *Mahaa vaakyam* is the only 'detergent' which can tackle this intractable '*moolaavidhyaa*' dirt.

And, what should be the aim of the *mumukshu*? **Ans:** "Bringing in *mahaa vaakyam* and removing *moolaavidhyaa*". We will only use the word *moolaavidhyaa*, utilize the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and get rid of *moolaavidhyaa*. We do not want to use a *pramaanam* to 'study' *moolaavidhyaa* It should be never done. Why? The reason:

ॐ निरालम्बा - *Moolaavidhyaa* 'exists' without having any clear feature of its own,

It does not clearly have even the feature of 'existence', because, if it has got a clear feature of existence, then there will be two things – *Brahman* and *moolaavidhyaa*. It exists in a mysterious manner, without having any clear features of its own. It means one cannot say 'it is *sath*'; one cannot say 'it is *asath*'; one cannot say 'it is *bhaava roopam*' or 'it is *abhaavaroopam*'. One cannot say 'it is *saadhi* (with beginning)'; one cannot say it is '*anaadhi* (without a beginning)'. One cannot say 'it is *sagunam*'; one cannot say 'it is *nirgunam*'.

One cannot say '*moolaavidhyaa* is *saavayavam* (with internal divisions)'; one cannot say 'it is *niravayavam*'. One cannot say 'it is part of *Brahman*'; one cannot say 'it is outside *Brahman*'. One cannot say 'it is located in *Brahman*'; one cannot say 'it is located outside *Brahman*'.

What is the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*? There was a detailed discussion on this, in the introduction to this chapter. One cannot firmly specify the *aasrayaa* of *moolaavidhyaa*. Sometimes, it is said to be the 'mind'; sometimes it is said to be *aathmaa*. *Moolaavidhyaa's aasrayaa* also is indefinable.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa terms *moolavidhyaa* as '*niraalambhaa*', meaning that 'it cannot be defined' / 'it cannot be categorized' / 'mysterious'. But, we have to

admit its existence. Why? **Ans:** "Because of that *moolaavidhyaa* alone, we have ignored the *saakshi*". Going back to the example, you cannot say 'darkness' is not there. Darkness cannot be defined. Darkness cannot be probed into. But, you cannot say darkness is not there; proved by the simple reason that we use the word 'darkness'. If there is no such thing as 'darkness', the very word will not be there. Darkness is as mysterious as *moolaavidhyaa*. Conversely, *moolaavidhyaa* is as mysterious as darkness.

The term '*niraalambhaa*' means '*anirvachaneeyaa*'.

ॐ सर्वन्यायविरोधिनी - and is averse to all logical categorization or classification.

'*Nyaayaa*', in this context, refers to 'logical categorization'.

Another meaning of '*sarva nyaaya virodhinee*' is '*sarva pramaana virodhinee*' / 'it is averse to all *pramaanam*-s'. How is it to be understood? **Ans:** "Without *pramaanam*, you will not be able to understand. With *pramaanam* also, you will not be able to understand, since, the moment *pramaanam* comes, *moolaavidhyaa* will disappear". Therefore:

ॐ सा विचारं न सहते - '*Moolaavidhyaa*' does not endure / stand any enquiry,

ॐ यद्वत् तमः दिवाकरम् (न सहते) - just as darkness cannot endure the sun.

There are three sentences in this verse. '*Saa iyam bhraanthi:|*' is the first sentence. '*Saa bhraanthi: niraalambhaa sarva nyaaya virodhinee (bhavathi)*' is the second sentence. '*saa vichaaram na sahathe yadhvath thama: dhivaakaram*' is the third sentence.

This *slokaa* is one of the most famous *slokaa*-s of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, since it establishes the '*anirvachaneeyam*' status of *moolaavidhyaa* and is quoted very often by different *aacharyaa*-s, in their commentaries or sub-commentaries. The fantastic *slokaa* from the *Viveka Choodaamani* (verse 109), quoted earlier, "*sannaapi asanaapi ubhayaathmikaa no bhinnapi abhinnaapi ubhayaathmikaa no saanghaapi anangaa hyubhayaathmikaa no mahaa adhbhuthaa anirvachaneeyaropaa*" - "Mayaa cannot be said as real or non-existent or combination of real and non-existent. It is not separate nor non-separate from *Brahman* nor combined in nature of separate

and non-separate; does not have parts nor is part-less, nor combined in nature. She is a great wonder and cannot be categorically explained" should be recollected again, in this context.

175: Chapter III, Verses 66-70 (27-02-2010)

In this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that the *moolaavidhyaa* or self-ignorance will get eliminated only by the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*; and, also, that, the aspirant should not try to probe deeply into *moolaavidhyaa*, because of a peculiar situation.

That 'peculiar' situation is this: If you have to probe into anything, you have to use the instrument of *pramaanam*; i.e. any probing / any enquiry is done with the help of a *pramaanam* only. If you want to probe into *moolaavidhyaa* or even any other *avidhyaa*, you have to bring in a *pramaanam* to probe into that. But, in the case of *moolaavidhyaa* / any *avidyaa*, there is a problem. The very job of the *pramaanam* is to produce the light of 'knowledge'; and naturally when *pramaanam* comes, the moment it is brought in, the 'light of knowledge' also will come; and, when 'light of knowledge' comes, *avidhyaa* will go away. In short, when *pramaanam* is absent, ignorance cannot be probed and when *pramaanam* is present, ignorance is not there at all for probing. This is the problem.

To repeat: Since any probing has to be done with a *pramaanam* only, when *pramaanam* is absent, ignorance cannot be probed into. But, when *pramaanam* is made available and present, ignorance will not be there for probing.

And, therefore, *moolaavidhyaa* will always remain inaccessible / unavailable for any probing or enquiry. It is 'experienced'; but, is not available for 'enquiry'. The consolation is, that, for achieving *mokshaa* or 'liberation', the aspirant / *mumukshu* does not have to know about or enquire into *moolaavidhyaa*. For *mokshaa*, he has to only negate *moolaavidhyaa*. And, even though *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be enquired into or probed into by any *pramaanam*, fortunately, it is not resistant to 'negation' by a suitable *pramaanam*. Thus, *moolaavidhyaa* (i) can be experienced (ii) cannot be enquired into (iii) but, can be negated.

In relation to *pramaanam*-s, this can be stated as (i) *moolaavidhyaa* can be 'experienced' in the absence of *pramaanam* (ii) *moolaavidhyaa* can be negated in the presence of *pramaanam* (iii) but, *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be enquired into, either in the absence of *pramaanam* or in the presence of *pramaanam*. To repeat the logic

behind this statement: "In the absence of *pramaanam*, *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be enquired into, because, without *pramaanam*, nothing can be enquired into. In the presence of *pramaanam*, *moolaavidhyaa* cannot be probed into or enquired into, because it is not there at all, since, on the arrival of *pramaanam*, it disappears".

That is why, Sureswaraacharyaa says "*saa vichaaram na sahathe*" - "*moolaavidhyaa* does not stand enquiry". Since *moolaavidhyaa* is not available for enquiry, it is not available for any definition or description also – "*saa anirvachaneeyam api*" | It cannot be classified under *sath* category or *asath* category. It cannot be considered as different from *Brahman* or identical with *Brahman*. Thus, it is *anirvachaneeyam* also.

Therefore, the *Vedhaanthic* advice is: "Do not try to enquire into *moolaavidhyaa*; fortunately, the 'enquiry' is not required for *mokshaa*. Instead, negate *moolaavidhyaa*, by bringing in the suitable *pramaanam*".

To convey these ideas, Sureswaraacharyaa is quoting the famous example of *Vedhaantha saasthra*. What is that example? **Ans:** '*Thama:*' / 'Darkness'.

Darkness is 'experienced' in the absence of light; darkness is 'negated' on the arrival of light. But, it is not possible to enquire or probe into the nature of darkness, either in the absence of light or in the presence of light.

Darkness cannot be enquired into, in the absence of light. Why? **Ans:** "Because for any 'enquiring', you require functioning eyes. To 'enquire' into anything, you have to use the enquiring instrument 'eye'. But, in darkness, eyes do not function for conducting the enquiry; eyes can function only in the presence of light. Darkness itself means 'absence of light'; and, 'absence of light' results in 'non-functioning' of eyes ; and, how can the non-functioning eyes enquire into 'darkness', which word itself means 'absence of light'?"

The Sanskrit word '*andhakaara:*' for 'darkness' is a very, very significant word and relevant here. '*Andhakaara:*' means 'that which makes the eyes blind', derived as '*andham karothi ithi andhakaara:*' |

So, what is the definition of darkness? **Ans:** "That which makes the eyes blind". It is a principle that 'blinds'. How can you probe the 'blinding' darkness, with the help of

the eyes, because, the moment 'darkness' is there, eyes become blind and how can anyone enquire with blind eyes ? The contradiction is obvious. Therefore, we arrive at the conclusion that darkness cannot be enquired into, in the absence of lights.

And, based on this observation, assume that someone reasons: "Eyes are blinded because of darkness / absence of light. With blinded eyes, I am not able to probe into darkness. So, let me bring lights, so that with the arrival of lights, eyes will start functioning and with functioning eyes, I will probe into darkness". But, he will find to his dismay, that, the moment any light is brought in, darkness goes away and is not there at all, for any enquiry.

To consolidate: (i) Darkness is available for 'experience' in the absence of light. (ii) Darkness is removable by bringing in light and, therefore, in the presence of light. (iii) But, darkness cannot be probed into, either in the absence of light or in the presence of light. Therefore, the statement '*vichaaram na sahathe*' can be applied to darkness also.

The next point is: Just as *moolaavidhyaa* is *sadhasadbhyaam anirvachaneeyam*, *andhakaara:* is also *sadhasadbhyaam anirvachaneeyam*. You can never say it is existent or non-existent. You cannot say darkness is a non-existent entity, though, of course, *tharkaa* philosophers hold this view. The *tharkaa* philosophers define darkness as 'absence of light'; and, they say it is '*abhaava roopam*'. But, though *Vedhaanthaa* also accepts that 'darkness is absence of light', *Vedhaanthaa* says 'darkness cannot be categorized into *abhaava roopam*'. Why not?

(Swamiji remarks: We have not discussed this topic in any other context earlier. *Naishkarmya Siddhi* has given us the opportunity / necessity to discuss the topic).

To continue with the discussion on darkness: You cannot say darkness is *abhaava roopam* or nothingness or void because, darkness seems to have several functions. What are the different functions of darkness?

Darkness envelopes / covers objects and makes them invisible. Expressed in Sanskrit: "*Andhakaarena aavruttha padhaartha: dhrashtum na sakhyathe*". Since *andhakaaraa*, thus, covers objects, this 'concealing' *andhakaaraa* cannot be a non-existent entity, because a non-existent thing cannot 'conceal'. *Aavara thathvaath*, 'darkness' cannot be *abhaava:* | The 'concealing' is one function of darkness.

Secondly, *andhakaaraa* or darkness obstructs one's eyes from perceiving the object; i.e., the second function of *andhakaaraa* is 'obstructing vision'. And, an obstructing factor also cannot be a non-existent factor, because, obviously, a non-existent entity cannot obstruct. How can a non-existent entity do the act of 'obstructing'? *Andhakaaraa* / darkness covers the object and it obstructs my vision. The 'obstruction of vision' is another function of darkness.

Apart from this reason, namely, the two 'functions of darkness', there is one more reason, as to why darkness cannot be considered *abhaavaroopam*. The reason is this:

When light comes, *andhakaaraa* goes away; whatever goes away cannot be *abhaavaroopam*, because, obviously, an *abhaava padhartha* cannot come or go.

To consolidate: darkness covers; darkness obstructs; darkness departs; a covering, an obstructing, a departing darkness cannot be *abhaavaroopam* or non-existent.

Then, can you say: "Therefore, 'darkness' is *bhaava roopam*; that, 'darkness' is a positive, material substance?" That also is not possible, because, if it is a material substance, when the light comes on, you must see the 'departing' darkness 'going' somewhere. We do not find it 'going' to some place. Alternately, if 'darkness' is considered 'destroyed', you do not also see any material remains / *avasham* of darkness. When an object is destroyed, you must be able to see the material of which it is made; for example, when a pot is destroyed, there is the material of potsherds, dust etc. But, when darkness is eliminated, you do not see bits of any material, that goes to make darkness. Therefore, you cannot call darkness *bhaavaroopam*, since it disappears into 'nothingness', when the light comes. A *bhaava padhartha* can never disappear into 'nothingness'. *Andhakaaraa* disappears into nothingness, when the light comes. Therefore, you cannot call it *bhaava padhartham*.

Therefore, the conclusion is: "*andhakaara: bhaava roopam vaa abhaavaroopam vaa bhaavaabhavaabhyaam anirvachaneeyam*". You cannot define darkness, in the form of positive entity or in the form of negative entity.

Similarly, *moolaavidhyaa* is also *anirvachaneeyam*. That is said here (in verse 66) , as "*thama: yadvath divaakaram na sahathe*" – " just as the nocturnal darkness cannot stand the arrival of sunlight for 'probing'", indicating, "similarly *moolaavidhyaa* cannot stand the arrival of *pramaanam* for 'probing'. "Therefore, do not ask too many questions about *moolaavidhyaa*" advises Sureswaraacharya.

As stated earlier, this is not only true with reference to *moolaavidhyaa*, but, is true about any other *avidhyaa* also, such as, ignorance of subjects like Physics, of languages and of any other ignorance. We 'experience' / we are aware of, the ignorance of Physics / Chemistry etc. But, if you try to probe into "what is that ignorance?", that 'ignorance' becomes a mystery. You just learn Physics and remove the ignorance of Physics. Do not ask questions as to what exactly is that ignorance. Do not ask questions such as "Is it *bhaava: vaa abhaava: vaa?*"

(Swamiji says, in a lighter vein: "We have never been asking such questions. But, when Sureswaraacharya comes and tells us 'do not ask questions', we wake up to such doubts and get curious").

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 67:

तस्याः खल्वस्याः अविध्यायाः भ्रान्तेः सम्यग्ज्ञानोत्पत्तिद्वारेण निवृत्तिः।

This illusion of the nature of nescience is put an end to, by the rise of perfect knowledge.

Moolaavidhyaa cannot be enquired into or probed into. We can only work for the elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*. And, we **have** to work for the elimination of *moolaavidhyaa*, because it **is** the cause of *samsaraa*. There are so many other forms of ignorance, which we need not eliminate. We do not know so many languages. We do not know many subjects – social or scientific. We can choose not to put in effort to remove such 'ignorance-s'. We hear that many corrupt acts are being indulged in, by responsible and powerful political leaders; but, we are not aware of the details. In fact, in such areas, 'ignorance is bliss'. And, if *moolaavidhyaa* also had been bliss, we need not work to eliminate it. But, since *moolaavidhyaa* **is** a problem, instead of being 'bliss', we **have** to eliminate it; we have to eliminate it, without enquiring into it. How to do it? Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ निवृत्ति : - The removal / elimination

ॐ तस्या : अस्याः अविध्याया : - of that moolaavidhya, (which was described in the previous slokaa)

ॐ भ्रान्तेः - which moolaavidhya is otherwise called bhraanthi: ,

The Aachaaryaa calls moolaavidhya as bhraanthi: , in this context. Normally, bhraanthi: is avidhya kaaryam. But, in this context, he is using the word bhraanthi: for avidhya itself. "kaarya sabdha: kaaranaarthe upayuthyathe jahathi lakshanayaa".

ॐ सम्यग्ज्ञान उत्पत्तिद्वारेण खलु (भवति) - is possible only by the rise of right knowledge.

'*Samyag jnaanam*' means 'right knowledge'. What should that 'right knowledge' be about ? **Ans:** "Since *moolaavidhya* is about *aathmaa*, *samyag jnaanam* also must be about *aathmaa* only". What type of *aathmaa*? **Ans:** "*sajaatheeya- vijaatheeya- svagatha-bedha rahitha aathmaa*". Through what does that *jnaanam* come? **Ans:** "Through *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* alone". Therefore the conclusion / advice: "Do not avoid *mahaa vaakyam*". That is said here, in the verse that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 67

बुभुत्सोच्छेदिनी चास्य सदसीत्यादिना दृढम् ।

प्रतीचि प्रतिपत्ति : स्यान्नासौ मानान्तराद्भवेत् ॥ ६७ ॥

Concerning the inmost Self, knowledge arises firmly from the text "Thou art that Being", which extinguishes all further enquiry. This knowledge cannot come from other sources of knowledge.

ॐ 'सत् असि' इत्यादिना (महा वाक्येन) - With the help of the mahaa vaakyam such as '*sath asi*' etc.,

'*Sath asi*' is another expression for '*thath thvam asi*'. In the statement '*thath thvam asi*', the word '*thath*' means 'that'. The word 'that' is a pronoun. And, what is that pronoun standing for here? To answer this question, we have to look into the context of the statement, in the sixth chapter, of the *Chaandhogyha Upanishad*. The relevant teaching starts with the statement "*sath eva soumya idham agra aaseeth*" (VI.2.1) - "O good looking one! In the beginning, this was Existence alone". Going

through the teaching, we will find, that, the pronoun '*Thath*' stands for this noun '*sath*', 'Pure Existence'. And, therefore, Sureswarachaaryaa replaces the word *thath*, by the 'pure Existence' / '*sath*'. He also drops the word '*thvam*', because, since the verb '*asi*' is 'second person singular', *thvam* need not even be said, i.e. since, the verb is second person singular, the subject is understood, as 'you'. So, he eliminates the word '*thvam*', considering it as redundant. In other words, the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*', shortened, is '*sadhasi*'.

ॐ अस्य - for this student,

ॐ प्रतिपत्तिः स्यात् - the right knowledge / samyak jnaanam arises

'prathipatthi:' means 'samyak jnaanam' / 'right knowledge'. What is this 'right knowledge' about?

ॐ प्रतीचि - with regard to prathyak aathmaa / the inner Self,

'Prathyak' means 'inner self'. 'Pratheechi' is the saphthami vibhakthi of 'prathyak', and means 'with regard to the aathmaa'. And, what type of knowledge is it?

ॐ बुभुत्स्सा उच्छेदिनी - which 'knowledge' extinguishes the desire for self- knowledge,

It is the knowledge which fulfills the desire for self- knowledge. How long does the desire for *any* knowledge continue? **Ans:** "Naturally, only till that knowledge is achieved". The moment one gets any particular knowledge, desire for that particular knowledge goes away. Therefore, it can be also said, that, 'knowledge' is that which destroys the 'desire for knowledge'. This is similar to claiming "eating is that which destroys the desire for eating, because the moment one does the 'eating job', the desire for eating goes away". Therefore, *jnaanam* is called *jignyaasaa nivarthakam* / the eliminator of the 'hunger for knowledge'. 'Knowledge' will eliminate the 'hunger for knowledge'. Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, calls it '*bhubhuthsocchedhinee*'. '*Bhubhuthsaa*' means 'hunger / thirst / yearning for knowledge'. '*Ucchedhinee*' means 'remover/ eliminator'.

Why does Sureswarachaaryaa use this expression '*bhubhuthsocchedhinee*'? That expression is also important. In the '10th man story', the 10th man negated all the other nine people, by counting "this is number one. number two. number three.number four." etc. And, when he said 'number one', there was a '*nethi*' taking

place. What was that '*nethi*'? When he said 'this is number one', he also meant 'it is not number ten / *dhasama: na* | Similarly, 'this is no. two' also meant '*dhasama: na* | 'This is number three' meant '*dhasama: na* | Thus, he had been saying '*dhasama: na, dhasama: na, dhasama: na*' or '*nethi, nethi, nethi*'. After he had completed all the nine, he got a 'hunger for knowledge'. What was that 'hunger'?
Ans: "If *dhasama:* is none of them, who is the *dhasama:* / *dhasama: ka:*"? When, thus, 'hunger for *dhasama jnaanam*' was there for the *dhasama purusha:*, the passer-by came and pointed out to him '*thath thvam asi*', because of which statement, the *dhasamaa's dhasama jignyaasaa* subsided.

Similarly, in *Vedhaanthaa*, by *anvaya vyathirekha vicharaa*, the aspirant negates everything in creation, as 'changing matter'. Having negated everything as 'changing matter', he gets the curiosity to know what is that changeless *Brahman*. He wonders: "If everything has been negated as changing matter - the world has been negated, body has been negated, mind has been negated, thoughts have been negated, everything 'experienced' is 'changing matter' - is there a changeless principle? If there is, what is that changeless principle? " In other words, he gets *Brahma Jignyaasaa* and when the *guru* comes and tells him: "Do not '*look for*' the changeless *Brahman*. The more you '*look for*' *Brahman*, the more you are denying *Brahman*. The very '*looking for*' is denial. Therefore, stop '*looking for*', by claiming "I', the questioner *am* the changeless *Brahman*". When the aspirant understands the message properly, his 'hunger' to know *Brahman* ends. That is indicated by his breaking into music, singing "*Ha vu ha vu ha vu aham annam aham annam aham annam aham annaadho aham annaadho aham annaadha:*" (*Thaithreeya Upanishad – Bhruvuvalli*) - "Wonderful, wonderful, wonderful. I am the food. I am the food. I am the food. I am the food-eater. I am the food-eater. I am the food-eater". His music indicates his 'hunger *nivrutthi:*' / Thus, it is 'knowledge' which satiates the 'desire for knowledge'. And, hence the adjective '*bubhuthocchedhinee*' to '*prathipatthi:*' / the 'right knowledge'.

And, what type of knowledge will it be?

ॐ दृढम् - and, which knowledge is 'firm'.

The knowledge will be firm knowledge, because there is no other *pramaanam* to challenge / negate this knowledge. All other *pramaanam-*s are about 'changing matter'. In contrast, the knowledge which the seeker gets from the *mahaa vaakya*

pramaanam is about the 'changeless' observer. Since other *pramaanam*-s can and do deal with *anaathmaa* only and *thathvamasī* deals with *aathmaa*, the other *pramaanam*-s cannot challenge or negate this knowledge. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says '*dhrudam syaath*'. '*Dhrudam*' is adverbial.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 68:

कथं पुनर्वाक्यं प्रतिपादयत्येवेति चेद् द्रष्टान्तोक्तिः ।

How is it to be made out that the text positively beings about this knowledge? To explain this, an analogy is advanced.

ॐ "कथं पुनः - "How indeed

ॐ वाक्यं प्रतिपादयति एव " - the mahaa vaakyam definitely / doubtlessly produces knowledge?"

'Prathipaadhayathi' means 'reveals'; 'eva' means 'definitely / necessarily'

ॐ इति चेद् - If somebody asks this question,

ॐ द्रष्टान्त उक्तिः : - an example is given (to answer the question).

The dhasama dhrustaantha: / '10th man' example is extended here.

The answer is (in Swamiji's own words): "A *pramaanam* will produce knowledge, whether you like or not. There is no question of *your* 'will' involved here. When the eyes are open and you are all sitting in front of me, whether I like to perceive you or not is not the criterion; the perception takes place of its own accord. When, in the neighborhood, the loudspeaker is blaring, whether you like or not, that movie song will reach your ears; and, if it is a Tamil song, and you are conversant with Tamil, you cannot say 'I do not want to know the meaning', because *sabdha* is also a *pramaanam*, and whether you want to know the meaning or not, the meaning keeps on striking. This is because the function of the word is to generate the knowledge of the meaning. As long as the word does not fall in your ears, you are saved; but, once it has fallen, you understand the meaning of that, whether you want to know or not. *Sabhdhaa* is a *pramaanam*; and, a *pramaanam* is *vasthu thanthram*; it is not *karthruthanthram*. The functioning of a *pramaanam* does not depend upon the will of the *pramaathaa*. Therefore, when the *mahaa vaakyam* says 'you are That', the message "I am *Brahman* can never be avoided".

Chapter III: Verse 68

जिज्ञासोर्दशमं यद्वन्नवातिक्रम्य ताम्यतः ।

त्वमेव दशमोऽसीति कुर्यादेवं प्रमां वचः ॥६८ ॥

To one who, after counting nine persons, torments himself searching for the tenth man, the proposition 'you are yourself the tenth man' does bring correct understanding.

ॐ यद्वत् - As in the case of the 10th man example / dhasama dhrushtaanthaa,

ॐ (दसम) जिज्ञासोः - for the '10th man', who is desirous of knowing the 10th man,

He is '*dhasama jignyaasu: dhasama:*' i.e. he is 'the 10th person who has the hunger to know the 10th person' (who, he does not know, is himself). Not only he has got this desire, he has already eliminated every other person. Every other person has been eliminated by him as " *na ayam dhasama:, na ayam dhasama:, na ayam dhasama:*" | As pointed out earlier, when he counts " *ayam prathama:*", it also means " *na ayam dhasama:*" / And, , when all the people are thus eliminated, there is only one person not eliminated, namely himself. Once he has eliminated all the other nine, who is left behind is only himself, the person who is doing the counting. Therefore, there is not even a scope for misunderstanding the situation. It is the most ideal situation for 'understanding'. The '10th man' wants to know the '10th man; he is very much there, without having been counted and eliminated. The other nine have been eliminated by counting. Therefore, the job of the passer-by, in pointing out 'you are the 10th person', has become very simple.

ॐ नव अतिक्रम्य - having already completed counting the nine,

'*nava athikramya*' literally means 'having crossed the nine'. 'Having crossed nine' means, 'having completed counting nine'

And, what does the counting indicate? **Ans:** It indicates '*Nethi nethi*'. Everyone else has been negated and nobody else is there, except the person counting.

ॐ ताम्यतः - and mentally distressed,

The 10th man is distressed, because he has been struggling to find out the 10th man. The 'distress' indicates the *samsaara*. And, in a similar manner, the ill-informed aspirant also mistakenly takes to meditation looking for *Brahma anubhavaa*, which *anubhavaa*, unfortunately, he will never get. This is because *Brahman* is never an object of experience. But, this ill-informed aspirant 'yearns' for *Brahma anubhavam* and is, therefore, 'stressed' / 'mentally tired' / சோர்ந்து இருக்கிறான்' / 'தளர்ந்து இருக்கிறான்'.

In the example, as a last desperate attempt, *dhasama:* appeals to the passer-by, to help him find the *dhasama:* | In the same manner, the *vedhaanthic* aspirant also surrenders to the *guru* and pleads "Hey *Guro* ! I have fallen into the sea of the world. Save me. I am burning in the blaze of the *samsaara* forest, which no man can extinguish. (*Dhurvaara samsaara daavaagni thaptham dhodhooyamaanam dhuradhrishtavaathai: bheetham prapannam paripaahi mruthyo: saranyam anyath yath aham na jaane*) Kindly reveal to me as to how I can cross this ocean of *samsaara*, what should be my goal and the path I should take". (*Viveka choodaamani* – portions from verses 35, 36 and 40).

ॐ 'त्वं एव दशमः असि' इति वचः - the statement 'you are yourself the tenth man'

In the example, the passer-by tells the *dhasama:* "you are the 10th man". The only unobservable person is the observer. The passer-by says "You, the counting person are the '10th man'. Why cannot you claim it right now?" In the same manner, the *guru*, out of compassion for the student, who has surrendered to him, says: "O *Soumya!* dear disciple ! Please listen to me with all attention. Do not be 'at tension'. Have attention" and proceeds to elaborate on the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

ॐ प्रमां कुर्यात् - will definitely generate irrefutable knowledge (in the mind of the 10th man).

The words of the passer-by will definitely produce doubtless and irrefutable knowledge in the *dhasama:*, because the *dhasama:* knows the language spoken and he hears the spoken word. As mentioned earlier, when, through a blaring loudspeaker a Tamil song reaches and falls in the ears of a person knowing the language of Tamil, whether he wants it or not, the meaning is going to strike him. Similarly, if the 10th man has been addressed by the passer-by, in a language he

knows, the realization "I am the 10th man" will helplessly arise. And, there can be no doubt also, because all the others have been eliminated. The only one left behind is the *dhasama*: |

Similarly, the *Vedhaanthic* student has eliminated everything through '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*'. The only left behind is, 'I', the unobservable. Therefore, in his case also, the *mahaa vaakyam pramaam kuryaath* – the *mahaa vaakyam* has to generate knowledge. The *Aachaaryaa* conveys this by using the term '*evam*':

ॐ एवं - In the same manner,

The sentence is incomplete and has to be completed by the student, as "*evam mahaa vaakyam api pramaam kuryaath*". He has to understand, that, " Similar to the *dhasama*: in the *dhrushtaantaa*, the *Vedhaanthic* student also , having completed *anvaya vyathirekhaa* / having completed *nethi nethi* / when he remains as *Chith*, Pure Consciousness, should understand that '*Sadeva chith. Chidheva sath*' from the *Upanishad*, which says 'the *Sath* you are looking for, happens to be you, the *Chith*,' In the *Upadesa Saahasri*, *Sankara Bhagavdh Paadhaa* declares : "*Satthayaa hi chith chitthaayaa hi aham*" |

Sambhandha gadhyam to verses 69 & 70 :

सा च तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यश्रवणजा प्रमोत्पन्नत्वादेव । न च नैवमिति प्रत्ययान्तरं जायते ।

तदेतदृष्टान्तेन प्रतिपादयति ।

Now this knowledge arising from 'That thou art' is valid merely by virtue of its origination. No knowledge arises afterwards to the effect 'It is not so'. This is explained through the analogy.

This is an important portion.

ॐ सा च - That knowledge

ॐ वाक्य श्रवणजा - which is born out of the Veda vaakyam,

'*Ja*' means 'born out of'; '*sravanam*' means 'hearing'; '*vaakyam*' means '*mahaa vaakyam*', which is '*apourusheya pramaanam*'. That knowledge itself i.e. the knowledge that rises in *sravanam*, is the 'final' knowledge. There is no question of

getting a separate knowledge in meditation or by any other separate experience. There is no further corroborating experience required or possible. This knowledge is the final liberating *aparokshajnaanam*. This is a very, very important doctrine of *advaita vedhaanthalaa*. Sureswaraacharya also does not accept 'knowledge taking place later in meditation'. He says *mahaa vaakyam* alone is *pramaanam* and if this *pramaanam* does not give knowledge, nothing else can. The aspirant may do meditation for some other purpose, for instance, 'to remove the old habitual thinking', 'for a tranquil mindset' etc. That is a different thing. If the *sravanam* sounds inefficient, it is because the mind is not prepared. Then the seeker can do meditation to prepare the mind, and, then come back to *sravanam*. But, meditation is never meant for *jnaana uthpathi*. The final liberating knowledge has to come through proper *sravanam* only. At the cost of repetition, it has to be stressed that this is a very, very important view of *Vedhaanthalaa*, which Sureswaraacharya highlights here.

ॐ तत्त्वमस्यादि - like 'thath thvam asi' etc.,

ॐ प्रमा - is the final knowledge,

And, why do we call it 'final knowledge'?

ॐ उपपन्नत्वात् एव - because that 'understanding' has taken place in the mind itself.

The example given earlier, viz. that, 'a blaring Tamil song, falling in the ears of a person conversant with Tamil, will be understood by the person, even without his will' is to be recollected here. The 'understanding' of the meaning of the song takes place 'helplessly'. Similarly, in the context of the student listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, the 'understanding' "I", the Consciousness principle, which is different from *anna mayaa, praana mayaa* etc. **am** the Existence principle, which is in and through the whole universe" takes place.

This understanding is final liberating knowledge. This understanding need not be and cannot be proved / corroborated / substantiated / revalidated by any other *pramaanam*.

And, why is it, that, it need not be validated by any other *pramaanam*? **Ans:** "Because of two reasons. The first reason is that *Veda pramaanam* is a primary *pramaanam* like the sense organs; by definition, a primary *pramaanam* produces a

knowledge which is final and which cannot be challenged by any other *pramaanam*. The five sense organs are 'primary' *pramaanam*-s. What the eyes reveal, the ears cannot prove or disprove; what the ears reveal, the nose cannot prove or disprove and so on. So also, what the *Veda pramaanam* / *apourusheya pramaanam* reveals, no other *pramaanam* can prove or disprove. *Veda pramaanam* can be verily considered as the 6th sense organ. The second reason is that the other *pramaanam*-s like *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa* etc., cannot prove disprove the *mahaa vakyam*, because they can function only in the field of *anaathmaa*".

Therefore, *apoureshaya pramaanathvaath*, the *mahaa vaakyam* has bestowed the seeker with a valid knowledge / an irrefutable fact.

This is true with regard to *Bhagavaan* also. We have accepted *Isvara* as a fact, based on *Veda pramaanam* only. There is no other *pramaanam*, which has proved God. Science has not proved; *prathyaksham* has not proved; *anumaanam* has not proved. Even though God has never been substantiated by any other *pramaanam*, God is a fact for us, revealed by *Veda pramaanam*. No other *pramaanam* has proved the existence of God and we, *Vaidikhaa*-s, do not expect them to or wait for their proof also. If at all, a *Vaidhikaa* will say "Let science disprove God; thereafter, I will reject God. In fact, the onus is not on the *Veda*; the onus is on Science. Until convincingly disproved, *Bhagavaan* is a fact for me".

Similarly, '*aham Brahma asmi*' is a fact for an *Advaitha Vedhaanthin* until it is disproved by any other *pramaanam*; and, he is confident that no other *pramaanam* can disprove this fact. Why not? **Ans:** "Because they do not even have access to such subtle topics, exactly like they have no access to the existence or otherwise of *Bhagavaan*".

176: Chapter III, Verses 70 (06-03-2010)

Swamiji commenced the class with some remarks, as follow (in his own words):

"Before entering into this portion I would like to clarify one or two points. The *mithyaa* concept of *advaitam* is a concept unique to *advaitam* only. It is not there, in any of the other systems of philosophy. *Mithyaa* is an unique concept and the definition of *mithyaa* is '*sadh asadbhyaam anirvachaneeyam*' meaning 'that which cannot be clearly categorized as *sath* / existent and that which cannot be clearly categorized as *asath* / non-existent also'. This mysterious entity, which cannot be categorized, is called *mithyaa*. You cannot say it is *bhaava roopam* ; you cannot say it is *abhaava roopam* also. It is '*Bhaava abhaavaabhyaam anirvacheeniyam / vilakshanam*'.

"And, because of this unique concept, we (the *Advaitin*-s) face certain difficulties, while handling other systems of philosophy. When they ask questions, we have to give an answer which *they* can understand; and, therefore, in our answer, we should not bring in the concept of *mithyaa*, because the word *mithyaa* is not there in their systems of philosophy.

"Therefore, *advaitam* has a double layer approach. For all questions, it gives one answer which is meant for the common people, as well as people of other systems of philosophy, i.e. for those who do not understand the concept of *mithyaa* ; and, after answering them, *advaitaa* calls the *Advaitic* students and says that, the answer given is only for others and there is a special answer for us, the *Advaitin*-s.

"Thus, we have got a temporary, provisional answer for people other than *Advaitic* students, and a special answer for the *Advaitin*-s

"And, you should learn to understand both answers clearly.

"An example for this fact (that there are two separate answers): There is a big discussion in *Brahma soothraa*-s, in the entire first chapter, where, the question raised, is, whether *jagath kaaranam* is *pradhaanam* / the matter, or the *jagath kaaranam* is *Brahman*. Is the cause of the universe *pradhaanam* (*pradhaanam*

means *prakruthi* or matter) or is the *jagath kaaranam Brahman*? And, in the entire first chapter, *Vyaasaachaaryaa* vehemently refutes the *saamkhyaa* philosopher, who claims *prakruthi* / matter is *jagath kaaranam*. He refutes that view and establishes that *Brahman*, the *chethana thathvam*, is *jagath kaaranam*, by quoting *sruthi pramaanam*, *yukthi pramaanam* and *anubhava pramaanam*. Nearly hundred and thirty four *soothraa*-s are dedicated to this topic and it is established by him, that *Brahman*, the *chethana thathvam* alone is *jagath kaaranam* and matter is not *jagath kaaranam*. A similar answer is given to the *naiyaayikaa* (*Nyaayaa* philosopher) also.

"The *Nyaayaa* philosopher says *paramaanu* is *jagath kaaranam*. *Vyaasaachaaryaa* refutes this '*paramaanu kaarana vaadhaa*' also and establishes that *Brahman* is *jagath kaaranam*. Thus, the very beginning of *Brahma Soothraa*, is the view '*Brahman* is the cause of the universe'. And, in the second chapter also, *Vyaasaachaaryaa* asserts that *Brahman* is *jagath kaaranam* and not matter.

"And, once this answer is given and our students are satisfied that *saamkhyaa's pradhaanam* and *naiyaayikaa's paramaanu* are both refuted, the teacher calls the students quietly to his *gurukulam* and whispers in their ears 'No doubt we said *Brahman* is *kaaranam* ; but, that is the general, provisional answer. The real answer is, '*Brahman* is *kaarya-kaarana-vilakshanam*; *Brahman* is neither *kaaryam* nor *kaaranam*. '*Na jaayathe mriyathe vaa vipaschith naayam kuthaschinna bhabhoova kaschith* (*Katopanishad* I.2.18) – 'This omniscient one does not originate or die. It did not originate from anything. It did not become anything'.

"In *Maandookya Kaarika* also, *Goudapaadhaachaarya* establishes that the *thureeyam Brahman* is neither *kaaryam* nor *kaaranam*.

"So, if somebody asks 'Is *Brahman kaaranam* or *akaaranam*?', what is our answer? It is a two-level answer. To the world and to all other systems of philosophy, we say, '*Brahman* is *kaaranam*'. Once you (the *Advaitic* student) come near me, what will I whisper? **Ans:** '*Brahman* is not *kaaranam*'.

"Then, naturally, the question 'how did the world come?' is raised. Then, I introduce the word *mithyaa* and answer that the world is *mithyaa*; that, the world is only seemingly existent / i.e., it is as good as non-existent and therefore, it does not require any *kaaranam* at all. Thus, we have two answers (i) *Brahman* is *kaaranam* and (ii) *Brahman* is not *kaaranam*.

"Similarly, if somebody asks 'what is *mokshaa*?', again, we have got two answers. The most popular answer is '*punar janma nivrutthi* / 'freedom from re-birth'. This is the definition of *mokshaa*, which all the other *dharsanam*-s give; the *advaitin* also joins them and says '*punarjanma nivrutthi*: is *mokshaa*'. And, once they all have been told so, the *Advaitic Aacharya* quietly calls his students and tells them 'There is no question of even *eka janmaa*. Where is the question of *punar-janmaa*? Understand that you never had *any janmaa* at *any* time. That 'understanding' alone is the real *mokshaa*. The other *mokshaa* is a temporary, provisional answer given, assuming the world is *sathyam*. Once the world is falsified, the talk about *punar janmaa* has no relevance. *Punar janmaa* is relevant, as long world comes under *sathyam* category. Once *mithyaa* is assimilated, what is *mokshaa*? **Ans:** The knowledge '*Mithyaa jagath adhishtaanam*' is alone *mokshaa*.

"Thus, '*Brahman* is *kaaranam*' is one answer. '*Brahman* is *akaaranam*' is the second answer. '*Mokshaa* is *punarjanma nivrutthi*' is the first answer.. '*Mokshaa* is *svaroopa avasthaanam*' is the second answer.

"What I want to say is that *Advaita Vedhaantha Aacharya*-s have got two tier answers for many questions / doubts in philosophy.

"Similarly, very often, the question 'Does darkness come under *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam*?' is raised. To this question also, we give two-tier answers.

"Lay people and non-*advaitin*-s have only two categories available - *bhaavaa* and *abhaavaa*; therefore, when we are discussing this topic with such people, our answer should be one of these two only. And, therefore, our first-level answer is: '*Andhakaara*: *bhaava roopam*'. This is our first layer answer. This answer is given mainly to the *naiyaayikaa*. The *naiyaayikaa* says '*andhakaaraa* is *abhaava roopam*'. To him, we say '*andhakaaraa* is *bhaava roopam*'. And, once the *naiyaayika* is thus refuted, the *Vedhaanthic* teacher calls the *Vedhaanthic* student and says '*andhakaara*: is **not** *bhaava roopam*'. Then, naturally, the student will ask the question 'If so, is it *abhaavaroopam*?' The teacher's answer will be: 'No, no; it is not *abhaavaroopam* also'. The *Vedhaanthic* teacher refutes *abhaavaroopam* also; *bhaava roopam* also. Then what is his answer? It is '*Bhaava abhaava vilakshanam*'.

"So, if somebody asks me this question viz. 'Is *andhakaaraa bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam*?', I will ask a counter question, 'what type of student are you ?' For lay-people and for people of other systems of philosophy, I answer '*Andhakaaraa is bhaava roopam*' and if the student is an *Advaitic* student, I will answer 'darkness is *bhaava-abhaava-vilakshanam*'.

"So also with *Moolaavidhya*. To the laypeople and people of other systems of philosophy, our answer will be '*moolaavidhya is bhaavaroopaa*'. And, once they have been dismissed, then we will call the *Advaitic* student and tell him: '*moolaavidhya* should not be *bhaavaroopaa*, because, if *moolaavidhya* is also *bhaavaroopam* and *Brahman* is also *bhaavaroopam*, there will be duality. Therefore, never say *moolaavidhya is bhaava roopam*'.

"Then, is it *abhaava roopam*? No, no; it is not *abhaava roopam* also. Then what is it? It is '*Bhaava abhaava vilakshanam*'. Thus, to the questions "Is *andakaaraa bhava roopam* or *abhaava roopam*?' and 'Is *moolaavidhya bhaavaroopam* or *abhaavaroopam*?', the first layer answer is '*bhaavaroopam*'; and, the real, final *advaitic* answer is '*bhaavaabhaava vilakshanam*'.

"And, for this, viz., '*bhaavaabhaava vilakshanam*'. we have a special idiom. In *Vedhaantha saaraa*, *Sadhaanandhaa* uses this idiom, which is '*yath kinchith bhaava roopam*', adding an adjective '*yath kinchith*' to '*bhaava roopam*'.

"So, what does '*yath kinchith bhaava roopam*' mean? **Ans:** 'Having some kind of an existence, which is *bhaava abhaava vilakshanam*, exactly similar to dreams'.

"If the question 'is dream *bhaava roopam* or *abhaava roopam*?' is asked, our answer is '*svapna: bhaava abhaava vilakshanam*' or '*svapna: yath kinchith bhaava roopam*' |

"Therefore, note this fact. In my classes also, I may sometimes say that *moolaavidhya* is '*bhaava roopam*' and sometimes as '*bhaava abhaava vilakshnam*'. I may do the same, with regard to 'darkness' and *svapnaa* also. Do not think I am confused ; it is not a result of my confusion; it is because of the conventional two layers of answers".

(Having made this detailed clarification, Swamiji referred to an 'omission' made by him, by oversight, in verse 67. He had not given the meaning of the fourth quarter

of verse 67, which 'omission' had been subsequently pointed out by a student. Now, Swamiji 'rectifies' the 'omission').

Chapter III: Fourth quarter of Verse 67

नासौ मानान्तराद्भवेत् ।

This knowledge cannot come from other sources of knowledge.

ॐ असौ - This knowledge

'*asau*' means '*asau prathipatthi:*' or 'this knowledge'. What is 'this knowledge'?

Ans: "'*Jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiykya-jnaanam*' is, here, referred to, by the pronoun '*asau*'.

ॐ न भवेत् - cannot arise

ॐ मान अन्तरात् - through any other *pramaanam*.

'*maanam*' means '*pramaanam*'; '*maana antharam*' means '*anyath maanam*'. '*Maana antharam*' or '*pramaana antharam*' means 'other *pramaanam*-s, such as *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaana*, *arthaapathi*, *anupalabdhi*, *anubhava sabdhaa*, *karma kaanda sabdhaa* etc. Even '*Veda karma kaanda sabdhaa*' cannot give '*jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiykya-jnaanam*'. Only *Vedhaantha mahaa vakyam* can. Other than *mahaa vaakyam*, nothing else can give this knowledge.

Reverting to the *sambhandha gadhyam* portion of verses 69 and 70:

This is a very, very important portion, because, here, Sureswaraachaaryaa clearly says "direct knowledge or *aparokshaa jnaanam* takes place in *sravanam* itself and in *sravanam* only. Meditation is not the means of *saakshaathkaaraa* ; *sravanam* alone is *saakshaathkaara kaaranam*." We have to note that the *Aachaaryaa* is very firm on this view.

ॐ सा च - This understanding / *prathipatthi:*

ॐ तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्य श्रवणजा - born out of the *mahaa vaakyam* like '*thaththvamas!*'

ॐ प्रमा - is the final knowledge,

The word '*pramaa*' means 'final knowledge' / 'direct knowledge' / '*aparoksha jnaanam*'. No other separate mystic experience is required to corroborate or validate this knowledge. This understanding is *saakshaathkaara: / pramaa*. The student may get a doubt: "If it is so, what is the purpose of *nidhidhyaasanam*? Why is it prescribed for an aspirant?" **Ans:** "*Nidhidhyaasanam* is not meant for any new knowledge or any new experience; it is meant for internalization of this knowledge; more than that, meditation is meant for removing our habitual triangular format." That the triangular format does not go away easily, is our own personal experience. Whenever any problem crops up in mundane matters, we do not immediately switch over to the '*aham brahma asmi*' *jnaanam*, to give us the strength to meet the problem. Instead, we rush to pray to *Bhagavaan* for immediate solution to the problem. This very fact, that we are rushing to *Bhagavaan*, indicates that we are refusing to drop the triangular format. 'Meditation' / '*nidhidhyaasanam*' is meant for 'dropping' that format; not for any mystic experience or new knowledge. 'Knowledge' *has* to arise only through *mahaa vaakyam*. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya asserts: '*vaakya sravanajaa pramaa*' – 'the understanding born out of *mahaa vaakya sravanam* is the final knowledge'.

And, why is it *pramaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ उत्पन्नत्वात् एव - because the 'teaching' has been understood (by the aspirant).

On hearing the *mahaa vaakyam* from the *guru*, the disciples do say "Swamiji! We are 'understanding' (the import of the *vaakyam*)". That understanding alone is *saakshaathkaara: |* Other than that 'understanding', no other '*saakshaathkaaraa*' exists. When it is Sureswaraacharya, the *saakshaath sishyaa* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*, who is emphasizing this '*uthpanaathvaadeva*', the student can/ should have no hesitation in accepting this fact.

Sureswaraacharya further says that this knowledge born out of a valid source of knowledge, namely, the *mahaa vaakyam*, cannot be refuted in the form 'it is not so', by any other *pramaanam*.

It is our experience, that, any knowledge born out of a valid source of knowledge is initially accepted as final knowledge; but, only until it is refuted by some other source of knowledge. For instance, very often, people accept a scientific theory

presented to them by a scientist, as final knowledge; they never question the theory, until another scientist arrives on the scene and proves the earlier theory as faulty.

The '*mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*' also, considered as 'final knowledge', may become invalid, *if* it is refuted / challenged by any other *pramaanam*. But, no other *pramaanam* can challenge this knowledge, the '*mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*'. Why not? **Ans:** "This has been explained earlier, by an analogy, namely, the human sense organs with different capabilities. For instance, once 'eyes' have revealed the colour of a particular object, 'ears' can never challenge that knowledge, for the simple and obvious reason, that, ears do not even have access to colours. How can ears challenge the knowledge produced by the eyes or how can eyes challenge knowledge produced by the ears, when their fields of action are entirely different ? Likewise, all *pramaanam*-s other than *mahaa vaakyam* deal only with matter and *mahaa vaakyam* alone deals with Consciousness. And, therefore, no other *pramaanam* can ever challenge this knowledge generated by *mahaa vaakyam*".

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ न च नैवमिति प्रत्ययान्तरं जायते - after '*aham brahma asmi jnaanam*', another challenging knowledge never comes .

'*Na evam*' literally means 'it is not so' and, therefore, in this context, implies '*eiikyam* is not true' ; '*ithi*' means 'as/' 'in this form'; '*prathyayaanthram*' means 'a contradictory knowledge'; '*na evam ithi prathyayaantharam*' therefore, means 'a contradictory knowledge in the form '*eiikyam* is not true"; '*na cha jaayathe*' means 'is never produced'.

A knowledge negating *advaitam* is produced / can never be produced, by any other *pramaanam*, because no other *pramaanam* deals with Consciousness or Existence. Modern science is studying everything in creation except these two principles, viz., Consciousness and Existence. It does not study what Consciousness is or what Existence is. Other than these two, it studies everything else. How then can modern science challenge *mahaa vaakyam*? Proceeding:

ॐ तद् एतद् - This particular idea

While studying this portion, a diligent student has to revise an earlier portion in this same third chapter, verses 35 to 38. In these verses 35 to 38, this topic has been dealt with more elaborately by Sureswaraacharya, wherein, addressing the aspirants, he asked the questions: 'Why do you not accept '*aham Brahma asmi*'? What stops you from accepting this fact?' He himself suggested four possible reasons and asked four questions 'Is it because of this (first) reason?' or 'Is it because of this (second) reason?' and so on. He suggested four possible reasons for an aspirant not accepting '*aham Brahma asmi*'; but, pointed out, with irrefutable reasoning, that none of those four reasons could be valid. He concluded in these verses 34 to 38: "Therefore, you must be able to accept '*aham Brahma asmi*'. Every diligent student should revise the portion (verses 34 to 38) repeatedly, because one's inability to enter binary format is only lack of faith in *mahaa vaakyam*. It is sheer lack of *sraddhaa*; if only one has *sraddhaa* in *mahaa vaakyam*, 'binary format' is the easiest and Sureswaraacharya asked the question 'Why don't you have that *sraddhaa*'?

ॐ प्रतिपादयति - is explained / clarified

ॐ द्रष्टान्तेन - through the 'tenth man' example.

Verse 69 – Chapter III:

दशमोऽसीति वाक्योत्था न धीरस्य विहन्यते ।

आदिमध्यावसानेषु न नवस्वस्य संशयः ॥ ६९ ॥

The understanding born out of the statement 'you are the tenth man' is not stultified. At no time, in the beginning, middle and end, is there any doubt that there are nine persons already.

Sureswaraacharya clarifies his statement "the knowledge arising from 'that thou art' is valid, merely by virtue of its origination and no knowledge arises afterwards to the effect 'it is not so' " by again resorting to the '10th man example'. The 10th man was deeply craving to know where the tenth man was. He had already counted the other nine members ; and, nobody else was in the area. The nine had already been negated by him as '*na dhasama: na dhasama:*' | Why '*na dhasama:*'? **Ans:** "He had said to himself '*ayam prathama: thasmaath na dhasama:*' '*ayam dhvitheeya: thasmaath na dhasama:*' and so on". Having thus confirmed 'this is the first; therefore, not the tenth; this is the second; and, therefore, not the 10th' etc., he

wanted to know the tenth person. This 10th person, who was doing the 'counting', was very anxious to confirm that the 10th person was alive and had not drowned while crossing the river. The passer-by had assured him that the 10th man was alive. So, the 10th man was very curious to know the 10th man, since he had confirmed that none of the others was the 10th. The *Vedhaanthic* aspirant, who has completed the *anvaya vyathirekha* exercise (through which, he gets the conviction, that he is not his body, mind, senses or intellect) is in a similar ideal situation. His situation is ideal for *mahaa vaakyam*. In the example, the 10th man is there; he is not any one of the others and nobody else is there and the passer-by says '*dhasama: asthi*' and also '*sa: dhasama: thvam asi*'; and when the 10th man listens to that *vaakyam*, will it not produce the knowledge? Definitely it will produce the knowledge and that knowledge can also be never challenged by later perception. Imagine when the teaching '*thvam dhasamosi*' is done, the 10th man closes his eyes for a moment and he internalizes with relief and tells himself "I thought '*dhasama: asthi*' | Now, I know '*dhasama: asthi*' is not the correct expression. '*dhasama: asmi*' is the correct expression". When he says this, he closes his eyes with absolute relaxation. After internalizing this idea, when he looks at the nine people again, will he get the doubt again 'Where is the 10th man?' **Ans:** "No. No further doubt will arise, because valid knowledge is never challenged by any later knowledge that one may gather". Once again he may count '*ayam prathama*'; '*ayam dhvitheeya*.' etc. but will conclude with '*aham dhasama*.'|

Likewise, in the context of the *Vedhaanthic* student, the *guru* had already talked about the existence of *Brahman* (similar to the passer-by's assurance that the tenth man is alive / '*Dhasama; asthi*'). The resultant 'understanding' is called '*asthi ithi buddhi*' by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* in his *Katopanishad bhaahsyam*. The *guru* follows it up by the exhortation '*thath (Brahman) thvam asi*'| Just like the 10th man in the example, the *Vedhaanthic* aspirant also, after understanding '*aham Brahma asmi*', need not sit in meditation permanently . He can look at the world and continue to interact with the world. But 'world perception' can never challenge his knowledge, since (this has already been mentioned many times; but, since important, is repeated once again): "valid knowledge born out of a valid source of knowledge, cannot be challenged by even an opposite experience".

In earlier contexts, several analogies were given for this fact. The analogies are recollected and re-presented below:

Analogy (1): What is our valid knowledge with regard to the movement of the earth? Is earth stationery or 'moving'? **Ans:** We have unshaken / unshakable knowledge that earth is moving around on its own axis and also going around the sun. Scientists and astronomers say, that, at times, there are also minor changes caused by severe earthquakes to the manner in which the movements of the earth take place, as a consequence of which, 'days' are shortened. This means that, not only is there 'movement of the earth', also that 'movement of the earth' is affected by natural phenomena. We learn all these, through scientific and astronomical studies. But, what is our 'experience'? In contrast to our 'knowledge', our 'experience' is a 'stationery' earth. But, this 'experience' never challenges our 'knowledge' that earth is violently moving around its axis and also around the sun.

Analogy (2): Similarly, we know that it is not the sun that moves from East to West; but, it is the earth which is rotating from West to East. We know, therefore, that 'sunrise' is a myth and the term 'sunrise' is a misnomer. Still, we 'experience' sunrise and in fact, we conduct tours to go to places like *Kanyaakumari*, to enjoy the 'sunrise'. But, the 'experience' of 'sunrise' cannot challenge the 'knowledge' that sun does not 'rise' or 'set'.

Analogy (3): We experience the waters of the ocean as 'blue' waters. On the other hand, our 'knowledge' is, that, 'water is colourless'. And, that knowledge is never challenged by 'experience' of the 'blue waters'.

Analogy (4): So also, the 'experience' of 'blue skies' cannot challenge our firm knowledge that 'skies' are also colourless.

Analogy (5): What about stars? We 'experience' very 'small' stars. There is even a nursery rhyme running 'twinkle, twinkle **little** star'. But, the experience of the 'little' star does not challenge our knowledge that stars are really huge in size, quite a few of them even bigger than 'our' sun.

As in the above mundane examples, the knowledge "I am non-dual *Brahman / advaita Brahman asmi*" is born out of valid *Vedhaantha pramaanam*. *Sruthi* declares *Brahman* as '*ekam eva adhvitheeyam*' (*Chaandogya Upanishad* – VI.2.1) and also that there is nothing else except *Brahman* '*neha naanaasthi kimchana*' (*Katopanishad* – II.1.11). This *advaita 'jnaanam*' can never be challenged by *dvaita 'anubhavaa*'. Let it be very clear, that, by any amount of 'perception of duality', an

Advaitin is never disturbed. He will stand firm in his conviction, that, 'experience' does not prove reality, just as the 'experience' of the 'rise' of the sun and the 'experience' of the 'smallness' of the stars, do not prove the 'realities', namely, that the sun actually does not 'rise' or 'set' and that the stars, in fact, are huge and not small. A valid *Pramaanam* alone will have to prove reality. And, through a valid *pramaanam*, namely, the *mahaa vaakyam*, the *Advaitin* has got his knowledge. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says 'valid knowledge is never challenged'.

ॐ अस्य धी : - The *jnaanam* of this 10th man,

The term '*dheerasya*' appears to be *shashti eka vachanam* of the noun *dheera:*; but, it is not so. It is to be split as '*dhee: + asya*' and interpreted as '*asya dhee:*'/ 'his knowledge'.

What is that '*jnaanam*' of the 10th man? **Ans:** '*aham dhasama: asmi*' *ithi jnaanam*. What is that knowledge born out of?

ॐ 'दसम : असि' इति वाक्य उत्था - born out of the *pramaana vaakyam* '*thvam dhasama: asi*' (the statement 'you are the 10th man'),

'*Dhasama: asi*' is equivalent to the *mahaa vaakyam* and the passer-by is equivalent to the *Vedhaanthic guru*.

ॐ न विहन्यते - is never obstructed / challenged;

In a similar manner, *advaita* is never disturbed by any other *pramaanam*. Not even by any amount of advancement in modern science. Let modern science advance still more; the *Advaitin* is not disturbed. This is because he is not negating the experience of the world. His teaching is "*advaitam is* the truth, in spite of *dvaita anubhavaa*". The *Advaitin* never questions '*dvaita anubhavaa*'.

ॐ आदि मध्य अवसानेषु - in all the three periods of time,

What are the 'three' periods of time? **Ans:** (i) *ajnaana kaalam*, (ii) *jnaana kaalam* and (iii) *jnaana anthara kaalam* / (i) the period of ignorance (ii) the time when he gets the knowledge and (iii) the period after acquiring the knowledge.

ॐ अस्य नवसु संशयः न (अस्ति) - for him, there is no doubt regarding the status of the other nine people.

The 10th man does not have any doubt regarding the status of the other nine people. And, what is their status? **Ans:** The common status of all of them is *dhasama bhinnathvam* / not being the 10th man. None of them is the *dhasama*: | The 10th man knows this, without any doubt. Only if and when, at any time, he looks upon any one of the others as *dhasama*:, there will be a problem. **His dhasamathvam** will be challenged. But, during all the three periods of time, he knows the others as *prathama*:, *dvitheeya*: etc. and also as *na dhasama*: / that, none of them is *dhasama*: | Then, who is *dhasama*: ? **Ans:** (The 10th man can claim) I and I alone.

Similarly, in the *Vedhaanthic* context, everything that I experience is matter; and there is a Consciousness in the creation; there *is* something called Consciousness. (How can you say, that, there is something called Consciousness? **Ans:** "Otherwise one cannot even talk about matter").

And, if there is something called Consciousness, it can only be 'I' the 'experiencer'; i.e., "Other than 'I', the 'experiencer', no other conscious principle is possible, because, whatever I experience happens to be matter".

To repeat: World is matter. All our bodies are matter. All our minds are matter. And, if everything that is experienced is matter and Consciousness exists, that Consciousness has to be 'I' myself only. Where is any difficulty in claiming that?

The '10th man example' makes it easier to understand this fact. Sureswaraacharya implies this by stressing "*aadhi madhya avasaaneshu navasu (nava puruhseshu) samsaya: na asthi*" in the example.

'*samsaya: na*' should be understood as '*dhasamathva samsaya: naasthi*'. The 10th man does not have any doubt regarding his *dhasamathvam*, i.e. he is convinced "I am the *dhasama:*."

Verse 70 – Chapter III:

एवं तत्त्वमसीत्यस्माद्वैतनुत्प्रत्यगात्मनि ।

सम्यग्ज्ञातत्वमर्थस्य जायेतैव प्रमा दृढा ॥७० ॥

Similarly, in one, who has perfectly understood already the import of "Thou", unshakable knowledge about the inmost Self positively arises from the proposition "That thou art", which dispels all doubts.

Sureswaraacharya says "Just as in the example, '*aham dhasama:*' is the final knowledge, which knowledge does not require meditation or any other means for corroboration or confirmation / just as this final knowledge is directly generated, similarly, for a sincere and proper listener of *mahaa vaakyam*, the final / liberating knowledge '*aham Brahma asmi*', does take place, doubtlessly. Generation after generation, *Aacharya*-s have gained this knowledge. What better proof do you want? Trust me; the knowledge does take place. If at all, it does not take place, it only means, that, *you* have not listened to the *mahaa vaakyam* properly".

One of the common basic assumption among students (of any subject) is, that, a 'class' gives only book-knowledge. The assumption is probably right, with regard to various other subjects in the world ; in many instances, 'class study' does give only 'book knowledge' and one requires exposure to the practical application of the subject studied, to gain 'final knowledge' of the subject. A common example given is, that, by reading a book on *Maanasarovar*, the reader will get only book knowledge and only if he visits *Maanasarovar* and physically sees the place, he gets 'direct' knowledge. Therefore, this orientation, namely, that "'study' gives only 'book-knowledge' and not 'experiential knowledge'" is very strong and is strongly entrenched among people. But, in the '10th man example', we have to understand and remember that, when the *dhasama:* is told 'you are *dhasama:*' he does not get 'book-knowledge' but the 'final knowledge'.

Maanasarovar is a place that is far away. In that instance, 'book knowledge' and 'experiential knowledge' may be different. But in the *dhasama:* case, the 10th man is

not far away. Where is the question of a distinction between 'book knowledge' and 'experiential knowledge'? There is no such problem.

The *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam* is similar. But, unfortunately, many *Vedhaanthic* students get a wrong idea that the *Vedhaantha* class gives mere 'book knowledge' / 'intellectual knowledge' / 'indirect knowledge' and not 'experiential knowledge'. If a *Vedhaanthic* student listens to the *mahaa vaakyam*, with this misguided orientation, even if he listens to the *mahaa vaakyam* for a billion *janmaa*-s, nothing will happen. 'Knowledge' cannot take place. He will be eternally looking at other options, like meditation etc., to acquire, what he considers, 'experiential knowledge'. A diligent student should drop this orientation forthwith. In the case of *Maanasarovar*, such an understanding or approach is permissible. But, not in the case of the *dhasama*: (in the example) or *Brahman*. *Dhasama*: is available at hand. Similarly, *Brahman* is also not far away. *Sruthi* (*Katopanishad* 1.2.20) refers to *Brahman* as '*nihitha: guhaayaam*' – 'located in the heart'. It is the *chaithanyam* available in all the *avasthaa*-s - '*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa vijrumbhathe*' – 'that shines forth clearly, in all the three states of existence, waking, dream and deep sleep' as *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* declares in his *Maneeshaa Panchakam*. *Sureswaraachaaryaa* asserts: "Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* does not give only 'book knowledge' or 'indirect knowledge' or mere 'intellectual knowledge'. It gives *aparoksha saakshaathkaara*:, if only you listen to it properly".

ॐ एवं - In this manner,

ॐ 'तत् त्वम् असि' इति अस्मात् (वाक्यात्) - from this mahaa vaakya pramaanaath / from the proposition 'That thou art',

ॐ दृढा प्रमा जायेत एव - unshakable / firm knowledge positively rises,

'pramaa' means '*jnaanam* / knowledge'; '*dhrudaa'* means 'firm' / 'unshakable'.

What is the 'knowledge' about?

ॐ प्रत्यक् आत्मनि - with regard to 'I, ' the innermost aathmaa, (which is in the form of chaithanyam, the Consciousness principle),

What type of Consciousness? **Ans:** "Which is not a part, product or property of the body; which pervades and enlivens the body; which is not limited by the boundaries of the body; which survives even in sleep, when the body and mind are resolved".

For whom does this knowledge arise?

ॐ सम्यग् ज्ञात त्वमर्थस्य - for the one who has clearly grasped the meaning of the word '*thvam*' in '*thath thvam asi*' (or the word '*aham*' in '*aham Brahma asmi*').

This is very important, because, if the aspirant includes the body-mind complex also, along with Consciousness, in the meaning of 'I', the *mahaa vaakyam* is guaranteed not to work. The *guru* says " 'you' are the all-pervading *Brahman*" - "*thath thvam asi*"; in assimilating this, the *sishtyaa* uses the word '*aham*' or 'I', as '*aham Brahma asmi*'; at that time, the words 'you' and 'I' should refer only to the Consciousness principle. By *anvaya vyathirekhaa* logic, the aspirant should have excluded the body and the mind - in fact, the entire *pancha anaathmaa*, consisting of profession, possessions, family, body and mind, from the meaning of 'I' or '*aham*'.

In his introduction to the *Geethaa Bhaashyam*, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* warns '*Sanyaasa sahitha jnaanaath eva moksha:*' – 'liberation is possible only through 'knowledge' coupled with *sanyaasaa*'. But, '*Sanyaasa*' is not merely putting on the ochre robes or taking to similar external symbols. '*Sanyaasaa*' consists in 'handing over' all personal concerns to the *Viswaroopa Isvara*; especially, the family, since 'family' is the greatest burden for a *grihasthaa*, who tends to say "I do not worry about myself. But, I cannot see my children / grandchildren suffer. I do not do any *parihaaram* for myself; but I have to do *parihaaram*-s for my children and grandchildren". Though such an approach cannot be totally faulted, ultimately, the aspirant himself should raise his level and drop this attitude. "'Clasp' (controllership and ownership) rejection and *ahamkaara- mamakaara* rejection is *sanyaasa*. That '*sanyaasa sahitha aham Brahma asmi jnaani*' is referred to here, as '*samyag jnaatha thvam artha:*' It should be noted that, in this compound term '*samyag jnaatha thvam arthasya*', '*samyag jnaatha*' is one part and '*thvam arthasya*' is the second part, meaning 'for the one who has clearly grasped the meaning of the word 'I', as the Consciousness excluding the *pancha anaathmaa* – profession, possession, family, body and mind'. Only after mental renunciation of these five, '*aham Brahma asmi*' can be a valid knowledge.

177: Chapter III, Verses 70 (13-03-2010)

In these portions, with the help of the *dhasama dhrushtaantha* / the 10th man example, Sureswaraacharyaa, points out that *mahaa vaakya sravanam* itself can give 'direct knowledge'. *Mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam* is **not** an 'indirect knowledge', which has to be converted into 'direct knowledge' later, in meditation. Of course, some *advaitin-s* themselves do hold this view that it is only 'indirect knowledge' to be converted into 'direct knowledge' by meditation. This school of thought, among *advaitin-s*, claims that *sravanam* gives 'indirect knowledge' and later meditation alone can give 'direct knowledge'. This is the contention of some *advaitin-s*; Sureswaraacharyaa strongly disagrees with that view and asserts that *sravanam* itself can give 'direct knowledge'. *Sravanam* itself **can** give 'direct knowledge, because, in this instance, namely, the teaching of *mahaa vaakyam*, the words used are intended to reveal facts about something which is already experienced. More elaborately: At the time of receiving the knowledge conveyed through the words of the *mahaa vaakyam*, 'experience' is already included in the 'knowledge', because the words are talking only about an already experienced entity, namely Consciousness. Or, in other words: the knowledge born out of the words of *mahaa vaakyam*, includes the experience of the discussed object, namely Consciousness, and, hence that knowledge **is** 'direct knowledge'. To convey this idea, the *dhasama* episode is given by Sureswaraacharyaa as *dhrushtaantha*.

What is 'direct knowledge' and what is 'indirect knowledge'? This was explained in an earlier context, in a *Viveka Choodamani* class, when an expression "introducing words' give 'direct knowledge'; 'describing words' give 'indirect knowledge' " was used. To explain with examples : If the speaker of the words, is describing an object which is far away, the 'describing words' give only 'indirect knowledge', because the knowledge does not include the experience of the object, as it happens to be 'remote'. Therefore, however eloquently the speaker describes the object, the description *will* give 'knowledge', but, will not include 'experience' of the object.

In contrast, imagine a situation when someone is being introduced by one individual to another. The person being introduced is right in front of both the introducer and of the person to whom the introduction is made. The 'introducer' or the speaker is introducing that person, and while introducing, he gives details of the person being

introduced, such as his name, his educational qualifications, his professional achievements etc. While the listener gets the descriptions of the person *in front of* both the speaker and listener, he need not wait for the experience part, since he is already experiencing the person.

The speaker is introducing the person and while introducing, he is describing the person. One may call it 'introductory description' or 'describing introduction'. But, those 'introducing words' include the experience of the person introduced. This 'experience-including-knowledge' is called 'direct knowledge'. No doubt, introducing words do not generate experience; but, introducing words need not also generate experience. Why? Ans: The listener is already having the 'experience'.

And, therefore, *Vedhaantha* says "whenever 'introducing words' are used, they will give *aparoksha jnaanam*. It (the *jnaanam*) does not require a separate effort at all".

Another example: "When I go into a herbal garden, I 'experience' several herbal plants, but, without knowing the names of those plants and their medicinal powers. In contrast, when I am taken on a conducted tour by someone conversant with the herbs and their powers, (in a lighter vein – an *oshadhi nishta aachaaryaa*) and he goes on naming and describing the herbs and their medicinal powers, I get 'knowledge' of the herbs. Is this knowledge *aparoksha jnaanam* or *paroksha*? Ans: I get *aparoksha jnaanam*. 'Knowledge' is generated by the word of the guide and 'experience' is already there, though *not* generated by the word."

In the *dhasama dhrushtaanatha* also, when '*dhasama: asi*' is revealed, the words give *aparoksha jnaanam*, since the '*dhasama:*' is available for 'experience'. In the same manner, when *Vedhaantha mahaa vaakyam* talks about *Brahman*, its words are not 'describing words', but, 'introducing words', which only point out that '*Brahman is* the already experienced Consciousness principle'. Consciousness need not be experienced in future meditation. It is experienced all the time – in all three states of existence, as quoted in the earlier session, "*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa yaa vijrumbhathe*".

Of course, there is a difference in the 'experience'. What is that difference? Ans: Before the *guru* came, the aspirant *was* 'experiencing' the Consciousness, but, without 'knowing' that it was *Brahman*. After the *guru's* exhortation '*thath thvam asi*' or '*pragnyaanam Brahma*', the 'experience' of the Consciousness is accompanied by

the 'knowledge' of 'identity with *Brahman*.' The example of the visits to the herbal garden may be recalled: "The first day, the guide was not there, when I visited the garden; the herbs were just 'experienced' by me. On the second day, there was the conducted tour of the same herbal garden with the guide; it was the same herbal garden. I did not get a new experience, because the experience was already there, but a I got a new knowledge about the names and powers of the herbs". That knowledge is *aparoksha jnaanam*.

Similarly, I have been experiencing Consciousness from ages. And, a *srothriya Brahma nishta guru* comes, and does not merely 'describe' *Brahman*, but also introduces *Brahman* (using the *mahaa vaakyam 'Pragnyaanam Brahma'*) as Consciousness, which has been / is / will ever be experienced. '*Pragnyaanam Brahma'* are 'introducing words' and, not 'describing words', introducing the available *chaithanyam* as *Brahman*, the *jagadh adhistaanam*.

And, therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, in verse 70, '*dhrudaa pramaa jaayetha eva*. '*Dhruda praamaa'* means '*dhruda jnaanam*' / 'firm knowledge'. And, the 'knowledge' is about '*Brahman* as '*chaithanyam*'. This 'firm knowledge' will be definitely born, if only the student has been listening properly.

At this point, Swamiji desires to discuss one more technical point, before proceeding further. Again, using his own words:

"Before travelling further, I will discuss one more technical point and proceed further.

"Even though the *guru* keeps on saying that (i) *chaithanyam* is experienced all the time, (ii) that experienced *chaithanyam* is *Brahman* and (iii) it has to be claimed in the class itself etc., the student may have another question.

"This question may be raised especially by a senior student who is supposed to have more information.

"What is the question? The student might argue with the teacher: 'No doubt I am experiencing Consciousness all the time. But, you have yourself taught me, that, that Consciousness experienced in the body-mind complex is *chidhaabhassa*. Therefore, what I am experiencing all the time is Consciousness alright; but, I am

having only *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*. And, you have taught me that *chidhabhaasaa* is only a *pramaatha* or *ahamkaaraa*; that, *chith* alone is the *saakshi* and *saakshi* alone is *Brahman*. That means, that, I am only experiencing the '*chidhabaasaa*, the *pramaatha*' and that, I am not experiencing '*Brahman*, the *saakshi*'. Therefore, you should tell me how to experience '*chith*, the *saakshi*'. I always have *pramaatha anubhavaa* and since I have not experienced *saakshi / chith / Brahman*, the *jnaanam* I have, is only *paroksha jnaanam*.

"The student's question is 'I have *chidhabhaasa anubhavaa*; how can I have *chith anubhavaa*? As long as I have the body mind complex / as long as I have the mind , I will have only *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*. I want to experience *chith*.

"In short, the student wants to exclude the *chidhaabhaasaa* and experience 'pure *chith*'. And, to exclude the *chidhabhaasaa*, some students, based on misconceptions due to misunderstanding some scriptures, want to eliminate the mind and thoughts, by going into *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. But, what will happen, if a student attempts this, in his noble pursuit of 'experience of *chith*' and the *chidhaabhaasaa* goes away in meditation? Ans: The only difference between life and death is the presence and absence of *chidhaabhaasaa*. This clip (referring to a clip on Swamiji's desk) is inert matter because it does not have *chidhaabhaasaa*. But, in the clip, is there *chith* or not? *Chith*, being all-pervading, must be there in the clip also and it is very much there. Still the clip is 'dead matter', because it lacks *chidhaabhaasaa*. Anything which lacks *chidhabhaasaa*, is 'dead'.

"Therefore, if you try to experience pure *saakshi* in meditation, by *eliminating chidhaabhaasa / thoughts / mind* etc., you are becoming akin to a dead body. If you remove mind and *chidhaabhaasa*, you cannot have *any* experience, because you become a dead individual. When there is no experience possible, how can you hope to experience the pure *chith*, the *saakshi*? If that is possible, all the clips must be liberated. All inert matter will be liberated, because they have *chith anubhavaa* and all living beings will be 'bound', because they can never have *chith anubhavaa* but only the *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*. Therefore, remember there is no separate *chith anubhavaa* and *chidhabhaasa anubhavaa*. A separate *chidhabhaasa anubhavaa* and a separate *chith anubhavaa* are logically impossible, because the moment you remove *chidhabhaasaa*, you become dead and you cannot have any experience.

"To repeat for stress: 'What should be remembered is, that, a separate *chith anubhavaa* and a separate *chidhabhaasa anubhavaa* are logically impossible. Therefore, working for pure *chith anubhavaa* in meditation is rank foolishness'.

"Even if you get some mystic experiences - which we admit are quite possible - they have nothing to do with *saakshi anubhavaa*. If mystics claim those mystic experiences as *saakshi anubhavaa*, we say that they have additional *adhyaasaa*. Earlier it was ordinary and normal *adhyaasaa*. Interpreting some mystic experience as pure *saakshi anubhavaa* is another added *adhyaasaa*, since *saakshi anubhavaa* in meditation is not possible according to *saasthraa*-s and also logically.

"So, never say 'I only have *chidhabhaasa anubhavaa* and not *saakshi anubhavaa*'. There is only one *chaithanya anubhavaa*, which is available at all times. Whether that *anubhavaa* is *chith anubhavaa* or *chidhabhaasaa anubhavaa* will depend upon the way you understand that experience.

"There is only one *chaithanya anubhavaa*; whether you call it *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* or *chith anubhavaa* will depend upon the way you perceive or understand that experience. Experience is already there. And, what is that experience? Ans: '*Chaithanya anubhavaa*'. But, whether that experience is *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* or *chith anubhavaa* / (I will change the language) whether it is *prathibhimba chaithanya anubhavaa* or *bhimba chaithanya anubhavaa* depends on the way you take the experience. If you take the experience properly / 'edit' the experience properly, it is *bhimba chaithanya anubhavaa*. If you do not 'edit' it properly, it is *prathibhimba chaithanya anubhavaa*. It all depends upon the 'editing' process. – not on the 'experience'. There is no separate *bhimba chaithanya anubhavam* or separate *prathibhimba chaithanya anubhavam*. By proper 'editing', we take it as *bhimba chaithanya anubhavaa* and by improper 'editing', we mistake it as *prathibhimba chaithanya anubhavaa*. The *anvaya vyathireka vichaara* and *thvam padha vichaaraa* are only for proper editing of the *chaithanya anubhavaa*. With proper 'editing', the *chaithanya anubhavaa* can be understood as *bhimba chaithanya anubhavaa*.

"And, how is it done? This is analyzed in *saasthraa*-s. The analysis is called '*prathibhimba vaada prakriyaa*'. I have not discussed this earlier. But, since this *prathibhimba parakriyaa* analysis is required to solve the unique problem of the senior students, who ask 'I have experienced *chidhaabhaasaa*. How to experience

chith? To answer this question, *prathibhimbha vaada prakriyaa* has to be understood properly.

“What is that *prathibhimbha vaada prakriyaa*? This can be understood through an example. Let us take the example of a person standing in front of a mirror to shave his face. And, when he stands in front of the mirror, he gets the ‘experience’ of his face. So, we can say, he has got *mukha anubhavaa* | He has got *mukha anubhavaa*, when he stands in front of the mirror. Now the question is: ‘What *mukha anubhavaa* has he got? Is it *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa* (experience of his original face) or *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa* (experience of the reflected face)?’ The answer, obviously, is ‘*prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*’. This individual is in a hurry to get ready for his work and rushes to get in front of the mirror, for getting *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. And, he wants to shave. But, which *mukham* will he shave? The answer is again obvious, namely, *bhimbha mukham*. Now, when a person wants to shave *bhimbha mukham*, why should he rush to a mirror, fully aware that he is going to get only *prathibhimbha muka anubhavaa*? *Bhimbha mukam* is not *prathibhimbha mukham*; and the *prathibhimbha mukham* is not *bhimbha mukham*. This being the fact, when the individual wants to shave the *bhimbha mukham*, why should he stand in front of the mirror and experience *prathibhimbha mukham* to shave *bhimbha mukham*? Logically speaking, shaving the *bhimbha mukham* by experiencing *prathibhimbha mukham* must be impossible, because *prathibhimbha muka anubhavaa* cannot help him shave the *bhimbha mukham*. But, even though it sounds logically impossible, it is found practically possible. The very fact that he has successfully shaved his *bhimbha mukham* for years, experiencing the *prathibhimbha mukham* and he will continue to do this in the future also, indicates that it is practically possible, though, logically, it seems to be impossible.

“How do we explain this? (*Saasthraa* analyses this phenomenon; of course, *saasthraa* does not use this example of shaving). What is this phenomenon? What is the answer?

“In the presence of the mirror, the individual has *mukha anubhavaa*. And, because of the presence of the mirror, certain incidental features are experienced in the face. These features are caused by the mirror; and, these features are only incidental features and not intrinsic features of the face. What are those features? What the person experiences are: ‘there is a face and the face is located on the mirror’. This

'seeming location of the face', namely, the mirror, is the first incidental feature. In reality, the face is located on the person's neck.

The face is located on his neck; but, now he experiences the 'location' on the mirror. The 'location' is an incidental feature caused by the mirror. Similarly, the face can be said to be supported by the mirror, because, the face is on the mirror. This 'seeming support' by the mirror, is also an incidental feature, experienced because of the mirror but is not an intrinsic feature of the face. 'Seemingly' the face is on the mirror; 'seemingly' it is supported by the mirror. Not only these two features; the face seems to have 'arrival' and 'departure' along with the mirror. The 'arrival' and 'departure' along with the mirror also are incidental features experienced, but not intrinsic features of the face, since before the 'arrival' also, the face was there and after the 'departure' also, the 'face' is there. But the 'arrival' and 'departure' of the face 'seem' to be there, because of the mirror.

"So, let us note these four incidental features (i) location on the mirror (ii) support by the mirror (iii) arrival because of the mirror and (iv) departure because of the mirror. There may be more incidental features also. But, these four will do for the purpose of the example.

"Now, if the person looking into the mirror, includes these four features as the intrinsic features of the face, then the *mukha anubhavaa* is called *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. On the other hand, since the person is intelligent, which 'intelligence' is proved by his daily use of the mirror for shaving, he understands that these four features are only 'seeming' or 'incidental' features and do not intrinsically belong to the face. As a consequence, he excludes / ignores those four features. Then, the very same *mukha anubhavaa* becomes *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. In other words: Only because he is willing to ignore those four features, viz., (i) the face is on the mirror (ii) the face is supported by the mirror (iii) the face comes with the mirror and (iv) the face goes away with the mirror, he looks upon the face as *bhimbha mukham*. And, using that *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa* (his corrected perspective), he is able to shave the *bhimbha mukham*.

"By this *bhimbha muka anubhavaa*, he has ignored the location of the face on the mirror; it is not on the mirror. It is not supported by the mirror. It is on his neck only. The moment he ignores these incidental features - which is called 'editing' - the *mukha anubhavaa* for this discerning observer is *bhimbha muka anubhavaa* only.

Therefore, using that *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa* he is able to shave *bhimbha mukam*. Therefore, for him, 'looking into the mirror' works.

"In a nutshell: How do I convert the *prathibhimbha muka anubhavaa* to *bhimbha muka anubhavaa*? **Ans:** 'By ignoring the incidental features'. In the presence of mirror, there is one *mukha anubhavaa*; that *mukha anubhavaa* is called *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa* if you include the incidental features; and the same *anubhavaa* becomes *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*, if you use the mirror and ignore the incidental features. .

"Every time a person goes to the mirror, does he want to see *bhimbha mukham* or *prathibhimbha mukham*? Remember, he wants to see the *bhimbha mukham* alone. Nobody goes to the mirror to see the *prathibhimbha mukham*, because, by seeing the *prathibhimbha mukham*, the *bhimbha mukham* cannot be shaved or 'made up' in any other manner. Therefore everybody goes to the mirror to see the *bhimbha mukham* only, after editing the incidental features.

"We saw that, when you look into the mirror and include the incidental features caused by the mirror to the face, then the *anubhavaa* is called *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. In *saasthraa-s*, the mirror, in such a situation, is called *viseshanam*. We also saw that, when you use the mirror and carefully ignore the incidental features caused by the mirror, the *anubhavaa* becomes *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. The mirror, in such a situation, is said to be used as '*upaadhi*'. Thus, there is only one *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*; when the mirror is used as *viseshanam*, the *anubhavaa* is called *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*; when the mirror is used as *upaadhi*, the *mukha anubhavaa* is called *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. There are technical terms for the two types of face also. The *prathibhimbha mukham* is called *visishta mukham*; *bhimbha mukham* is called *upahitha mukham*.

"One mirror itself can be used for *bhimbha muka anubhavaa* or *prathibhimbha muka anubhavaa*, depending upon how you use the mirror.

"This is called *prathibhimbha vaada prakriyaa*, which has to be deeply meditated upon, for thorough understanding. The champion of this *prakriyaa* is *Padmapaadhaachaarya*, a primary disciple of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*. *Padmapadhaachaarya* has refined this *prakriyaa*.

"Now, suppose a person says: 'I do not want *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa* at all; I want only pure *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. If I use the mirror I will get only *prathibhimbha mukaa anubhavaa*. So, I will not use the mirror'. What will happen then? Ans: Obviously, if he refuses to use the mirror, he will get neither *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa* nor *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. No *anubhavaa* will come. So, 'throwing away the mirror' is folly. You should not throw away the mirror. Use the mirror, delete the incidental features and get *bhimbha mukha anubhavaa*.

"Hoping that the example is understood by the aspirants, *Padmapaadhaachaaryaa* says: 'Mind is the mirror. *Chaithanyam* is the *mukham*. If you abolish the mind, you will get no *chaithanya anubhavaa*'.

"If you abolish / destroy the mind, you will be like the clip which has no mind. What does the clip experience? It does not experience anything. Therefore, the first lesson is: 'Have the mind. Do not try to destroy it'.

"Never think of '*mano naasam*'. If you destroy the mind, you will be like a clip/ a dead body. What *anubhavaa* can take place to a dead body? Neither *bhimbha chaithanya anubhavaa* nor *prathibhimbha chaithanya anubhavaa*. No *anubhavaa* will take place, if you eliminate the thoughts and destroy the mind.

"If that term '*mano naasam*' is found used in any *Vedhaanthic* context, it should be interpreted as *mano mithyaathva jnaanam*. Do not take the term *mano naasam* literally and try to go on eliminating thoughts and mind.

"Unfortunately, some *Vedhaanthic* students do misunderstand the term *mano naasam*, in its literal sense. They think that in every session of *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, a portion of the mind will get dissolved and then will come a day of *Brahma anubhavam*, when the last trace of mind will get destroyed and pure *aathmaa* will be experienced. All these are misconceptions.

"*Aathmaa*, by itself, can never have the experience of itself, because, pure Consciousness cannot do any action and any experience is also an activity.

"Therefore, the term *mano naasam* should not be interpreted in its literal meaning; nor should attempts be made to 'destroy' the mind. *Mano naasam* means 'understanding *manasa: mithyaathvam*, keeping the mind'.

"Therefore *Padmapaadhaachaarya* says: 'The mind **has to be** kept. Mind is required to manifest the *chaithanyam*. In the presence of the mind alone *chaithanya anubhavaa* is possible'.

"Mind **does not give** *chaithanyam* to *aathmaa*. Mind **manifests** the *chaithanyam*.

"Lesson no. 1: Keep the mind. Lesson no. 2: In the presence of mind, all of us have *chaithanya anubhavaa*, which is called *aham asmi*. The first half of verse 7, of *Sri Dakshinamurthy Sthothram* of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* refers to this, as, "*baalyaadhisvapi jaagradhaadhisu thathaa sarvaasu avasthaasvapi vyaavruththaasu anuvarthamaanam aham ithi antha: spurantam thathaa*" – "In all stages of life like boyhood , in all states of life like waking and in all other conditions also, (Consciousness) constantly manifests inwardly, as 'I'". In *Maandookya kaaraikaa*, *Goudapaadhaachaaryaa* uses a term '*ekaathma prathyaya saaram*', which means '*aham aham ithi eka aham roopena*'. That is *chaithanya aubhavaa*.

"This *chaithanya anubhavaa* can be called *prathibhimbha chaithanya anubhavaa* or *bhimbha chaithanya anubhavaa*, depending on the way you take it. Recollect the example of 'shaving the original face, experiencing the reflected face'. If you try to shave the mirror, instead of shaving your original face, it means that you are treating the *mukha anubhavaa*, as *prathibhimbha mukha anubhavaa*. You wrongly assume that the face is located on the mirror and keep on shaving the mirror. But, what do you actually do? You do not shave the mirror; you shave your original face. That is the indicator that you are ignoring the 'location' caused by the mirror. In a similar manner, you should ignore / remove the incidental features of Consciousness, caused by the 'mind-mirror'.

"What are the incidental features caused to the Consciousness, by the 'mind-mirror'?"

Ans: They are (similar to the example): (1) the seeming location of the Consciousness in the mind (2) the seeming support of the mind to the Consciousness (3) the seeming arrival of Consciousness with the arrival of the mind and (4) the seeming departure of the Consciousness with the departure of the mind.

"If you misunderstand that the Consciousness is located in the mind, that Consciousness will become *prathibhimbha chaithanyam*, the location being an incidental feature caused by the mind. If you misunderstand that Consciousness is supported by the mind i.e. Consciousness is an attribute of the mind, again the Consciousness will become *prathibhimbha chaithanyam*. Similarly if you think, that along with the arrival and departure of the mind, the Consciousness also suffers 'arrival' and 'departure' and consequently say that *chaithanyam* is traveling from one *lokaa* to another, then also, you attribute incidental features to the *chaithanyam*, which *chaithanyam* will, therefore, have to be deemed *prathibhimbha chaithanyam*.

"On the other hand, suppose you ignore these incidental features. How do you ignore? Ans: 'By understanding that all these features belong only to the mind; that, the location belongs to the mind, the supporting character also belongs to the mind and not to the *chaithanyam* and the arrival and departure also belong to the mind only'. Thus you carefully avoid superimposing the four incidental features on the Consciousness. This 'avoidance' / 'ignoring' is an intellectual job.

"If, thus, ignoring the four features you experience the Consciousness as '*aham aham*' / if you understand 'I am the Consciousness, but not located in the mind; I am the Consciousness but not supported by the mind; I am the Consciousness, but I do not come with the mind; I am the Consciousness, I do not go with the mind' / if you can ignore these four features and assert that the Consciousness '*na jaayathe mriyathe vaa kadhaachith naayam bhoothvaa bhavitha vaa na bhooya: ajo nithya: saasvathoyam puraana: na hanyathe hanyamaane sareere*' (*Bhagavadh Githa* – II.2) – 'This (Self) is neither born at any time, nor does it die. It will neither come into existence nor will it disappear again. It is birthless, eternal and free from decay as well as growth. It is not affected when the body is affected' / if you experience the Consciousness as 'I am', in the presence of the mind-mirror, diligently ignoring the seeming attributes caused by the mind-mirror and claim '*aham asmi sadhaa bhaavi sadhaachinnaham apriya: brahmaiva aham siddham sachhidhaanadha lakshanam*', then you are experiencing *bhimbha chaithanyaa*, the *saakshi* only. When I include the four features; my experience is called *prathibhimbha chiathanya anubhavaa*. I exclude the four features; my experience is called *bhimbha chaithny anubhavaa*. Therefore, two separate *anubhavaa*-s are not there. Only two separate **interpretations** of one *anubhavaa* is there. There is only one experience of Consciousness and two separate interpretations.

"Let us again recollect the 'shaving' example. In the example, if my interpretation is 'the face is there on the mirror' and I shave the mirror, it is *prathibhimba muka anubhavaa*. If I experience the face and shave the original face here, the experience is *bhimba muka anubhavaa* only. And, do we all go to the mirror for *prathibhimba muka anubhavaa* or *bhimba muka anubhavaa*? Ans: Since we are all people who are capable of proper 'editing', we go to the mirror for *bhimba muka anubhavaa* only.

"This should be done in the context of Consciousness also. *Visishta chaithanyam* is *prathibhimba chaithanyam* and *upahitha chaithanyam* is *bhimba chaithanyam*. *Visishta chaithanyam* is *pramaatha* and *upahitha chaithanyam* is *saakshi*.

"And, when am I experiencing the *saakshi*? Ans: 'Whenever the mind is available, I am experiencing the *saakshi*; if the mind goes away from me, there can be no experience to me, similar to the clip which never experiences anything. But since the mind is always there with me, I will experience the *saakshi* either in active form in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa* or in passive form in *sushupthi*. I experience *saakshi* all the time, either in active or in passive form, because of the presence of the mind either in active form (in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa*) or in passive form (in *sushupthi*).

"And, *mahaa vaakyam* says this *chaithanyam* is *Brahman*, the Pure Existence, as Sage *Uddhaalakaa* tells his son *Svetahakethu*, in the *Chaandoghya Upanishad* '*sadheve soumya idham agra aaseeth jagatj kaaranam*.

"Therefore, when the guru says '*thath thvam asi*', the diligent *sishyaa* should use the mind as *upaadhi* – not as *viseshanam*. He should retain the *chaithanya anubhavaa* and exclude the location, travel etc., and claim "I' am the all-pervading, changeless and un-located *bhimba chaithanyam saakshi*. For such a diligent student, *pramaa dhrudaa jaayathe eva*".

177: Chapter III, Verses 70 and 71 (20-03-2010)

During the earlier session, it was seen that there are no two separate experiences in the forms of *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* and *chith anubhavaa*. There is only one *chaithanya anubhavaa*, which a discerning person understands as *chith anubhavaa* and other people misunderstand as *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*. Only one experience, if rightly understood is *chith anubhavaa*; and, if misunderstood, is *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*.

There is only one experience, because there is only one Consciousness. That Consciousness is never available for 'objectification'. But, that Consciousness, though not available for 'objectification', *is* available for all of us, in the form of 'I am' experience.

In this 'I am' experience, Consciousness *is* available as 'I am'. Therefore, the 'I am' experience is a 'self experience', which is without subject-object duality. Thus, Consciousness can be said to be available as 'I am' experience or 'self-experience' or 'subject-experience'. You may call it 'I am' experience; you may call it 'subject experience'; you may call it 'self experience';

And, contrary to popular belief, we need not work for this *chaithanya anubhavaa*; it is universally available, because is not the 'I am' realization / claim common to all the beings? Therefore, we need not do any separate exercise for this 'I am' *anubhavaa*.

But, this availability of Consciousness, as 'I am' experience, is possible only in the presence of the mind. In the absence of mind, Consciousness will be present, but, will not be available for 'I am' experience. This should be carefully understood and noted: Consciousness is available for 'I am' experience only in the proximity or presence of the mind. In the absence of the mind, Consciousness *is* very much present; but, is not available as 'I am' experience.

There is another problem also. When Consciousness is thus available in the presence of the mind as 'I am' experience, along with this 'I am' experience, a limitation also is experienced, because of the mind; which limitation is: A 'seeming' location.

Because of the presence of the mind, I do not experience / understand Consciousness as all-pervading, un-located Consciousness; but, I experience it with a 'seeming' location, namely, the mind. Unfortunately, this experience of 'seeming' location cannot be avoided, obviously because the mind *is* necessarily required for 'I am' experience. To consolidate: Only in the presence of the mind, Consciousness can be experienced as 'I am' and that experience of Consciousness includes the experience of a limitation also, viz., 'seeming' location, namely, the mind, and caused by the mind.

As long as the mind is there, the seeming location will result . If you, therefore, try to abolish the mind, what will happen? Ans: No doubt, the 'seeming location' will go away; but, the 'I am' experience also will go away. *Soonyam* alone will result.

To consolidate again: The mind *has* to be there to experience Consciousness. As a result of the presence of the mind, Consciousness can be experienced as 'I am', but that experience will include the seeming location caused by the mind.

If I mistake the seeming location, the mind, as the real location of Consciousness, then the experience is named *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*; but, if, with a discerning intellect, I exclude the seeming location, understanding that it is *only* seeming location, then that experience will be *chith anubhavaa*. In other words, one 'I am' *anubhavaa* itself, is called *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*, when I include the location and the very same experience is called *chith anubhavaa*, when I exclude the location.

How do I exclude the location? Ans: 'Merely by intellectually understanding that the location is only seeming location'. Non-discerning people have got the 'I *anubhavaa*' in the form of *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* because they include the location; and, discerning people have the 'I *anubhavaa*' in the form of *chith anubhavaa*, because they exclude the seeming location, by merely understanding that the 'location' is only 'seeming'. But, whether I include the seeming location or exclude the seeming location, experience of the seeming location cannot be avoided.

This also is to be noted carefully: Whether I include the seeming location or exclude the seeming location, the experience of the seeming location can never be avoided, because, *chaithanya anubhavaa* will require the mind and the mind will necessarily

cause the seeming location. The only consolation is that the mind causes only a seeming location; the mind does not cause a real location.

In essence, a discerning person uses the mind for *chaithanya anubhavaa* and he experiences the *chaithanyam*, without 'objectifying' it, by claiming 'I am the Consciousness.' And, at the time of claiming 'I am the Consciousness', the 'seeming location' *will be* experienced by the discerning person also; but, even while experiencing the seeming location, he says 'I am un-located Consciousness'. This is similar to our seeing the 'blue' waters of the ocean, but understanding and maintaining that the oceanic water is colourless. As even as we say 'the water is colourless', what does the eye report? The eye continues to report the 'blue colour'; but, we say, the water is colourless.

Every discerning person experiences *chaithanyam* - not *chidhaabhaasaa* - all the time - '*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa*'. What type of *chaithanyam*? Ans: 'Seemingly located but really un-located Consciousness', as 'I am' ...'I am'....'I am'.

As already indicated, this experience is possible only in the proximity of the mind. When the mind is abolished 'I' will be there; but I will not say 'I am *chaithanyam*'. In the presence of mind, ***all the time***, *chithanya anubhavaa* is there.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The 'discerning' student is the one, who has completed the *anvayavyathirekhaa vichaaraa* and therefore claims 'I am the un-located Consciousness, not *chidhaabhaasaa*, but *chith* itself'. When such a 'discerning' aspirant listens to the *mahaa vaakyam*, using the word '*aham*' to mean the *chith* and not the *chidhaabhaasaa*, '*aham Brahma asmi jnaanam* will be instantaneous to him". Such a student will not argue: "Swamiji! I am experiencing only *chidhaabhaasaa*. Should I not resort to *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* for *chith anubhavaa*?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys all these points, which we discussed elaborately, in the entire last session and till now in the present session also, tersely, in one compound word "*samyag jnaatha thvam arthasya*" (in verse 70) - meaning 'the one who has rightly understood the meaning of the word '*thvam*' as 'I', the un-located Consciousness".

The compound word '*samyagjnaathathvamarthasya*' should be carefully split, as '*samyag + jnaatha + thvam + arthasya*' and not as '*samyag + jnaathathvam +*

arthasya. According to Sanskrit grammar, the term will be considered as *bahuvreehi samaasam*, derived as '*samyag jnaatha: thvam artha: yena sa: purusha:*'| It describes a particular type of student. What type of student? Ans: "The student, who says 'I am' and understands 'I' as *chaithanyam* and not *chidhaabhaasaa*". He has understood in this manner through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise, has transferred all the attributes and locations to the body-mind complex and stands as un-located Consciousness principle, without any attribute'. For such a student, Sureswaraacharya says: '*dhrudaa pramaa jaayathe eva* – 'clear knowledge has to take place / will take place'.

It is very important also to understand and note (though Sureswaraacharya does not mention it here), that this knowledge will take place, at the very time of *sravanam* itself – not separately in *samaadhi* or later meditation. As even as such a student 'listens' to the *mahaa vaakyam*, he can / will gain the final, liberating knowledge.

With regard to what? Sureswaraacharya says: '*prathyag aathmani*' meaning 'with regard to the *prathyag aathmaa* / the real, inner self'. The term '*prathyag aathmani*' is *vishaya saphami*, connected to *pramaa*. The knowledge gained is, with regard to the real 'I', *prathyag aathmaa*.

And, what is the knowledge? **Ans:** 'That 'I' am the *jagadh adhishtaanam Brahman*, and not one who tries to escape in the name of *videha mukthi*'.

A diligent *Vedhaanthin* should get rid of the idea of 'escaping from this world'. He should not want to 'escape' in the name of *videha mukthi*. When, 'I' **am** the *jagadh adhishtaanam*, in which *adhishtaanam*, galaxies rise and fall, where is the question of 'escaping'? 'Escaping' is neither possible nor required. It is not possible, because 'I' am everywhere and, therefore, where can I escape to? 'Escaping' is not required, because nothing in the universe can touch / affect 'me'.

The next question: What is the means through which this knowledge takes place? Sureswaraacharya says: '*thathavamasi ithi asmaath (vaakyaath)*' meaning 'from this most profound *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*'.

All these portions of the verse were covered in an earlier session. But, there is a crucial word in the verse, which we missed to discuss earlier:

ॐ द्वैतनुत् - (which *vaakyam* is) the destroyer of all dualities.

This is a very important word, describing the *mahaa vaakyam*. '*Dvaitam*' means 'duality' and '*nuth*' means 'remover / eliminator / destroyer', derived from the root '*nudh*' meaning 'to push off'.

Knowledge of *Brahman* automatically negates the pluralities / '*thriputi*'-s in the forms of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, *pramaathaa-pramaanam-prameyam* etc. All forms of dualities and pluralities are instantaneously falsified / negated, just as, at the very moment of one waking up from a dream, the *svapna* duality goes away.

The only difference is: When I wake up from dream, not only is the dream world falsified, the dream world will also 'go away' from my experience; whereas, in *advaita jnaanam*, the *jaagrath* world will be only falsified but will **not** 'go away' from experience. It is like continuing a dream, with the knowledge that I am awake, which, of course, does not happen. The 'analogy' is only hypothetical: 'keeping awake, with the understanding that I am awake, but, with the dream continuing'.

And, therefore, i.e., after *mahaa vaakyam* also, while 'I' am of a 'higher order' of reality, the world will continue as of a 'lower order' of reality; all things will continue as they are. As Lord Krishna says in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Chapter V – verses 8 & 9) "*naiva kinchith karomeethi yuktho manyetha thathvavith pasyan srunvan sprusan jighran asnan gacchan svapan svasan pralapan visrujan gruhnan unmishan nimishannapi indriyaani indriyartheshu varthanthe ithi dhaarayan*" – "Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening and closing the eyes, the disciplined knower of the Truth understands 'I do not do anything at all', bearing in mind that sense organs move among sense-objects'. Of Himself also (as *Isvara*), Lord Krishna says "*thasya karthaaram api maam viddhi akarthaaram avyayam*" - "I create also; but, really speaking, I do not create" (Chapter IV-Verse 13). And, again (Chapter IX – verses 4 & 5) "*Mathsthaani sarva bhoothaani; na cha mathsthaani bhoothaani*" – "All beings are in Me. In fact, beings are not in Me". The seeming world of duality will continue, but with the knowledge and conviction that it is seeming.

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 71:

प्रत्यगात्मनि प्रमोपजायत इत्युक्तं तत्र चोद्यते । किं यथा घटादि प्रमेयविषया प्रमाकर्त्रादिकारकभेदानपह्वेन जायते तथैवोत अशेषकारकग्रामोपमर्देन कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनीति । उच्यते ।

That 'knowledge arises about the inmost Self' has been said. Does this knowledge arise like the 'knowledge about a jar' etc., without cancelling the diversity of factors involved in action? Or does it arise by destroying all such plurality of causal factors, in the agent i.e. the Self? The question is answered in the following verse:

The word '*dvaithanuth*' of the previous *slokaa* is explained in this *slokaa*, following a question from a student, who asks: "What is the difference between this knowledge and any other knowledge? I know that, when I use any other worldly *pramanaam*, like *prathyakshaa*, *anumaana* etc., I stand as a *pramaathaa*, I operate a *pramaanam* and I get the knowledge of the *prameyam*. And, even after that knowledge (for example, I look at a pot and get the knowledge 'this is a pot'; and, after that *ghata jnaanam* also) I continue to be a *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* continues to be there and there are other *prameyaa*-s which also I can get to know.

"Thus, in all other *pramaana vyaapaara*, knowledge keeps on coming; and, the *thriputi* is sustained and continued. Even if I go to *svarga lokaa*, I will continue to be a *pramaathaa*, operating a *pramaanam* and experiencing a *prameyam*. Therefore, in all other *jnaana vyavahaaraa*-s, *thriputi* is protected and maintained. Now, what I want to know is: is there any difference between *mahaa vaakya pramaana vyaapaara* and *anya pramaana vyapaaraa*?"

'*Vyaapaara*' means 'operation'. The student's question is: "Is there any difference between operation of *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and other *pramaanam*-s?" And, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say "Yes. There **is** a very big difference".

To explain (in Swamiji's words): "In dreams, we see several objects. Imagine that, in a particular dream of yours, a tiger appears. It chases you, catches up with you and pouncing on you, pushes you down. And, at that moment, because of the shock, you wake up. This experience of the tiger attacking you, is an unique experience. What is the uniqueness about it? It woke you up and removed the entire dream, *including* the tiger also. The tiger removed the dream world and the tiger removed

the dreamer who was located in the dream world / the frightened individual in the dream. Both of them were negated; but, not only that. The uniqueness of the tiger is, that it woke you up and in the process, the tiger also got falsified. Therefore, from one perspective, even though it is a false tiger, it is a 'sacred' tiger, because it is a tiger which 'woke' you up from your nightmare. It may have caused you the nightmare; but, it rid you also of the nightmare". So, if a *poorva pakshin* asks an *Advaitin* "how can *mithyaa* (*guru* and *saasthraa-s*) lead you to *sathyam* (*Brahman*)?", *Vedhaanthaa* gives the example of the dream tiger and responds "If the dream tiger can help me wake up from dream, in the same manner, in the waking state, *mahaa vaakyam*, like the dream tiger, 'awakens' me to the *thriputi rahitham Brahman*. And, as even as I wake up, *prameyam* (this *mithyaa jagath*) goes away and I also, as a *pramaathaa*, a localized individual, get falsified. And, what about the *mahaa vaakyam*? *Mahaa vaakyam* also disappears as a *pramaanam*, again similar to the dream-tiger".

For a *jnaani*, *mahaa vaakyam* also is falsified. '*Athra vedaa: avedaa:*' declares *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iii.22). And, *Dhasaslokee* (verse 7): "*na saasthaa na saasthram na sishyo na sikshaa na cha thvam na chaaham na chaayam prapancha:| svaroopovabodho vikalpaasahishnu: thadekovasishta: siva:kevaloham*" |

For this phenomenon, viz., 'the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* disappearing as *pramaanam* after *jnaanam*, *advaita aachaaryaa-s* usually give the example of a powder, known as '*kataka renu*', which was widely used in ancient times, for the purpose of cleaning turbid water. The powder is added to the water, to remove all suspended dust particles. Obviously, if the dust particles are removed by the powder, and, instead, the powder itself remains suspended, the object of cleaning the water will not be served. But, how does this particular powder '*kataka renu* act? Ans: It gathers all the dust particles and, *along with them*, settles down at the bottom of the container making it possible for the clean water layers at the top to be collected carefully, for use. In a similar manner, the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* removes duality and removes itself also. Thus, *mahaavaakya pramaana vyaapaara* is *thriputi nivarthakam*, while *anya pramaana vyaapaaraa-s* are *thriputi pravarthakaa-s*.

This is the difference between *mahaa vaakya pramaana vyaapaaraa* and *anya pramaana vyaapaaraa-s*. That is what is clarified here. First comes the question:

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मनि प्रमा - "This knowledge with regard to the real 'I' (that 'I' am Brahman')

ॐ उपजायते - is born instantaneously" -

The instantaneous 'birth' of this knowledge is similar to the '*dhasama jnaana*' born in the *dhasama dhrushtaantha*. Another common example given is '*Karna dhrushtaantha*', from the epic *Mahaabhaaratha*. As is popularly known, *Karna* was brought up from infancy by a charioteer, and was looking upon himself as the charioteer's son, as the others also did. But, from *Kunti's vaakyam* (akin to *mahaa vaakyam*), the realization that he was *Kunti's* son and not the charioteer's, dawned in him. Similarly, the knowledge "'I' am not *jeevaa*; but, *Brahman*" is born instantaneously, from *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

ॐ इति उक्तं - Thus was mentioned (in the previous sloka).

ॐ तत्र - With regard to this knowledge / prama viashaye,

ॐ चोध्यते - the following question is asked (by someone).

And, what is that question? Ans: "Does this knowledge (*aathma jnaanam*) also retain duality, similar to other types of knowledge which do retain duality, or does this knowledge dismiss duality?"

In fact, the very word 'knowledge' brings into our minds, duality / plurality. This is because when the word 'knowledge' is mentioned, the ideas (i) 'there is a knower' (ii) 'there is something to be known' (iii) 'there is a 'revealing' instrument' and (iv) 'because of their coming together, knowledge is born', arise in the listener's mind. The very word 'knowledge' brings 'duality' to the mind. Hence the question, "Does this self-knowledge also retain duality?" Reverting to the text:

ॐ यथा - Just as

ॐ घटादि प्रमेयविषया प्रमा - the knowledge of any object like a pot

ॐ जायते - arises in our minds

ॐ कर्त्रादि कारक भेद अनपह्वेन - retaining the plurality, in the form of various accessories like the knower etc.,

'*Pramaa*' means knowledge. What knowledge is referred to here? Ans: '*ghataadhi prameya vishayaa*' meaning 'of any object like a pot'. How does that knowledge rise in our minds? Ans: '*karthraadhi kaaraka bedha anapahnavena*' meaning 'retaining the plurality, in the form of various accessories like the knower etc.' '*Kartha*', in this context, should be taken as '*pramaathaa*' or 'knower'. '*aadhi*' means 'etc.', which, in this context, indicates *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. '*Kaarakaa*' means 'accessory' and '*bedha:*' means 'plurality'. '*apahnava:*' means 'removal / elimination'; '*anapahnava:*' (used here), therefore, means, 'non-elimination' or 'retention'. So, what is the essence of this part of the sentence? Ans: "The knowledge of objects like a pot, arises, maintaining / retaining the *thriputi*." Any knowledge other than self-knowledge, is, therefore, not a threat to '*thriputi*'. What about self-knowledge?

ॐ किं कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनि (प्रमा) - does the knowledge with regard to the inner self of the listener

ॐ तथा एव (अनपह्वेन जायते) - arise in the same manner, without eliminating *thriputi*?

ॐ उत - Or else,

ॐ अशेष कारकग्राम उपमर्दन (जायते) - does the knowledge (Brahma jnaanam) rise, totally negating the *thriputi*?

For the sake of easier understanding, this involved sentence is split into two shorter sentences, also supplying the words within the brackets.

'*Karthru:*', in this context, should be understood as '*srothru:*' i.e., as 'of the listener'. The word '*Utha*' is indeclinable and (according to Sanskrit dictionary) is 'a particle expressing doubt / uncertainty / guess'. '*Graama*' means 'group' and '*kaaraka graama*' means 'group of accessories', viz., *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* (in this context of *pramaa*). '*Asesha*' means 'totally'. '*Upamarda:*' means 'destruction / elimination', same as '*apahnava:*' The two words are synonyms.

The essence of this involved sentence, is the question: "Does *Brahma jnaanam* negate *thriputi* or does it not negate *thriputi*?" A diligent *Vedhaanthic* student will know the answer, viz., "It negates *thriputi*, not in terms of experience, but, in terms of 'reality'". Experiential plurality *will* continue. A diligent student of *Advaita* should

carefully note this, because, many other systems of philosophy repeatedly criticize *advaitam*, without understanding this basic view. They derisively say "the *Advaitic guru* talks of *advaitam*, but conducts classes. If he is really an *advaitin*, how can he do so? According to his philosophy, there can be no duality / plurality of *guru*, *sishyaa*, *saasthraa*, *sikshaa* etc." Unfortunately, they ask the question and go away without caring to listen to the answer. The answer, which should be carefully remembered by the student, is, that, the *advaitin* never negates 'experiential duality'. He negates only 'factual duality'. This is similar to (as quoted already) our experiencing 'blue' waters and 'blue' sky and still maintaining the facts, that water is colourless and sky is colourless. It is experiential 'blue' water; not real 'blue' water. It is experiential 'blue' sky; not real blue sky.

The *Advaitic guru* can, therefore, happily continue to teach, with not just one student but with several students and keep on asserting " I am *advaitam* ; *aham annam* ; *aham annadha*; ; *aham slokakrith*" – " 'I' alone appear as *annam*, *annaadha*: *slokakrith* etc.", in the lines of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* (*manthraa* 6 of *Bhrugu vall*). *Chaandoghya Upanishad* declares (VII.25.2): "*Aathmaa eva adhashtaath aathmaa uparishthaath aathmaa paschaath aathmaa purasthaath aathmaa dakshinatha: aathmaa uttharatha: athmaa eva idhagum sarvam*" – "The Self indeed is below , the Self is above, the Self is behind, the Self is in the front, the Self is in the South, the Self is in the North, the Self indeed is all this". In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, *Maithreyi Brahmanam* (II.iv.6), Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* declares to his wife and disciple *Maithreyi*: "*ime lokaa: ime vedhaa: imaani bhoothaani, idhagum sarvam yadayam aathmaa*" – "these worlds, these gods, these beings, all these are the Self"

Therefore, 'I' **alone** am; but appearing as plurality. This 'appearance' is the glory of 'my' *maayaa*; and, I should be grateful to *maayaa* for this possibility. That is why we are able to enjoy the Creation. If *maayaa* was not there, there will be no Creation and what will we enjoy? Therefore, let *maayaa* be there and let this drama go on.

In fact, if the question "what is the meaning and purpose of life?" is raised, the answer can very well be: "To understand 'my' glory". This is because, if *maayaa* is not there, life is not there. Without *maaya*, *Brahman* as *Brahman*, can never say "'I am *Brahman*". So, let us permit *maayaa* to continue as 'our' glory and let us enjoy the Creation. As an *Advaitic* axiom says "If you understand the true nature of your Self, life is entertainment provided by *maayaa*. If you miss the true nature of your

Self, life turns into a burden", showing how crucial *mithyaathva nischayaa* is. The *mithyaathva nischayaa* is the benefit of this *jnaanam*. Reverting to the text:

ॐ उच्यते - The question is being replied.

Chapter III: Verse 71

प्रत्यक्तास्य स्वतोरूपं निष्क्रियाकारकाफलम् ।

अद्वितीयं तदिद्वा धीः प्रत्यगात्मेव लक्ष्यते ॥ ७१ ॥

Immediate self-awareness is the intrinsic nature of the Self. It is without action, the factors of action and fruits of action. It is without a second. This intellect ignited by it, as it were, appears as the inner Self.

ॐ अस्य स्वतोरूपं - The real nature of the aspirant (is)

The aspirant who has come to *Vedhaanthaa* is only a 'seeming' *samsaari*, which fact the *guru* knows well. But, generally, the *sishyaa* does not and therefore, does not say that he is a 'seeming' *samsaari*, and, would even proudly claim to be a *mahaa samsaari*. 'Asya' means '*samsaari jeevasya*'. '*svathoroopam*' means 'real nature'.

ॐ प्रत्यक्ता - the inner self, the *chaithanyam*,

'My' real nature is not *chidhaabhaasa*, but only 'appears' as *chidhaabhaasaa*, with the transferred attributes of the mind. With these attributes, I appear to be *samsaari*. The attribute-less Consciousness of the Self is the real nature of the aspirant. What type of inner self?

ॐ निष्क्रिया कारक अपलम् - which is always free from action, accessories to action and fruits of action,

'*Kaarakam*' means 'accessory to action'. The subject, object, instrument, beneficiary, benefactor, location etc. of an action are all called *kaarakaas*. '*Kriyaa*' means 'action'. Action is always born from *kaarakam*. '*Kaaraka janyaa kriyaa*' is the definition of '*kriyaa*'. The moment the accessories come together,

activities will start. *Kaarakaa* leads to *kriyaa* and *kriyaa* will lead to *palam*, whose definition is '*kriyaa janyam palam*'. What is the *palam*? Ans: *Punarjanmam*. In the *puarjanmaa* also *karakaa*, *kriyaa* and *palan* are there. This cycle will go on and on and on, because the *jeevaa's sanchitha karmaa* is infinite.

But, what about the *aathmaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* says '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*' meaning 'free from all these three – action, accessories for action and results of action'. The term should be read as '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*', formed as '*Nishkriyaa kaarakam cha thath apalam cha*'. '*nishkriyaa kaarakam*' is *bahuvreehi samaasam* and '*apalam*' is another *bahuvreehi*. Two *bahuvreehi*-s together become *karmadhaarya samaasam*. In this context, the term '*nish kriyaa kaaraka apalam*' can be understood to mean the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* also. The term '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*' qualifies '*svathorooam*'. Thus, 'I' **am** always **advaitam Brahman**. This is being said:

ॐ अद्वितीयं - and which is of non-dual nature.

How do we know that? Ans: "The *Upanishad* itself describes *Brahman* as '*ekam eva adhvitheeyam*', that *Brahman* is second-less". If *Brahman* is second-less, you cannot accept a world separately, because if the world is accepted, there will be duality.

But then, this may be followed by the question: "Then, why can't you take the world as a part of *Brahman*? Then there will not be a second thing". **Ans:** "No, that is also not possible, because *Upanishad* also says *Brahman* is part-less".

Brahman is second-less; *Brahman* is part-less. Therefore, world cannot be separate from *Brahman* nor part of *Brahman*.

And, you cannot say the world is not there also, because we are experiencing it. Therefore, when *Advaitin*-s say that '*Brahman* is second-less', they mean '*Brahman* is without a **real** second one; a second **real** world is not there'. They do not say a second world is not there ; they only say, that, a second **real** world is not there, which means that the world is experientially available, but, cannot be counted, similar to our reflections in the mirror or similar to the dream world.

This is called *mithyaathva nischaya:* | And, according to the *advaithin*, without *mithyaathva nischaya:*, problems will never be solved, because the world and the events in the world will continue all the time. We have, in earlier contexts also, discussed an interesting thought: that, even *Bhagavaan* cannot be free, if the world is not *mithyaa*. If the world is *sathyam* / real, *Bhagavaan* will have to see the real sufferings of all His devotees. How can *Bhagavaan* comfortably relax on His *ananthasayanam*, when all His devotees are suffering? His job will be the most painful, because He has to regularly create the world, He has to regularly create the *jeevaa-s*, He has to regularly create sufferings, regularly distribute the sufferings and regularly watch the sufferings also. '*Sarva saakshithvaath*' (being a Witness of everything) He cannot even turn His head away. He will have to constantly watch the suffering. How can *Bhagavaan* ever have peace of mind?

Bhagavaan also gets *mukthi* only because of that knowledge, *mithyaathva nischaya jnaanam*. This is proved by (as earlier quoted) Lord Krishna's seemingly contradictory declarations in the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*mathsthaanai sarva bhoothani Arjuna – na cha mathsthaani bhoothaani*" implying "without really creating the world, I seem to create the world". These are all *Isvara's leelaa-s* / dramas.

There is a profound statement in the *Purusha sooktham* also: "*Ajaayamaana: bahudhaa vijaayathe*" meaning "(*Isvara*) though not subject to birth, *appears* as the many".

Bhagavaan is free because of *jagan mithyaathva nischaya:* | We can also be free by *jagan mithyaathva nischaya:* |

The first part of the verse can be taken as one complete sentence by providing the verb '*bhavathi*' and read as "*Asya svathorropaam nishkriyaa karaka apalam, adhvitheeyam prathyakthaa (bhavathi)*" - "The real nature of any individual is the *Chith* (Consciousness) which is free of all *thriputi-s* and non-dual" |

The rest of the verse can be treated as a separate sentence.

ॐ तद् इद्म धीः - The mind which has been made sentient by that chaithanyam,

The pronoun '*thadh*' refers to the '*thriputi-rahitha, advitheeya chaithanyam*' | '*Iddhaa*' means 'enlivened / made sentient', derived from the root '*indh*' meaning 'to kindle'. (The student may remember that word is used in verse 37, Chapter IV, of the *Bhagavadh Githaa* – the relevant portion being "*yathaa edhaamsi samiddogni: basmasaath kuruthe*" – "Just as a **well-kindled** fire reduces the fuel to ashes"). '*Thadh iddhaa*', therefore, means '*chaithanya iddhaa*' / 'enlivened by *chaithanyam*'. This is adjective to '*dhee*:', which word means 'mind'. What mind? Ans: The *mithyaa* and *jada roopa* mind. The *mithyaa* mind, which is intrinsically *jadam*, is made alive and sentient because of that *Brahma advitheeya chiathanyam* / because of the real non-dual Consciousness. But:

ॐ लक्ष्यते - is misunderstood (by the people),

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मा इव - as the inner Self.

The *mithyaa*, inert mind, enlivened by the real Consciousness is mistaken as the Self or 'I', by me. Instead of claiming I am the real Consciousness, I mistake the material mind, which is enlivened by the Consciousness as the 'I'. And, consequently 'mental' problems become 'my' problems. Therefore, whenever there is turbulence in the mind, I do not say I am the witness of the turbulent mind but say / am disturbed / / am depressed. (In a lighter vein: And subject myself to medical treatment. Of course the medicine is also *mithyaa*; and, therefore, I *can* use the *mithyaa* medicine to cure the *mithyaa* mind of the *mithyaa* sickness).

If only you can view all these as only a huge drama, you will never get depressed or disturbed.

178: Chapter III, Verse 71 (20-03-2010)

During the earlier session, it was seen that there are no two separate experiences in the forms of *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* and *chith anubhavaa*. There is only one *chaithanya anubhavaa*, which a discerning person understands as *chith anubhavaa* and other people misunderstand as *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*. Only one experience, if rightly understood is *chith anubhavaa*; and, if misunderstood, is *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*.

There is only one experience, because there is only one Consciousness. That Consciousness is never available for 'objectification'. But, that Consciousness, though not available for 'objectification', *is* available for all of us, in the form of 'I am' experience.

In this 'I am' experience, Consciousness *is* available as 'I am'. Therefore, the 'I am' experience is a 'self experience', which is without subject-object duality. Thus, Consciousness can be said to be available as 'I am' experience or 'self-experience' or 'subject-experience'. You may call it 'I am' experience; you may call it 'subject experience'; you may call it 'self experience';

And, contrary to popular belief, we need not work for this *chaithanya anubhavaa*; it is universally available, because is not the 'I am' realization / claim common to all the beings? Therefore, we need not do any separate exercise for this 'I am' *anubhavaa*.

But, this availability of Consciousness, as 'I am' experience, is possible only in the presence of the mind. In the absence of mind, Consciousness will be present, but, will not be available for 'I am' experience. This should be carefully understood and noted: Consciousness is available for 'I am' experience only in the proximity or presence of the mind. In the absence of the mind, Consciousness *is* very much present; but, is not available as 'I am' experience.

There is another problem also. When Consciousness is thus available in the presence of the mind as 'I am' experience, along with this 'I am' experience, a limitation also is experienced, because of the mind; which limitation is: A 'seeming' location.

Because of the presence of the mind, I do not experience / understand Consciousness as all-pervading, un-located Consciousness; but, I experience it with a 'seeming' location, namely, the mind. Unfortunately, this experience of 'seeming' location cannot be avoided, obviously because the mind *is* necessarily required for 'I am' experience. To consolidate: Only in the presence of the mind, Consciousness can be experienced as 'I am' and that experience of Consciousness includes the experience of a limitation also, viz., 'seeming' location, namely, the mind, and caused by the mind.

As long as the mind is there, the seeming location will result. If you, therefore, try to abolish the mind, what will happen? Ans: No doubt, the 'seeming location' will go away; but, the 'I am' experience also will go away. *Soonyam* alone will result.

To consolidate again: The mind *has* to be there to experience Consciousness. As a result of the presence of the mind, Consciousness can be experienced as 'I am', but that experience will include the seeming location caused by the mind.

If I mistake the seeming location, the mind, as the real location of Consciousness, then the experience is named *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*; but, if, with a discerning intellect, I exclude the seeming location, understanding that it is *only* seeming location, then that experience will be *chith anubhavaa*. In other words, one 'I am' *anubhavaa* itself, is called *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa*, when I include the location and the very same experience is called *chith anubhavaa*, when I exclude the location.

How do I exclude the location? Ans: 'Merely by intellectually understanding that the location is only seeming location'. Non-discerning people have got the 'I *anubhavaa*' in the form of *chidhaabhaasa anubhavaa* because they include the location; and, discerning people have the 'I *anubhavaa*' in the form of *chith anubhavaa*, because they exclude the seeming location, by merely understanding that the 'location' is only 'seeming'. But, whether I include the seeming location or exclude the seeming location, experience of the seeming location cannot be avoided.

This also is to be noted carefully: Whether I include the seeming location or exclude the seeming location, the experience of the seeming location can never be avoided, because, *chaithanya anubhavaa* will require the mind and the mind will necessarily

cause the seeming location. The only consolation is that the mind causes only a seeming location; the mind does not cause a real location.

In essence, a discerning person uses the mind for *chaithanya anubhavaa* and he experiences the *chaithanyam*, without 'objectifying' it, by claiming 'I am the Consciousness.' And, at the time of claiming 'I am the Consciousness', the 'seeming location' *will be* experienced by the discerning person also; but, even while experiencing the seeming location, he says 'I am un-located Consciousness'. This is similar to our seeing the 'blue' waters of the ocean, but understanding and maintaining that the oceanic water is colourless. As even as we say 'the water is colourless', what does the eye report? The eye continues to report the 'blue colour'; but, we say, the water is colourless.

Every discerning person experiences *chaithanyam* - not *chidhaabhaasaa* - all the time - '*jaagrath svapna sushupthishu sputatharaa*'. What type of *chaithanyam*? Ans: 'Seemingly located but really un-located Consciousness', as 'I am' ...'I am'....'I am'.

As already indicated, this experience is possible only in the proximity of the mind. When the mind is abolished 'I' will be there; but I will not say 'I am *chaithanyam*'. In the presence of mind, ***all the time***, *chithanya anubhavaa* is there.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "The 'discerning' student is the one, who has completed the *anvayavyathirekhaa vichaaraa* and therefore claims 'I am the un-located Consciousness, not *chidhaabhaasaa*, but *chith* itself'. When such a 'discerning' aspirant listens to the *mahaa vaakyam*, using the word '*aham*' to mean the *chith* and not the *chidhaabhaasaa*, '*aham Brahma asmi jnaanam* will be instantaneous to him". Such a student will not argue: "Swamiji! I am experiencing only *chidhaabhaasaa*. Should I not resort to *nirvikalpaka samaadhi* for *chith anubhavaa*?"

Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys all these points, which we discussed elaborately, in the entire last session and till now in the present session also, tersely, in one compound word "*samyag jnaatha thvam arthasya*" (in verse 70) - meaning 'the one who has rightly understood the meaning of the word '*thvam*' as 'I', the un-located Consciousness".

The compound word '*samyagjnaathathvamarthasya*' should be carefully split, as '*samyag + jnaatha + thvam + arthasya*' and not as '*samyag + jnaathathvam +*

arthasya. According to Sanskrit grammar, the term will be considered as *bahuvreehi samaasam*, derived as '*samyag jnaatha: thvam artha: yena sa: purusha:*'| It describes a particular type of student. What type of student? Ans: "The student, who says 'I am' and understands 'I' as *chaithanyam* and not *chidhaabhaasaa*". He has understood in this manner through *anvaya vyathirekhaa* exercise, has transferred all the attributes and locations to the body-mind complex and stands as un-located Consciousness principle, without any attribute'. For such a student, Sureswaraacharya says: '*dhrudaa pramaa jaayathe eva* – 'clear knowledge has to take place / will take place'.

It is very important also to understand and note (though Sureswaraacharya does not mention it here), that this knowledge will take place, at the very time of *sravanam* itself – not separately in *samaadhi* or later meditation. As even as such a student 'listens' to the *mahaa vaakyam*, he can / will gain the final, liberating knowledge.

With regard to what? Sureswaraacharya says: '*prathyag aathmani*' meaning 'with regard to the *prathyag aathmaa* / the real, inner self'. The term '*prathyag aathmani*' is *vishaya saphami*, connected to *pramaa*. The knowledge gained is, with regard to the real 'I', *prathyag aathmaa*.

And, what is the knowledge? **Ans:** 'That 'I' am the *jagadh adhishtaanam Brahman*, and not one who tries to escape in the name of *videha mukthi*'.

A diligent *Vedhaanthin* should get rid of the idea of 'escaping from this world'. He should not want to 'escape' in the name of *videha mukthi*. When, 'I' **am** the *jagadh adhishtaanam*, in which *adhishtaanam*, galaxies rise and fall, where is the question of 'escaping'? 'Escaping' is neither possible nor required. It is not possible, because 'I' am everywhere and, therefore, where can I escape to? 'Escaping' is not required, because nothing in the universe can touch / affect 'me'.

The next question: What is the means through which this knowledge takes place? Sureswaraacharya says: '*thathavamasi ithi asmaath (vaakyaath)*' meaning 'from this most profound *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*'.

All these portions of the verse were covered in an earlier session. But, there is a crucial word in the verse, which we missed to discuss earlier:

द्वैतनुत् - (which *vaakyam* is) the destroyer of all dualities.

This is a very important word, describing the *mahaa vaakyam*. '*Dvaitam*' means 'duality' and '*nuth*' means 'remover / eliminator / destroyer', derived from the root '*nudh*' meaning 'to push off'.

Knowledge of *Brahman* automatically negates the pluralities / '*thriputi*'-s in the forms of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*, *pramaathaa-pramaanam-prameyam* etc. All forms of dualities and pluralities are instantaneously falsified / negated, just as, at the very moment of one waking up from a dream, the *svapna* duality goes away.

The only difference is: When I wake up from dream, not only is the dream world falsified, the dream world will also 'go away' from my experience; whereas, in *advaita jnaanam*, the *jaagrath* world will be only falsified but will **not** 'go away' from experience. It is like continuing a dream, with the knowledge that I am awake, which, of course, does not happen. The 'analogy' is only hypothetical: 'keeping awake, with the understanding that I am awake, but, with the dream continuing'.

And, therefore, i.e., after *mahaa vaakyam* also, while 'I' am of a 'higher order' of reality, the world will continue as of a 'lower order' of reality; all things will continue as they are. As Lord Krishna says in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Chapter V – verses 8 & 9) "*naiva kinchith karomeethi yuktho manyetha thathvavith pasyan srunvan sprusan jighran asnan gacchan svapan svasan pralapan visrujan gruhnan unmishan nimishannapi indriyaani indriyartheshu varthanthe ithi dhaarayan*" – "Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening and closing the eyes, the disciplined knower of the Truth understands 'I do not do anything at all', bearing in mind that sense organs move among sense-objects'. Of Himself also (as *Isvara*), Lord Krishna says "*thasya karthaaram api maam viddhi akarthaaram avyayam*" - "I create also; but, really speaking, I do not create" (Chapter IV-Verse 13). And, again (Chapter IX – verses 4 & 5) "*Mathsthaani sarva bhoothaani; na cha mathsthaani bhoothaan*" – "All beings are in Me. In fact, beings are not in Me". The seeming world of duality will continue, but with the knowledge and conviction that it is seeming.

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 71:

प्रत्यगात्मनि प्रमोपजायत इत्युक्तं तत्र चोद्यते । किं यथा घटादि प्रमेयविषया प्रमा कर्त्रादिकारकभेदानपह्वेन जायते तथैवोक्त अशेषकारकग्रामोपमर्देन कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनीति । उच्यते ।

That ‘knowledge arises about the inmost Self’ has been said. Does this knowledge arise like the ‘knowledge about a jar’ etc., without cancelling the diversity of factors involved in action? Or does it arise by destroying all such plurality of causal factors, in the agent i.e. the Self? The question is answered in the following verse:

The word '*dvaithanuthi*' of the previous *slokaa* is explained in this *slokaa*, following a question from a student, who asks: "What is the difference between this knowledge and any other knowledge? I know that, when I use any other worldly *pramanaam*, like *prathyakshaa*, *anumaana* etc., I stand as a *pramaathaa*, I operate a *pramaanam* and I get the knowledge of the *prameyam*. And, even after that knowledge (for example, I look at a pot and get the knowledge 'this is a pot'; and, after that *ghata jnaanam* also) I continue to be a *pramaathaa*, the *pramaanam* continues to be there and there are other *prameyaa*-s which also I can get to know.

"Thus, in all other *pramaana vyaapaara*, knowledge keeps on coming; and, the *thriputi* is sustained and continued. Even if I go to *svarga lokaa*, I will continue to be a *pramaathaa*, operating a *pramaanam* and experiencing a *prameyam*. Therefore, in all other *jnaana vyavahaaraa*-s, *thriputi* is protected and maintained. Now, what I want to know is: is there any difference between *mahaa vaakya pramaana vyaapaara* and *anya pramaana vyapaaraa*?"

'*Vyaapaara*' means 'operation'. The student's question is: "Is there any difference between operation of *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and other *pramaanam*-s?" And, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to say "Yes. There **is** a very big difference".

To explain (in Swamiji's words): "In dreams, we see several objects. Imagine that, in a particular dream of yours, a tiger appears. It chases you, catches up with you and pouncing on you, pushes you down. And, at that moment, because of the shock, you wake up. This experience of the tiger attacking you is an unique experience. What is the uniqueness about it? It woke you up and removed the entire dream, *including* the tiger also. The tiger removed the dream world and the tiger removed the dreamer who was located in the dream world / the frightened individual in the

dream. Both of them were negated; but, not only that. The uniqueness of the tiger is, that it woke you up and in the process, the tiger also got falsified. Therefore, from one perspective, even though it is a false tiger, it is a 'sacred' tiger, because it is a tiger which 'woke' you up from your nightmare. It may have caused you the nightmare; but, it rid you also of the nightmare". So, if a *poorva pakshin* asks an *Advaitin* "how can *mithyaa* (guru and *saasthraa-s*) lead you to *sathyam* (*Brahman*)?", *Vedhaantha* gives the example of the dream tiger and responds "If the dream tiger can help me wake up from dream, in the same manner, in the waking state, *mahaa vaakyam*, like the dream tiger, 'awakens' me to the *thriputi rahitham Brahman*. And, as even as I wake up, *prameyam* (this *mithyaa jagath*) goes away and I also, as a *pramaatha*, a localized individual, get falsified. And, what about the *mahaa vaakyam*? *Mahaa vaakyam* also disappears as a *pramaanam*, again similar to the dream-tiger".

For a jnaani, *mahaa vaakyam* also is falsified. 'Athra vedaa: aavedaa:' declares *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iii.22). And, *Dhasaslokee* (verse 7) : "na saasthaa **na saasthram** na sishyo na sikshaa na cha thvam na chaaham na chaayam prapancha:| svaroopovabodho vikalpaasahishnu: thadekovasishta: siva:kevaloham"|

For this phenomenon, viz., 'the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* disappearing as *pramaanam* after *jnaanam*', *advaita aachaaryaa-s* usually give the example of a powder, known as 'kataka renu', which was widely used in ancient times, for the purpose of cleaning turbid water. The powder is added to the water, to remove all suspended dust particles. Obviously, if the dust particles are removed by the powder, and, instead, the powder itself remains suspended, the object of cleaning the water will not be not served. But, how does this particular powder 'kataka renu' act? Ans: It gathers all the dust particles and, along with them, settles down at the bottom of the container making it possible for the clean water layers at the top to be collected carefully, for use. In a similar manner, the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* removes duality and removes itself also. Thus, *mahaavaakya pramaana vyaapaara* is *thriputi nivarthakam*, while *anya pramaana vyaapaaraa-s* are *thriputi pravarthakaa-s*.

This is the difference between *mahaa vaakya pramaana vyaapaaraa* and *anya pramaana vyaapaaraa-s*. That is what is clarified here. First comes the question:

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मनि प्रमा - "This knowledge with regard to the real 'I' (that 'I' am Brahman')

ॐ उपजायते - is born instantaneously" -

The instantaneous 'birth' of this knowledge is similar to the '*dhasama jnaana*' born in the *dhasama dhrushtaantha*. Another common example given is '*Karna dhrushtaantha*', from the epic *Mahaabhaaratha*. As is popularly known, *Karna* was brought up from infancy by a charioteer, and was looking upon himself as the charioteer's son, as the others also did. But, from *Kunt's vaakyam* (akin to *mahaa vaakyam*), the realization that he was *Kunt's* son and not the charioteer's, dawned in him. Similarly, the knowledge "'I' am not *jeevaa*; but, *Brahman*" is born instantaneously, from *mahaa vaakya sravanam*.

ॐ इति उक्तं - Thus was mentioned (in the previous sloka).

ॐ तत्र - With regard to this knowledge / prama viashaye,

ॐ चोध्यते - the following question is asked (by someone).

And, what is that question? Ans: "Does this knowledge (*aathma jnaanam*) also retain duality, similar to other types of knowledge which do retain duality, or does this knowledge dismiss duality?"

In fact, the very word 'knowledge' brings into our minds, duality / plurality. This is because when the word 'knowledge' is mentioned, the ideas (i) 'there is a knower' (ii) 'there is something to be known' (iii) 'there is a 'revealing' instrument' and (iv) 'because of their coming together, knowledge is born', arise in the listener's mind. The very word 'knowledge' brings 'duality' to the mind. Hence the question, "Does this self-knowledge also retain duality?" Reverting to the text:

ॐ यथा - Just as

ॐ घटादि प्रमेयविषया प्रमा - the knowledge of any object like a pot

ॐ जायते - arises in our minds

ॐ कर्त्रादि कारक भेद अनपह्वेन - retaining the plurality, in the form of various accessories like the knower etc.,

'*Pramaa*' means knowledge. What knowledge is referred to here? Ans: '*ghataadhi prameya vishayaa*' meaning 'of any object like a pot'. How does that knowledge rise in our minds? Ans: '*karthraadhi kaaraka bedha anapahnavena*' meaning 'retaining the plurality, in the form of various accessories like the knower etc.' '*Kartha*', in this context, should be taken as '*pramaathaa*' or 'knower'. '*aadhi*' means 'etc.', which, in this context, indicates *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. '*Kaarakaa*' means 'accessory' and '*bedha:*' means 'plurality'. '*apahnava:*' means 'removal / elimination'; '*anapahnava:*' (used here), therefore, means, 'non-elimination' or 'retention'. So, what is the essence of this part of the sentence? Ans: "The knowledge of objects like a pot, arises, maintaining / retaining the *thriputi*." Any knowledge other than self-knowledge, is, therefore, not a threat to '*thriputi*'. What about self-knowledge?

- ॐ किं कर्तुः प्रत्यगात्मनि (प्रमा) - does the knowledge with regard to the inner self of the listener
- ॐ तथा एव (अनपह्वेन जायते) - arise in the same manner, without eliminating *thriputi*?
- ॐ उत - Or else,
- ॐ अशेष कारकग्राम उपमर्देन (जायते) - does the knowledge (Brahma jnaanam) rise, totally negating the *thriputi*?

For the sake of easier understanding, this involved sentence is split into two shorter sentences, also supplying the words within the brackets.

'*Karthru:*', in this context, should be understood as '*srothru:*' i.e., as 'of the listener'. The word '*Utha*' is indeclinable and (according to Sanskrit dictionary) is 'a particle expressing doubt / uncertainty / guess'. '*Graama*' means 'group' and '*kaaraka graama*' means 'group of accessories', viz., *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam* (in this context of *pramaa*). '*Asesha*' means 'totally'. '*Upamarda:*' means 'destruction / elimination', same as '*apahnava:*' The two words are synonyms.

The essence of this involved sentence, is the question: "Does *Brahma jnaanam* negate *thriputi* or does it not negate *thriputi*?" A diligent *Vedhaanthic* student will know the answer, viz., "It negates *thriputi*, not in terms of experience, but, in terms of 'reality'". Experiential plurality *will* continue. A diligent student of *Advaita* should carefully note this, because, many other systems of philosophy repeatedly criticize

advaitam, without understanding this basic view. They derisively say "the *Advaitic guru* talks of *advaitam*, but conducts classes. If he is really an *advaitin*, how can he do so? According to his philosophy, there can be no duality / plurality of *guru*, *sishyaa*, *saasthraa*, *sikshaa* etc." Unfortunately, they ask the question and go away without caring to listen to the answer. The answer, which should be carefully remembered by the student, is, that, the *advaitin* never negates 'experiential duality'. He negates only 'factual duality'. This is similar to (as quoted already) our experiencing 'blue' waters and 'blue' sky and still maintaining the facts, that water is colourless and sky is colourless. It is experiential 'blue' water; not real 'blue' water. It is experiential 'blue' sky; not real blue sky.

The *Advaitic guru* can, therefore, happily continue to teach, with not just one student but with several students and keep on asserting "I am *advaitam*; *aham annam*; *aham annadha*; *aham slokakrith*" – " 'I' alone appear as *annam*, *annaadha*; *slokakrith* etc.", in the lines of *Thaithreeya Upanishad* (*manthraa* 6 of *Bhrugu valli*). *Chaandoghya Upanishad* declares (VII.25.2) : "*Aathmaa eva adhashtaath aathmaa uparishtaath aathmaa paschaath aathmaa purasthaath aathmaa dakshinatha: aathmaa uttharatha: athmaa eva idhagum sarvam*" – "The Self indeed is below , the Self is above, the Self is behind, the Self is in the front, the Self is in the South, the Self is in the North, the Self indeed is all this". In the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*, *Maithreyi Brahmanam* (II.iv.6), Sage *Yaagnyavalkyaa* declares to his wife and disciple *Maithreyi*: "*ime lokaa: ime vedhaa: imaani bhoothaani, idhagum sarvam yadayam aathmaa*" – "these worlds, these gods, these beings, all these are the Self"

Therefore, 'I' **alone** am; but appearing as plurality. This 'appearance' is the glory of 'my' *maayaa*; and, I should be grateful to *maayaa* for this possibility. That is why we are able to enjoy the Creation. If *maayaa* was not there, there will be no Creation and what will we enjoy? Therefore, let *maayaa* be there and let this drama go on.

In fact, if the question "what is the meaning and purpose of life?" is raised, the answer can very well be: "To understand 'my' glory". This is because, if *maayaa* is not there, life is not there. Without *maaya*, *Brahman* as *Brahman*, can never say "'I' am *Brahman*". So, let us permit *maayaa* to continue as 'our' glory and let us enjoy the Creation. As an *Advaitic* axiom says "If you understand the true nature of your Self, life is entertainment provided by *maayaa*. If you miss the true nature of your Self, life turns into a burden", showing how crucial *mithyaathva nischayaa* is. The *mithyaathva nischayaa* is the benefit of this *jnaanam*. Reverting to the text:

ॐ उच्यते - The question is being replied.

Chapter III: Verse 71

प्रत्यक्तास्य स्वतोरूपं निष्क्रियाकारकाफलम् ।

अद्वितीयं तदिद्धा धीः प्रत्यगात्मैव लक्ष्यते ॥ ७१ ॥

Immediate self-awareness is the intrinsic nature of the Self. It is without action, the factors of action and fruits of action. It is without a second. This intellect ignited by it, as it were, appears as the inner Self.

ॐ अस्य स्वतोरूपं - The real nature of the aspirant (is)

The aspirant who has come to *Vedhaantha* is only a 'seeming' *samsaari*, which fact the *guru* knows well. But, generally, the *sishtyaa* does not and therefore, does not say that he is a 'seeming' *samsaari*, and, would even proudly claim to be a *mahaa samsaari*. '*Asya*' means '*samsaari jeevasya*'. '*svathorooam*' means 'real nature'.

ॐ प्रत्यक्ता - the inner self, the chaithanyam ,

'My' real nature is not *chidhaabhaasa*, but only 'appears' as *chidhaabhaasaa*, with the transferred attributes of the mind. With these attributes, I appear to be *samsaari*. The attribute-less Consciousness of the Self is the real nature of the aspirant. What type of inner self?

निष्क्रिया कारक अपलम् - which is always free from action, accessories to action and fruits of action,

'*Kaarakam*' means 'accessory to action'. The subject, object, instrument, beneficiary, benefactor, location etc. of an action are all called *kaaraka*-s. '*Kriyaa*' means 'action'. Action is always born from *kaarakam*. '*Kaaraka janyaa kriyaa*' is the definition of '*kriyaa*'. The moment the accessories come together, activities will start. *Kaaraka* leads to *kriyaa* and *kriyaa* will lead to *palam*, whose definition is '*kriyaa janyam palam*'. What is the *palam*? Ans: *Punarjanmam*. In the *puunarjanmaa* also *kaaraka*, *kriyaa* and *palam* are there. This cycle will go on and on and on, because the *jeeva's sanchitha karma* is infinite.

But, what about the *aathmaa*? The *Aachaaryaa* says '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*' meaning 'free from all these three – action, accessories for action and results of action'. The term should be read as '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*', formed as 'Nishkriyaa kaarakam cha thath apalam cha'. 'nishkriyaa kaarakam' is *bahuvreehi samaasam* and '*apalam*' is another *bahuvreehi*. Two *bahuvreehi*-s together become *karmadhaarya samaasam*. In this context, the term '*nish kriyaa kaaraka apalam*' can be understood to mean the *pramaathru-pramaana-prameya thriputi* also. The term '*nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*' qualifies '*svathoroopam*'. Thus, 'I' **am** always *advaitam Brahman*. This is being said:

ॐ अद्वितीयं - and which is of non-dual nature.

How do we know that? Ans: "The *Upanishad* itself describes *Brahman* as '*ekam eva adhvitheeyam*', that *Brahman* is second-less". If *Brahman* is second-less, you cannot accept a world separately, because if the world is accepted, there will be duality.

But then, this may be followed by the question: "Then, why can't you take the world as a part of *Brahman*? Then there will not be a second thing". Ans: "No, that is also not possible, because *Upanishad* also says *Brahman* is part-less".

Brahman is second-less; *Brahman* is part-less. Therefore, world cannot be separate from *Brahman* nor part of *Brahman*.

And, you cannot say the world is not there also, because we are experiencing it. Therefore, when *Advaitin*-s say that '*Brahman* is second-less', they mean '*Brahman* is without a *real* second one; a second *real* world is not there'. They do not say a second world is not there ; they only say, that, a second *real* world is not there, which means that the world is experientially available, but, cannot be counted, similar to our reflections in the mirror or similar to the dream world.

This is called *mithyaathva nischaya*: | And, according to the *advaitin*, without *mithyaathva nischaya*:, problems will never be solved, because the world and the events in the world will continue all the time. We have, in earlier contexts also, discussed an interesting thought: that, even *Bhagavaan* cannot be free, if the world is not *mithyaa*. If the world is *sathyam* / real, *Bhagavaan* will have to see the real sufferings of all His devotees. How can *Bhagavaan* comfortably relax on His

ananthasayanam, when all His devotees are suffering? His job will be the most painful, because He has to regularly create the world, He has to regularly create the *jeevaa-s*, He has to regularly create sufferings, regularly distribute the sufferings and regularly watch the sufferings also. '*Sarva saakshithvaath*' (being a Witness of everything) He cannot even turn His head away. He will have to constantly watch the suffering. How can *Bhagavaan* ever have peace of mind?

Bhagavaan also gets *mukthi* only because of that knowledge, *mithyaathva nischaya jnaanam*. This is proved by (as earlier quoted) Lord Krishna's seemingly contradictory declarations in the *Bhagavadh Githa*: "*mathsthaanai sarva bhoothani Arjuna – na cha mathsthaani bhoothaani*" implying "without really creating the world, I seem to create the world". These are all *Isvara's leelaa-s* / dramas.

There is a profound statement in the *Purusha sooktham* also: "*Ajaayamaana: bahudhaa vijaayathe*" meaning "(*Isvara*) though not subject to birth, *appears* as the many".

Bhagavaan is free because of *jagan mithyaathva nischaya*: We can also be free by *jagan mithyaathva nischaya*: |

The first part of the verse can be taken as one complete sentence by providing the verb '*bhavathi*' and read as "*Asya svathorropaam nishkriyaa karaka apalam, advitheeyam prathyakthaa (bhavathi)*" - "The real nature of any individual is the *Chith* (Consciousness) which is free of all *thriputi-s* and non-dual" |

The rest of the verse can be treated as a separate sentence.

ॐ तद् इद्वा धीः - The mind which has been made sentient by that *chaithanyam*,

The pronoun '*thadh*' refers to the '*thriputi-rahitha, advitheeya chaithanyam*' | '*Iddhaa*' means 'enlivened / made sentient', derived from the root '*indh*' meaning 'to kindle'. (The student may remember that word is used in verse 37, Chapter IV, of the *Bhagavadh Githaa* – the relevant portion being "*yathaa edhaamsi samiddogni: basmasaath kuruthe*" – "Just as a **well-kindled** fire reduces the fuel to ashes"). '*Thadh iddhaa*', therefore, means '*chaithanya iddhaa*' / 'enlivened by *chaithanyam*'. This is adjective to '*dhee*;', which word means 'mind'. What mind? Ans: The *mithyaa* and *jada roopa* mind. The *mithyaa* mind, which is intrinsically *jadam*, is made alive

and sentient because of that *Brahma advitheeya chiathanyam* / because of the real non-dual Consciousness. But:

ॐ लक्ष्यते - is misunderstood (by the people),

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मा इव - as the inner Self.

The *mithyaa*, inert mind, enlivened by the real Consciousness is mistaken as the Self or 'I', by me. Instead of claiming I am the real Consciousness, I mistake the material mind, which is enlivened by the Consciousness as the 'I'. And, consequently 'mental' problems become 'my' problems. Therefore, whenever there is turbulence in the mind, I do not say I am the witness of the turbulent mind but say / am disturbed / / am depressed. (In a lighter vein: And subject myself to medical treatment. Of course the medicine is also *mithyaa*; and, therefore, I *can* use the *mithyaa* medicine to cure the *mithyaa* mind of the *mithyaa* sickness).

If only you can view all these as only a huge drama, you will never get depressed or disturbed.

179: Chapter III, Verse 71 to 73 (27-03-2010)

In this verse (verse 71) Sureswaraachaaryaa talks about the difference between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and all the other *pramaanam*-s in the world.

All the other *pramaanam*-s also generate varieties of knowledge, regarding the *prameya vasthu*-s. But, while generating the knowledge, the *pramaanam*-s retain the *thriputi*, in the form of *pramaathaa*, *pramaanam* and *prameyam*. For example, when my eyes are revealing this hall, the eyes generate the knowledge of the hall ; hall is the *prameyam*; eyes are the *pramaanam* and I am the *pramaathaa*. And, while generating the knowledge of the hall, the eyes, as *pramaanam*, confine themselves only to the generation of knowledge, without causing any harm or damage to the *thriputi*. Even after the knowledge is generated, the *thriputi* will continue to exist. I continue to be the *pramaathaa*, the eyes continue to be the *pramaanam* and the hall will continue to be the *prameyam*. The additional knowledge generated by the *pramaanam*, viz., the eyes, does not do any harm to the *thriputi*. This is true with regard to all other *pramaanam*-s-, *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa*, *upamaanaa* etc. Even among the *saasthraa*-s, the *veda karma kaanda pramaanam* does not do any damage to *dvaitham* or *thriputi*.

But, *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* is different. How? Ans: By revealing the *jeevaathma-Parmaathma- eikyam*, it reveals *Brahman* as a fact, a *Brahman* which is **advitheeyam**. '*Brahma Advitheeyam*' means there is no second thing other than *Brahman* and there is no internal difference within *Brahman* also. *Sajaatheeya-vijaatheeya-svagatha bedha rahitham Brahma*. And, once that *Brahman* knowledge is generated and the student understands '*Brahman* is a fact' - here comes the difference - that knowledge cannot accommodate *thriputi*, because '*Brahman* as a fact' can never co-exist with '*thriputi* as a fact'. This, in turn, is because *thriputi* comes under *duality* / plurality and *Brahman* comes under non-duality / non-plurality. '*Advaitam Brahma*' and '*dvaita thriputi*' can never be **both** facts. If *Brahman* is a fact, *thriputi* cannot be a fact; if *thriputi* is a fact, *Brahman* cannot be a fact. Therefore, *Brahman* and *thriputi* will have a conflict, as it is said in Tamil. நீயா நானா ஒரு கை பாத்துடுவோம்'- 'let us see whether I survive or you survive'

Since *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* has revealed *Brahma advaitham* as a fact or truth, *thriputi* will not be able to survive as a truth. Of course, *thriputi* will continue to be experienced; but, *thriputi* would have lost its reality. This loss of reality of the *thriputi* is called '*upamardhanam*', a technical word, very often used by *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa*. What is the meaning of the word *upamardhanam*? Ans: "*Thriputi* losing the reality status, the moment *Brahman* is understood as a fact". Thus, *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* is *thriputi nivarthakam*, while other *pramaanaa-s* are *thriputi pravarthakaa-s*.

If *thriputi* continues to be a fact for an aspirant, even after *mahaa vaakyam*, it only shows that he / she has not understood '*Brahman as advaitham*'. '*Brahman* understanding' and '*thriputi* reality' cannot co-exist.

So, what is the proof to know whether *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* has generated '*Brahman* understanding or not' in the aspirant? Ans: "The moment the *pramaanam* has generated '*Brahman* understanding', the '*thriputi* reality' is knocked off".

Conversely, if '*thriputi* reality' continues, then '*Brahman* understanding' has not been generated. '*Brahman* understanding' and '*thriputi* reality' cannot co-exist.

This is similar to someone waking up from one's dreams. The moment one wakes up, one's dreams and the dream-reality go away. 'Waking up' and 'dream reality' cannot co-exist. If dream continues to be real, 'waking up' has not taken place. If 'waking up' has taken place, 'dream reality' does not continue. In the same manner, if *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* has successfully done the job that it has to do on an aspirant, 'world-reality' will cease for that aspirant

This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa says in verse 71 (which though already covered in the earlier session, is now repeated for continuity):

ॐ अस्य स्वतः रूपं - The real nature of the listening student

ॐ प्रत्यक्ता - which is the inner Self, the chith

ॐ अद्वितीयं - is the non-dual Brahman ,

ॐ निष्क्रिया कारक अपलम् - which cannot accommodate any form of duality or plurality.

'*Nishkriyaa kaaraka apalam*' is a crucial term in this verse. It means, that, the non-dual *Brahman* does not have any plurality. In what form? **Ans:** '*kriyaa-kaaraka-pala roopena*' / in the form of action, factors of action and results of action. This is one type of plurality, explicitly expressed in the verse. Another implied type of plurality is '*pramaathru-pramaana-prameya roopena*' / in the form of 'knower', 'knowing instrument' and 'known'. Therefore, the 'rise of knowledge' and 'falsification of duality / plurality' take place simultaneously. '*Brahmasathyathvam*' and '*jagan mithyaathvam*' are two sides of the same coin. Even though they are presented as two separate facts, in reality, they are not. In *Advaitaa* philosophy, '*Brahma sathyam*' means '*jagan mithyaa*' and '*Jagan mithyaa*' means '*Brahma sathyam*'.

The other systems of philosophy want to have both *Brahma sathyathvam* and *jagath sathyathvam* (as the Tamil proverb goes, both *koozhu* and *meesa*). They want a 'peaceful co-existence' (as it were) of a 'real' *Brahman*, a 'real' *jeevaa* and a 'real' world. These are the *thathva thrayaa* of *Visistaadhvaithaa*, which philosophy looks at the *thathvathrayaa*, as having the same order of reality. Sureswaraachaaryaa says "Unfortunately, it is not possible". Continuing the verse 71,

ॐ तद् इद्वा धीः - The mind activated by that non-dual *Brahman*

'*Thadh*', in this context, refers to the '*adhvitheeyam prathyakthaal*' '*sathyam Brahman*'. '*iddhaa*' means activated / blessed / graced. '*Thadh iddhaa*' means 'blessed by the *sathyam Brahman*'.

The entire world comes into existence, blessed by *sathyam Brahman*. What type of world? **Ans:** The *mithyaa* world.

How? **Ans:** The inert objects of the world borrow 'Existence' from *Brahman*. The sentient bodies in the world borrow two things from *Brahman* – 'Existence' and 'Consciousness'. *Aaanandha maya kosaa* borrows three things from *Brahman*, 'Existence', 'Consciousness' and '*aanandhaa*'.

External inert world borrows *sath* only; four *kosaa*-s borrow *sath* and *chith*; one *kosaa*, namely, *aanandha maya kosaa*, borrows three things *sath*, *chith* and *aanandhaa*. But, what is common to all? **Ans:** All of them are *mithyaa*. External world is *mithyaa*, borrowing one thing. Four *kosaa*-s are *mithyaa*, borrowing two things. The fifth *kosaa* is also *mithyaa*, borrowing three things.

Asthi bhaathi priyam roopam naama cheth amsa panchakam aajya thrayam Brahma roopam jagath roopam thado dvayam. The entire world is *mithyaa*, borrowing either *sath* only or *sath* and *chith* only or *sath-chith-aanandhaa*. And, in this borrowing spree, who is the 'lender'? Ans: "*Brahman* is the 'lender' ". *Brahman* lends to objects and beings, either *sath* or *sath* and *chith* or *sath*, *chith* and *aanandhaa*. The 'borrowers' include our minds also. The mind also is *mithyaa*, borrowing *sath* and *chith* from *Brahman*. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, that mind with the borrowed *sath* and *chith*,

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मा इव लक्ष्यते - appears as the real Self.

Because of the presence of the borrowed *sath* and *chith* in the mind, the mind imitates the *aathmaa*. The mind resembles the *aathmaa* because of the presence of *sath* and *chith*. But, the mind has got only borrowed *sath* - *chith* and therefore, it becomes a fake *aathmaa*. *Aathmaa* / *Brahman* has got original *sath-chith*.

Thus, every individual has got a real *aathmaa* and a fake *aathma*. And, people are not able to differentiate between the fake *aathmaa* (the mind) and the original *aathmaa* (the Consciousness). We have got *ahamkaaraa*, the false self, and *aathmaa*, the real Self, which we are not able to differentiate. All other confusions follow only from this basic confusion.

Chapter III: Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 72 & Verse 72 –

यस्मादेवम् ।

विपश्चितोऽप्यतस्तस्यामात्मभावं वितन्वते ।

दवीयस्सु इन्द्रियार्थेषु क्षीयते ह्युत्तरोत्तरम् ॥ ७२ ॥

Hence: Even the wise man sometimes sees the Self in the intellect. For him, phenomena like the senses and their objects, remote in varying degrees from this inner sense, lose their claim to be the Self, in accordance with their distance from it.

ॐ यस्मात् एवम् - Because of this reason:

What reason? Ans: "The co-existence of one real Self and one fake self, in one and the same body, the real Self being the Consciousness, the fake self being the mind, with borrowed Consciousness".

- ॐ अतः - Therefore (because of the 'resemblance' between aathmaa and ahamkaaraa) विपश्चितः अपि - even learned people / scholars,
- ॐ वितन्वते - entertain
- ॐ आत्मभावं - 'I' notion
- ॐ तस्यां - upon the fake self called ahamkaaraa.

Even people who are learned in *aparaa vidhyaa*, i.e. *karma kaandaa* and *upaasanaa kaandaa*, and even many people who come to *Upanishad*-s, are not able to differentiate between *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa*.

This lack of capacity for discrimination between the real Self and fake self, may be likened to the incapacity of most people to differentiate between a real diamond and a fake diamond. That is why, as is commonly known, when any gem is to be valued, it is taken to a jeweler, who is well trained on gems, has developed an 'eye' for making the 'distinction' between the 'real' and the 'fake' and is also equipped to do some special tests . This expert opinion is necessitated when the 'original' and 'fake' are identical.

The mind with borrowed Consciousness is called *ahamkaara* / the ego / the fake self. Even well-read / well informed scholars entertain 'I' identification upon the *ahamkaaraa*. That is why they continue to say "I am a *saadhakaa*". The idea that "I am a *saadhakaa*" is also an obstacle (in the path to *jnaanaa*), because as long as I am a *saadhakaa*, I look upon myself as *ahamkaara*.

(At this point, Swamiji says: "*Mahaa vaakyam*'s aim is to knock off the notion 'I am a *saadhakaa*'. The message of the *Upanishad* is 'I am the *aathmaa*, which is eternally *siddhaa*'. But, very often, a student comes to me and says 'Swamiji! Your teaching is wonderful. There is no teacher like you. Thanks to you, my *saadhanaa* is going well. You can be proud of me, because I am a good *saadhakaa*. Previously, I was doing meditation for half an hour; now, I have increased it to one hour'. In saying this, the student uses the word 'I', to mean *ahamkaaraa*. You *can* use the word 'I' to mean *ahamkaaraa*; but never *claim* 'I am the *ahamkaaraa*'. Remember, that, the essence

of the *Vedhaanthic* teaching is: 'how can you be *saadhakaa*, when you are *Brahman* all the time?' *Saadhakathva bhaava branthi nivritthi: is mokshaa*. The definition of *mokshaa* is 'dropping the idea 'I am a *saadhakaa*. But, even educated *Upanidhadic* students miss this important message and continue to entertain 'I' notion in the *ahamkaaraa*.)

'*Thasyaam*' (in the verse) means '*ahamkaare / ahamkaara roopa buddhau*. And, this identification in *vijnaana maya kosaa buddhi*, later, gets transferred to *mano maya kosaa*, which is slightly farther, then *praana maya kosaa* and then to *anna maya kosaa*, resulting in *abhimaanam* in oneself, then in one's family, community, country and so on. Interestingly, the *abhimaanam* extends even to an alien country and culture, if there is association with that country in some form or other, say, like a son or daughter living in that country. *Abhimaan aathma bhaavaa* extends to all the *anaathmaa*-s. Of course, it is also true, that, the farther the *anaathmaa*, lesser the *abhimaanam* and the closer the *anaathmaa*, greater the *abhimaanam*.

Sureswaraacharya, here, refers to this fact, viz., that *aathma bhaavam* and *abhimaanaa* weaken as *anaathmaa* gets farther and farther away:

ॐ (आत्मभावं) - (*Aham abhimaanaa*)

ॐ क्षीयते - becomes weaker and weaker

ॐ दवीयस्सु इन्द्रियार्थेषु - towards sense objects which are remote / farther away

ॐ उत्तरोत्तरम् - in proportion to their remoteness (from *ahamkaaraa*).

The verse has been divided by us, into two sentences, for easier understanding; the term '*aathma bhaavam*' is re-used as 'subject' of the second sentence.

The reference, here, is to the *baahya anaathmaa* / the external *anaathmaa*, which are farther away from the individual, compared to *buddhi* and other *kosaa*-s. '*Dhaveeyassu*' is adjective to '*indriyaartheshu*', meaning 'remote', derived from '*dhooram*'.

'*Uththarottharam*' is an indeclinable word and is, here, adverbial to the verb '*ksheeyathe*'.

That means that I am ready to renounce the farther *anaathmaa*, in favour of closer *anaathmaa*. For the sake of family members, I will renounce other people. For my

own sake , I will be ready to renounce everything else. Sage *Yaagnyavalkya*'s declaration to his wife and disciple *Maithreyi* (*Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* – II.iv.5 and IV.v.6) "*Na vaa arey boothaanaam kaamaaya boothaani priyaani bhavanthi; aathmanasthu kaamaaya boothaani priyaani bhavanthi*" – "It is not for the sake of beings, my dear, that they are loved, but, for one's own sake, that they are loved" may be recollected here.

Thus, all the people have identification with *anaathmaa*, which identification is called *jeeva bhaava*: | And, what is the aim of *mahaa vaakyam*? Ans: "*Jeeva bhaava thyaagha*: and *Brahma Bhaava sveekaara*: are the aims of *mahaa vaakyam*".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 73:

आह । यदि वाक्यमेव यथाभूतार्थावबोधकमथ कस्य हेतोरविध्योत्थापितस्य कर्तृत्वादेरुपदेशः इत्युक्ते प्रतिविधीयते ।

An objection is raised here: 'If the proposition itself teaches the truth, why, then, is the Self taught as having agency etc., which are all attributes brought about by nescience?' This is answered now.

Here, a *poorva pakshin* comes and raises a question. What is that question? He says: "Hey! Sureswaraa! From the *Vedaa*-s, you are taking only the *mahaa vaakyam*-s, also called *abedha vaakyam*-s, which talk about *jeeva Brahma aikyam*, and which mention that *jeevaa* is *asamsaari* / *akartha* and also *jeevaa* is *Brahma abhinna*m. But, the very same *Vedaa*-s are talking about *bedha* also. There are numerous sentences , in fact, much more numerous than the *mahaa vaakyam*-s, in the *Vedaa*-s, which very clearly say that *jeevaa* is different from *Brahman*, that *Jeevaa* is *samsaari* and *jeevaa* is a *kartha*-*boktha*. According to the *Veda poorvaa*, a *Jeevaa* has to do regular *poojaa*-s. The entire *karma kaandaa* is proposing various types of *Pujaa*-s. That means *Jeevaa* has to be a *kartha*. The entire *upasanaa kaandaa* of the *Vedaa*-s is proposing several *upaasanaa*-s to be followed. This also proves that *jeevaa* is a *kartha*. In fact, I can quote very many portions from the *Vedaa*-s, bulkier than the *mahaa vaakyaa* portions, which clearly say that *jeevaa* is *kartha*, *jeevaa* has to do *karma*, *jeevaa* is different from *Isvara*, *jeevaa* is different form *Brahman*, *jeevaa* should worship *Brahman* etc. When, thus, *Jeeva-Brahma bedha* and *jeeva samsaaraa* are also talked about in the *Vedaa*-s, why you are you selectively repeating the *mahaa vaakyam*-s alone, editing the rest of the *Vedaa*-s?"

The *poorva pakshir's* argument continues. He asks Sureswaraacharya "Why are you forgetting *veda vaakyam-s* other than *mahaa vaakyaa-s*? You cannot say that these *Vedic* sentences are results of *bhraanthi* or delusion. Delusion can be there for *jeevaa*, but, *Vedaa-s* can never be accused of any delusion. If *jeevaa* alone talks about *bedhaa*, you may say attribute it to 'delusion'; but, when *Vedaa* itself talks about *bedhaa*, you cannot do so. Whatever *Veda* says / declares has to be a fact and not a result of 'delusion'. Therefore, *jeevaa* is different from *Brahman*, *jeevaa* is a *samsaari* and *jeevaa* is a *karthaa-bokthaa*. Your wanton ignoring of many *veda-vakkyam-s*, explicitly and implicitly talking about *jeeva-Brahma-bedhaa*, amounts to partial rejection of the *Vedaa-s*, which is not acceptable to me".

Naturally a controversy arises. A third person may come and ask: "If *Vedaa* talks about *bedhaa* also in certain places and *Vedaa* talks about *abedhaa* also in certain other places, then the question will be, 'which is the truth?' You cannot say that both are true, since they are mutually exclusive. If *bedhaa* is a fact and I am a *dhaasaa* of *Isvaraa*, then I cannot be *Isvaraa*. And, if I am *Isvaraa*, I cannot be a *dhaasaa* of *Isvaraa*. *Dhaasathvam* and *Isvarathvam* cannot co-exist. Therefore, is *Vedaa* a dependable *pramaanam* at all?".

We, as *Vaidhikaa-s*, will have to analyze and see which one is the intention / verdict of the *Vedaa*? Am I *Isvaraa* or *Isvara dhasaa*? Am I *Brahma bhinna:* or *Brahma abhinna:?*

What are the *bedha vaakyam-s* in the *Vedaa-s*? **Ans:** "They are innumerable"

The most famous one is the *Mundakopanishad* "*Dvaa suparnaa sayujaa sakhaayaa samaanam vruksham parishasvajaathe thayo: anya: pippalam svaad atthi anasnan anya: abhichaakaseethi*" (III. i. 1) – "Two birds with beautiful wings, which are close friends, are perched on the same tree. Among them, one eats the fruits with relish. The other looks on without eating".

In this *Mundakopanishad manthraa*, it is very clearly said, that, upon the body-tree, *jeevaathmaa* -bird is seated and *Paramaathmaa*-bird is also seated. *Jeevaathmaa* is *karthaa-bokthaa*, experiencing the *karmapalan* (*thayo: anya: pippalam atthi*); whereas, *Paramaathmaa* does not have *samsaaraa* (*anya: anasnan abhichaakaseethi*).

The *poorva pakshin* says: "When *Mundakopanishad* is so explicitly talking about two distinct *aathmaa*-s, how can you ignore that? If you quote *mahaa vaakyam*, I will quote this *vaakyam*".

The *bedha vaadhi / dhaasa vaadhi* further tells the *Advaithin*: "In fact, my views have better support. Not only does the *Vedaa* say that I am different from *Brahman* and that I am *samsaari*, it is my own experience also that I am 'miserable'. Thus, *bhedhaa* has two *pramaanam*-s, viz., *saasthra pramaanam* and *prathyaksha anubhava pramaanam*. Whereas, for *eiyyam*, you do not have two *pramaanam*-s. You have only the *mahaa vaakyam* and that too in an insignificant corner of the *Vedaa*-s. Unfortunately, you are holding on to that". This is the *poorva-pakshin's* view.

Even a *samsaari-advaitic* student may tell his teacher: "Only you are saying that we are 'wonderful'. Of course, when we listen to your soothing words that we are wonderful, we forget our problems for a short while; but, at all other times, our feeling is that we *are* miserable. In fact, we are coming here to hear your nice words that we are wonderful, while we know that we are really miserable".

How are we going to answer the *poorva pakshin*? The *Advaithin's* responses are very interesting. He tells the *poorva pakshin*: You say "*Bedhaa* (*jeevaa's* difference from *Brahman*) and the *samsaara* of the *jeevaa* are revealed by *prathyaksham* and are also revealed by *saasthraa*. And, therefore, *bedhaa* and *samsaraa* must be facts. The *abedhaa vaakyaani* must be only some consoling words. You have to interpret the *abedha vaakyam*, 'you are *Brahman*' as 'you belong to *Brahman*'. *Bedhaa* is revealed by *prathyaksha*. So, *saasthraa* also must be revealing only *bedhaa*' etc. But, let me tell you, that this argument which you are quoting in your favour, really speaking, is the argument which is going to be in my favour.

Sureswaraacharya, here, does not explicitly say "The argument which you claim to be in your favour is actually in my favour"; but, that is implicit in his reply. What is that reply? Three arguments are presented.

The first argument: "If *bedhaa* and *samsaara* are already revealed by *prathyaksha pramaanam*, then *saasthraa* need not reveal them. If it does, *saasthraa* will become redundant. A *pramaanam* is not a *pramaanam*, if it cannot give a new piece of knowledge, which cannot be gained by other *pramaanam*-s. If *Vedaa* is also going

to say, that I am different from *Brahman* and that I am a *samsaari*, which I already know, how can *Vedaa* be considered as *pramaanam*? For instance, when a student is attending a *Vedhaanthic* class and the teacher tells him 'We are all human beings. We are all Indians. India is a poor country. So, we are all in a poor country' and such ideas which the student already knows, then the class cannot be a *pramaanam*. One of the four conditions to be a *pramaanam* (as already discussed a few sessions back) is '*anadhigathathvam*' – 'status of being the only / first source of a given knowledge', a very important criterion to be declared as a *pramaanam*. So, if *prathyaksha pramaanam* has already revealed *bedhaa*, then, since *Vedaa* is considered a *pramaanam*, it cannot also talk about *bedhaa*. The *poorva pakshin* himself says that *prathyaksha pramaanam* reveals *bedhaa* and therefore, *Vedaa* will be *apramaanam* if its message also is considered to be *bedhaa*. Whereas, *jeeva-Brahma- eiykyam can* be a teaching of *Vedaa*, since it is not known through any other *pramaanam*". This is argument no. 1.

The second argument is: "Suppose *bedhaa* and *samsaaraa* (that I am different from *Brahman* and that I am a *samsaari*) are proved by both *prathyaksha pramaanam* and *saasthraa* and, therefore, they become 'facts', in that case, *samsaaraa* can never be eliminated, since what is 'fact' or 'truth', cannot be changed by any amount of *saadhanaa*. A truth / fact cannot be eliminated / changed, because, the very definition of 'fact' is 'that which cannot be changed'. And, therefore, if *samsaaraa* is a fact, then study of *saasthraa* is not going to be of any use. Even *saasthram* cannot give *mokshaa*. *Anirmoksha prasangha dhoshaa* will result". This is the second problem, if *bedhaa* is the truth and if 'I am a *dhaasaa* of *Brahman*' is the fact.

Then, the third argument: "Suppose that *samsaaraa* is a fact, and I am a *samsaari* now, different from *Brahman*, and by some *karma saadhanaa* or *upaasanaa saadhanaa*, I am going to attain *mokshaa* later, at a particular time and in a particular place. In such a case, that *mokshaa* which is attained by *saadhanaa*, will be limited only; it will not be very different from *svarghaa*, in the sense, that, just as *svargaa* is a reversible result, *mokshaa* will also be 'reversible'. *Bhagavadh Githaa* (Verses 20 & 21 – Chapter IX) talks of the attainment of *svargalokam* as being finite: "*thraividhya: maam somapaa: poothapaapaa: yagnyai: ishtvaa svargathim praarthayanthe ; they punyam aasaadhya surendralokam asnanthi ; divyaan divi devaboghaan they tham bukthvaa svargalokam visaalam ksheene punye marthyalokam visanthi*" – "Some people who know the three *Vedaa*-s, who drink the *somaa* juice in *somaa* sacrifices and who are thus purified of sins, having worshipped

Me through rituals, pray for access to the heavens. Having reached the sacred world of *Indra*, they enjoy the celestial pleasures of gods in the heavens. Having enjoyed that vast heavenly world, they come back to the world of mortals, when their *punyaa* is exhausted". A *mokshaa* attained by *saadhanaa*-s will also be a temporary *palam* achieved in time and place, similar to the '*surendralokam*' mentioned in these *Githa* verses. As is well known, whichever has got a 'manufacturing date' will have a 'date of expiry' also. But, *mokshaa*, by definition, is *nithyam*.

"And, therefore, our conclusion is as follows: '*Bedhaa* and *samsaaraa* are **not** *prathyaksha siddham*. They are not '**proved**' / '**established**' by *prathyaksha pramaanaa*, but are only '**appearing**' due to *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*, which term means '**defective prathyaksham**'. *Bedhaa* and *samsaaraa* are only *prathyaksha aabhaasa siddham*. And, therefore, *bedhaa* is a *braanthi* / 'delusion'. *Vedaa* wants to first talk about this 'delusion', first emphasizing 'you **think** you are different from Brahman and you **think** that you are a *samsaari*', but, later stressing 'you are **not** different from *Brahman*, nor are you a *samsaari*. *Bedhaa* and *samsaaraa* are **not revealed** by *Vedaa*; but, they are **only quoted** by *Vedaa* as 'delusions' resulting from *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*.

"In short, the development of the argument is: Through *prathyaksha aabhaasaa* / defective *prathyaksham*, we have 'delusions' of *bedhaa* and *samsaaraa*. *Vedaa*, through the *Mundakopanishad manthraa* - III.i.1, is only quoting this 'delusion' of *bedhaa*. This *Mundakopanishad manthraa* is **not** to teach '*jeeva Isvara bedhaa*'; it only quotes our delusion. Having quoted the delusion, the *Upanishad* exhorts 'you have to negate that delusion', through the very next *manthraa* (*Mundakopanishad* - III.i.2) "*samaane vruksho purusho nimagna: aneesayaa sochathi muhyamaana: jushtam yadhaa pasyati anyam eesaamasya mahimaanam ithi veethasoka*:"- "Being deluded and lost in the tree and its fruits, the first bird helplessly suffers. **But, when it recognizes the other free bird and joins it, the former one also becomes free and free from grief also**". The delusions of *bedhaa* and *samsaaraa* are to be eliminated. How? Again, *Mundakopanishad* gives the answer (III.ii.9): "*sa yo ha vai paramam brahma veda brahmaiva bhavathi*" – "Indeed, he, who knows that supreme *Brahman*, becomes *Brahman* itself". One has to know "'I' am *Brahman*, by 'knowledge'".

"Therefore, all the *bedha vaakyam*-s amount to *sruthi* only **quoting** our delusion and all *abedhaa vaakyam*-s are *sruthi teaching* the *eikyam*. In other words: All the

bedha vaakyaani are *braanthi anuvaadhaka vaakyaani* and all *abedha vaakyaani* are *pramaana vaakyaani*.

"An analogy will make this clear. *Sruthi's* reference to the delusion of *jeevathma-Praramaathma-bedhaa* and its final declaration or teaching of *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiykyam jeeva-Brahma-eiykyam* may be likened to the statement "that *small* star in the sky is very, very big". What does this statement mean? When I say 'the small star in the sky', the word 'small' is quoting only our delusion, caused by our *prathyaksha aabhaasa pramaanam*. The 'smallness' of the star is not a fact *revealed* by *prathyaksha pramaanam*. It is defective *prathyaksham* or *prathyaksha aabhaasaa* which makes the stars 'appear' small, when, in reality, the stars are huge. But, still, the *prathyakshaa* shows 'little' stars and I also use the word 'little' star; but, when I use the adjective 'little' or 'small', that adjective must be within 'quotes'. It is not revelation of the fact. It is a quotation of the delusion. Having quoted the delusion, what do I want to teach? I want to teach that the 'small' star is 'big' or 'huge'. Similarly, you, the '*samsaari jeevaa* - the so-called '*samsaari jeevaa*, where '*samsaari*' is within 'quotes'- who was considered a *dhaasaa*, *kartha* and *bokthaa* in the '*dva suparnaa*' *slokaa*, seemingly *samsaari*, because of *prathyaksha aabhaasaa*, is, in reality, *Brahman*. That is the teaching.

"Similarly, when I say *thvam*, the word, by itself, reveals limitation only, since the word '*thvam*' literally means 'you', and excludes 'I', 'he', 'she', 'it' etc. That seemingly limited 'you', the seemingly limited *samsaari jeevaa* is *Brahman*, in which the differences 'you', 'he', 'she', 'it', 'I' are all absent".

That '*bedha vaakyaani* are *bhraanthi anuvaadhaka vaakyaani*' is the topic of the following *slokaa*-s.

180: Chapter III, Verses 73 to 75 (03-04-2010)

In the *Vedhaanthic* scriptures, there are many statements which indicate 'difference' between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*. All those *Vedhaanthic* statements, which indicate *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa* are called *bedha vaakyaani*. We also find several *Vedhaanthic* statements, which talk about the non-difference or oneness between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*. All such *Vedhaanthic* statements which talk about *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-abadhaa* are called *abadha vaakyaani*.

Thus, we find both *bedha vaakyaani* and *abadha vaakyaani* in the *Vedic* scriptures. Naturally, a student / seeker will be confused as to which one should be taken as the primary teaching of the *Vedaa-s*, whether *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-bedhaa* or *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-abadhaa*. The student, naturally, cannot accept both types of statements together, because they are mutually contradictory or exclusive. Acceptance of *bedha vaakyaani* will force him to reject *abadha vaakyaani* and, similarly, acceptance of *abadha vaakyaani* will mean rejection of *bedha vaakyaani*. At the same time, since a *Vaidhikaa* is to accept the whole *Vedaa* as *pramaanam*, he has no right to accept one portion of the *Vedaa* and reject another portion. Partial validity of the *Vedaa* is not proper for a *Vaidhikaa*. Such partial validity amounts to *ardha jaratheeya nyaayaa*, i.e., similar to saying one part of a person is seventy years old and another part of the same person is forty years old. *Ardha jaratheeya nyaayaa*, obviously, is not logical. It is not possible.

Therefore, all the *aachaaryaa-s* have grappled with the problem and have struggled to reconcile the *bedha* and *abadha vaakyaani* in such a manner, that while the central *Vedic* teaching is properly interpreted, the whole of *Vedaa* is also validated. Non-*Advaithic aachaaryaa-s* give more validity to *bedha vaakyaani* and without rejecting *abadha vaakyaani*, look at them as '*artha vaadam*' or glorifying exaggerations/ exaggerated glorifications. Whereas, we, in *Advaithaa*, talk about *abadha vaakyaani* as *the thaathparya vaakyaani*; and, hold, that though there are *bedhaa vaakyaani* in the *Vedaa-s*, there is no *thaathparyam* in them.

Naturally, we will be expected to justify why we say there is *thaathparyam* only in *abadha vaakyaani* and no *thaathparyam* in *bedha vaakyaani*. In this context alone, we have to use the *shadlinghaani*, in line with the axiom, '*upakramo-upasamhaarau*

abhyaaso poorvathaa palam arthavaado upapaathi cha lingam thaathparya nirnaye. We heavily use many *meemaamsaa* arguments, to establish our contentions, '*abedha vaakye eva thaathparyam asthi; bedha vaakye thaathparyam naasthi*'. Among many such arguments used, one important argument is discussed in the context of the *samanvaya adhikaranam* ('*thaththu samanvayaath soothram*) of *Brahmasoothraa*-s. (B.S.1.1.4). *Goudapaadhaachaaryaa* also expounds on this argument, in the third chapter of his *Maandookya Kaarilaa*.

The essence of this argument is: "*Sruthi* itself, in several places, condemns *bedha dharsanam*. In such places, *bedha dharsanam* is very strongly criticized by *sruthi*, pointing out that *bedha dharsanam* only reinforces *samsaaraa*. One example is *Katopanishad manthraa* II.i.10, which declares "*Mruthyo: sa mruthyum aapnothi ya: iha naaneva pasyathi*" – "One who sees here plurality, as it were, goes from death to death". There are hundreds of similar statements in the *Vedaa*, through which *Vedaa* itself criticizes *bedha dharsanam* / 'perception of difference'.

"If, thus, *Vedaa* itself criticizes *bedha dharsanam*, obviously, *Veda* cannot **teach** *bedhaa*. Simultaneously criticizing *bedhaa* and teaching *bedhaa* will only make *Vedaa* lose its credibility. Since, thus, *Vedaa* cannot afford to criticize *bedhaa* in one place and teach *bedhaa* in another place, we have to conclude, that *bedhaa*, though mentioned by *Vedaa*, is **not** the teaching of *Vedaa*. Therefore, wherever *bedha vaakyaani* are there, they should be understood as only making a reference to the *prathyaksha siddha bedhaa* (perceived differences) and not 'teaching' *bedhaa*. Statements expressing what are already known, are called '*anuvadhaka vaakyaani*'.

"*Advaitins*' contention is that, all *bedhaa vaakyam*-s are *anuvadhaka vaakyam*-s, (meaning, that there is no *thaathparyam* / teaching in them) and that, only *abedha vaakyam*-s are **the** *thaathparya vaakyam*-s, which are meant for teaching".

Naturally the following questions arise: "Why should *Vedaa* do the *anuvadaa* of *bedhaa*? If it does not want to teach *bedhaa*, why should it talk of *bedhaa* at all?" In reply, several reasons are given. Out of them, two are given below:

The first reason is, that, *Vedaa* is fully aware that not all students / aspirants are ready to receive the teaching of *abedhaa*, in the initial stages of their *Vedaanthic* study; in fact, even after study of *Vedhaanthaa* for a long time, most students find it difficult to claim "I and God are one". They are more comfortable with

dhaasabhaavaa than *Swamibhaavaa*. There are many such students / aspirants, who are not mentally prepared to accept *abedhaa*.

Further, *Vedaa* also recognizes, that, *Bedha dharsanam* has the utility of preparing the mind, through *karma anushtaanam* and *upaasanaa-s*; based on these two facts, with an intention to prepare the students, *Vedaa* allows *bedhaa* to continue for some time, in the initial stages of an aspirant's spiritual journey. Even though *bedhaa* is not the message of the *Vedaa*, *Vedaa* has to accept *bedhaa* initially for some time, because *bedhaa* is useful for making the necessary 'preparation' and acquiring the necessary qualification for *abedha jnaanam*. Until the students are ready, *vedaa* 'accepts' *bedhaa*, but not with an intention to 'teach' *bedhaa*.

The second reason is, that, *Vedaa* will have to talk about *bedhaa*, for negating the *bedhaa*. Naturally, A wrong notion will have to be cited / quoted, for pointing out that it is a wrong notion.

An analogy was given earlier. Any child has got the notion that stars are small. This is because that is how the child 'experiences' the stars. That 'stars are small' is *prathyaksha anubhava siddhaa*. Therefore, the child gets the thought / notion that the stars are small. Added to this, in the school also, the child is taught the popular English rhyme 'Twinkle, twinkle **little** star', by none other than the child's educated teacher, whom the child is expected to respect. Thus, for the child, the *prathyaksha pramaanam* is supported by *sabdha* or *vaakya pramaanam* also.

Therefore, with both *sabda pramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam*, the child gets the wrong notion that the stars are small. How can this wrong notion be corrected? Obviously, there is only one way. The child has to be told: 'That small star you are talking about, is really a big star'. In this sentence, 'the small star is a big star', 'small star' is also mentioned and 'big star' is also mentioned; and, the two adjectives 'small' and 'big', are contradictory. Obviously, a 'small' star cannot be 'big' star and a 'big' star cannot be 'small' star. Because of this contradiction, it must be concluded that one adjective must be *anuvaadhakam* and the other, the *bodhakam*. When the teacher uses the word 'small', he does not intend to teach that the star is small. He is quoting that adjective 'small', only for the purpose of displacing the perceived 'smallness' with the factual 'bigness' of the star.

The *mahaa vaakyam* is similar. When the *mahaa vaakyam* '*thatthvamas*' wants to say '*jeevaathmaa* is *Paramaathma*', the *upanishad* uses the word '*thadh*' for *Paramaathmaa* and the word '*thvam*' to indicate *jeevaathma*. The pronoun '*thadh*', meaning, 'that', reflects the 'seeming' remoteness of *Paramaathmaa* in *Vaikuntam* or *Kailaasam*. By the word '*thvam*', the seemingly closer '*jeeva*' is indicated. Since, both adjectives '*jeeva*' and '*Parama*' are there in the equation, one must be *anuvadhakam* and the other must be the *bodhakam* (teaching). *Anuvadhakam* is to be displaced and *bodhakam* is to be retained. Which one is to be known as *anuvadhakaa*? Ans: The '*jeeva*' adjective should be taken as *anuvadhakam*. I am **not** *jeevaathmaa*. The '*jeeva*' adjective is only 'quoted' by *Vedaa*, as *anuvadhaa*. *Karthruthvam* is *anuvadhaa*; *bokthruthvam* is *anuvadhaa*; *samsaarithvam* is *anuvadhaa*. The '*akarthruthvam*' / '*abokthruthvam*' / '*asamsaarithvam*' taken from the '*Paramaa*', should be brought on to 'myself'.

The *poorva pakshin*, not knowing these facts (the two reasons given above) raises the question "Why should the *Vedaa* talk about *bedhaa* at all?", in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 73 . In reply to him, that '*bedha vaakyaani* are only *anuvadhaka vaakyaani*', is what is taught in the verses that follow.

- ॐ यदि वाक्यं एव यथा भूतार्थावबोधकं - "If the *Vedaa* is teaching the reality of non-duality / *jeevaathma-Paraaathma-abadhaa*,
- ॐ अथ: - then / in that case,
- ॐ कस्य हेतोः - for what purpose
- ॐ अविध्योत्थापितस्य कर्तृत्वादेः उपदेशः - does the *Vedaa* teach *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam*, *samsaarithvam*, *jeevathvam* and *bedhaa* etc., which are all attributes brought out by nescience?"

The suffix '*aadhi*' (etc.) in '*karthruthvaadhi*', refers to the five factors, *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam*, *samsaarithvam*, *jeevathvam* and *bedhaa*.

Where does the *Vedaa* talk of all these? **Ans:** The *Mundaka manthraa* '*dvaa suparnaa sayujaa sakhaayaa*' etc (III. 3 .1) is a typical example.

According to this *manthraa*, two birds are perched on one and the same tree – the *jeevaathmaa* bird and the *Paramaathmaa* bird; and, they are talked of, as distinct from each other. *Jeevaathmaa* is a *bokthaa*; and, *Paramaathmaa* is *abokthaa*. '*Thayo: anya: pippalam svaadhu aathi*' means 'among them, one (the *jeevaathmaa*

bird) is *bokthaa* / '*anya: anasnan abhichaakaseethi*' means 'the other one, being *abokthaa*, is only a witness'. The *poorva pakshin* asks: "This *manthraa* is in the *Upanishad*. You generally use the adjective '*avidhyotthaapithaani*' for '*karthruthvaadhi*' | The adjective means 'born out of and nurtured by confusion'. Then, do you want to say that the *Upanishad* is also confused? If '*bedhaa*' is confusion, why should the *Upanishad* teach the 'confusion'?"

The crucial mistake the *poorva pakshin* commits, is the use of the word '*upadesa:*'- 'teaching'. Our (*Advaitins*) answer is going to be: "It is **not** *upadesa:* | It is *anuvaadhaa*". Obviously, the *poorva pakshin* is unable to distinguish the difference between *upadesa:* and *anuvaadha:* The difference is very, very important, in *Meemaamsaa*.

ॐ इति उक्तेः (सति) - If such a question is raised,
ॐ प्रति विधीयते - the answer is given.

Chapter III: Verse 73 –

भ्रान्तिप्रसिद्धान्ध्यार्थं तत्तत्त्वं भ्रान्तिबाधया ।
अयं नेत्युपदिश्येत तथैवं तत्त्वमित्यपि ॥ ७३ ॥

When something is the object of an illusory apprehension, it is first of all referred to as it is known under the illusion and then its real nature is taught by the removal of the illusion by saying 'This is not so'. So is the case in 'That thou art' also.

Here, Sureswaraacharya points out that '*bedhaa*' is **not** *upadesa:*; it is only *anuvaadha:*; i.e., 'quoting' or 'referring to' the mistaken notion of the student.

ॐ अनूध्य - Re-stating / quoting / *anuvaadham* *krithvaa*
ॐ भ्रान्ति प्रसिद्ध्य - an universally misconceived
ॐ अर्थ - idea,

The term '*prasiddhya*' conveys that the *bhraanthi* / misconception is an universal misconception, similar to the 'smallness' of stars. The misconception of the 'smallness' of the stars is universal, whereas, in the well-known rope-snake example, 'mistaking the rope for a snake' need not happen to all the people. There are many misconceptions, which are individualistic or belonging to a small group of people. And, there are also many misconceptions which are 'universal', like the 'smallness' of

the stars, which is a wrong perception not of one human being, but, of the entire humanity experiencing the stars as small. In the same manner, *jeeva-Isvara-bedhaa* is not a misconception of one person, but is an universal misconception.

तद् तत्त्वं उपदिश्येत - the reality is revealed

भ्रान्ति बाधया - by the removal of the misconception,

अयं न इति - by asserting 'this is not so'.

The essence of the verse should be grasped. It points out, that, for negating any wrong notion, the wrong notion will have to be necessarily quoted first, in clear terms, for the very purpose of negation. This is the general rule. In the same manner, the delusion of *jeeva-Isvara-bedhaa* can also be negated, only after quoting the 'delusion'.

Later, Sureswaraacharya himself gives the example of the 'stars' and their apparent 'smallness'. To proceed with the verse:

ॐ तथा एव - So is the case

ॐ तत्त्वमित्यपि - in 'thath thvam asi' mahaa vaakyam also.

In Swamiji's own words: "What does Sureswaraacharya mean by this? When it is clearly stated by the *mahaa vaakyam*, that *jeevaathmaa* is *Paramaathmaa*, it means that, the '*jeevaa*' adjective is only a misconception. That, in turn, means none of us is a '*jeevaa*'. All of us are none other than '*Brahman*'".

Noting a titter going around, as he says this, Swamiji continues: "In fact, even as I say this, many of our students are laughing. Obviously, they think that I am joking; they are not willing to take my statements seriously. It is because our expectation generally is that we will 'reach' / 'become' *Brahman*, only sometime in the future. We are unable to give up this 'reaching' notion or 'becoming' notion. That's why *Upaniishad* is forced to assert repeatedly 'you are not *jeevaa* at all' ".

In the following *slokaa*-s, Sureswaraacharya explains the extension of the general rule 'for negating a delusion / wrong notion, the delusion has to be necessarily quoted or mentioned', to the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 74 :

इममर्थं द्रष्टान्तेन बुद्धावारोहयति ।

This principle is brought home through an analogy:

ॐ इमं अर्थ - This particular method (of 'displacement of a wrong notion with the help of the right knowledge, by mentioning both the wrong notion and the right knowledge')

ॐ आरोहयति - is brought home

ॐ बुद्धौ - to the intellect of the student,

ॐ द्रष्टान्तेन - through an example

This is a well known example. The example comes in the *slokaa* that follows.

Chapter III: Verse 74

स्थाणुः स्थाणुरितीवोक्तिर्न नृबुद्धिं निरस्यति ।

व्यनुवादात्तथैवोक्तिर्भ्रान्तिं पुंसो न बाधते ॥ ७४ ॥

If a man merely repeats 'This is a post, this is a post', without reference to the fact that it has been mistaken for a man so far, he does not succeed in removing the illusion that it is a man. Similarly if it is simply said 'You are that', without referring to what the subject is taken to be in illusion, that illusion about the Self does not get removed.

Sthaanu: means a pillar. This is the well-known, often-quoted example of mistaking a post or a pillar as a man, generally taken as a thief, to indicate the reaction of 'fear'. 'Mistaking a pillar for a thief' is the example taken here.

A certain person sees a pillar in semi-darkness and mistakes it for a thief; and, another person, who has got the correct vision, sees the pillar. Suppose the second person wants to correct the mistake of the first person, what is the method of correcting the mistake? He has to say "the 'thief' that you are seeing, is nothing other than a pillar". He will have to necessarily quote the word 'thief', even though in his vision, the thief does not exist at all and therefore, he must not be using the word 'thief'. Still he is forced to use the word 'thief', for the sake of displacement of the wrong perception of the first person. Suppose this person who intends to correct

the first person, wants to avoid the word 'thief', because he does not see a thief at all and therefore, without using the word 'thief', just says 'there is a pillar'. What will happen? The first person will now mistake that there are two things. He will now wrongly conclude: 'I see a thief; this man says there is a pillar. Now I have understood that there is a thief and there is a pillar also. Probably the thief is standing near a pillar, which I am not seeing'. Therefore, by saying merely 'there is a pillar', instead of saying 'the 'thief' you see, is, in reality, a pillar', the second person will not be able to correct the mistake of the first person.

In the same manner, many people studying *Vedhaanthaa / mahaa vaakyaa* conclude 'I have *Paramaathmaa* within me'. Getting this idea 'I have *Paramaathmaa* within me', is also a blunder. That only shows that the misconception 'I am only a *jeevaathmaa*' is still not getting eliminated. Instead, the revised conclusion is: "I am a *jeevathmaa*. I am a *samsaari*. Within me, there is *Paramaathmaa*, who is *asamsaari*". Unfortunately, this knowledge also is a misconception and is also of no use. If you believe that you are a *jeevaathmaa*, having a *Paramaathmaa* 'within' you, you will get no benefit at all, because, you will continue to be a *samsaari*.

(In a lighter vein): Instead of removing your pathetic condition, you may start sympathizing with *Paramaathmaa* also. That will be the case, if it is wrongly taught.

As we discussed earlier, in the example, 'mistaking a pillar for a thief', the second person who is trying to correct the mistake of the first person, cannot stop with saying 'there is a pillar'. That statement will not educate the first person. The only educating statement is 'the so-called 'thief' is none other than a pillar'. By this statement alone, the 'thief', which is a misperception, gets displaced by 'pillar', the right perception. Only in the displacement of the 'thief', the fear of the first person goes away. Similarly, *jeevathvam* will have to be eliminated; otherwise, any amount of *Vedhanthic* study, retaining the idea 'I am a *jeevaa*', will not solve the problem. The student with such an understanding may claim "I have understood *Brahman* very well"; but, will still say, "after death, I should not come back". Even after a long study of *Vedhanthaa*, the aim of some of the *Vedhanthic* students is not to be born again. They want to take themselves to be *jeevaa-s*; they want to continue in the triangular format; they want to die painlessly, never to come back. This idea of *mokshaa*, is a result of their not dropping the idea that they are *jeevaa-s*.

Even the term *jeevan mukthi* should be understood as a misnomer, by an advanced Advaitic seeker, for whom, there are no two different mukthi-s, as *jivan mukthi* and *videha mukthi*. There is only one mukthi, with the firm convictions “‘I’ was Brahman; ‘I’ am Brahman; ‘I’ will ever be Brahman. The world is a ‘drama’ staged by *maayaa*, which, I watch through this body for some time”.

Thus, the *jeeva bhaavaa* should be displaced. That will never happen, unless the teacher talks of the wrong concept of *bedhaa* first, for the very purpose of negating it, similar to the example, where the word ‘thief’ has to be quoted for correcting the wrong perception of ‘thief’, to the right understanding of ‘pillar’.

ॐ 'स्थाणुः स्थाणुः' इति उक्ति :- The statement ‘pillar is a pillar’

This is a statement addressed to the person shivering with the wrong perception of a thief in the pillar. Such a statement:

ॐ न निरस्यति - will not eliminate

ॐ नृबुद्धिं - the misperception of a man / thief (in the pillar),

The term ‘*nrbuddhim*’ can be replaced by the term ‘*chorabuddhim*’, meaning ‘the misperception of a thief (in the pillar)’.

ॐ व्यनुवादात् - since the wrong perception of the ‘thief’ is not specifically quoted .

‘*Vi anuvaadhaath*’ means ‘*anuvaadha abhaavaath*’ i.e., ‘because of the absence of a specific mention of / reference to the wrong perception’ . When ‘*vi*’ is used as a prefix to a noun, the compound word conveys the opposite meaning of the noun, much in the same way as ‘*निर्*’ or ‘*अ*’ .

How should the quotation / mention / *anuvadhaa* be done? The statement should be “The so-called ‘thief’ that you are seeing, is a pillar”. The misperception of the ‘thief’ must be specifically brought in, by the person who wants to correct the misperception. The *anuvadhaa* is extremely important. When it is not there, the misperception is not eliminated. Up to this is the example. Now, to *mahaa vaakyam*:

ॐ तथा एव उक्तिः - A similar statement without the *bedha anuvaadhaa* / *bedha anuvaadha rahitha ukthi*:

ॐ पुम्सः भ्रान्तिं न बाधते - will not eliminate the misconception (of *jeevathvam*) in an individual (the aspirant).

A statement without the specific *bedha anuvaadhaa* will not negate the misconception of *bedhaa*. Therefore, the *sruthi* has to say '*jeevaathmaa* is *Paramaathmaa*', in order to negate '*jeevathvam*'; and, in that statement, the word '*jeevaa*' should be within quotes, since, it is only an *anuvaadha* and not an *upadesaa* and also, since, the ultimate reality is, that, we are not *jeevaa-s*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 75:

यस्माच्छ्रोतृप्रसिद्धानुवाद्येव त्वमितिपदं तस्मादुद्दिश्यमानस्थत्वात् दुःखित्वादेरविवक्षितत्वमेव ।
विधीयमानत्वे हि सति विरोधप्रसङ्गो न तु विधीयमानानूध्यमानयोरिति । स्वप्रधानयोर्हि
पदयोर्विरोधाशङ्का सामान्यालिङ्गितत्वात्तयोर्न विपर्यये ।

Since the term 'Thou' merely recalls what the subject is ordinarily taken to be, the subjection to suffering etc. are parts of the connotation of the subject and they are not intended to be affirmed. Only if they also were predicated, there would be contradiction between them and the new predication embodied in 'Thou art that'. There can be no conflict between what is simply referred to as connotation of the subject and what is predicated anew. Only between principal factors, there could be a contradiction, as they are universal in their significance and not when they are not so:

Here, Sureswarachaaryaa says, that, if this fact, namely that, 'the reference to *bedhaa* is only a necessary *anuvaadhaa*', is not understood, *mahaa vaakyam* will be subject to misinterpretation. This misinterpretation is done by *visishtaadvaitin-s* and *dvaitin-s*. When the *visishtaadvaitin-s* read the *mahaa vaakyam*, the first thing they see is the obvious contradiction in the statement, exactly like the statement 'the 'small star' is a big star'. In this example, if you do not understand that the term 'small star' is only within quotes, i.e., it is only an *anuvaadhaa* and not a teaching, then the statement will certainly look like a contradiction and give rise to the question 'how can a small star be big star'? And, if you desire to 'resolve' this contradiction, you will tend to interpret the sentence to mean 'the small star is a part of the big star',

To repeat: If, instead of understanding 'smallness' as a misperception and, therefore, removing the 'smallness', you take the statement at face value, viz., 'the small star is a big star', it may lead to a misunderstanding that the small star is a part of a big star. The 'small star' misconception is retained and you make that misconceived small star, as a part of a big star.

In a similar manner, the *visishtaadvaitin* argues: "In the *mahaa vaakyam*, the word '*thvam*' refers to '*jeevaathmaa*', because it is addressed to the student. '*Jeevaathmaa*' is evidently a *samsaari*. The word '*thadh*' means 'that' and this very demonstrative pronoun '*thadh*' denotes something far away / remote and, therefore, the seemingly remote *Paramaathmaa*. The *Paramaathmaa*, by nature, is *asamsaari*. 'You' are the '*samsaari jeevaathmaa*' here, and 'that' ever-free *Parmaathmaa* is there in the remote *Vaikuntaa*. Therefore, it is impossible for the *jeevaathmaa* to be the *Paramaathmaa*. Since, thus, *mahaa vaakyam* contains a contradiction, the only way to resolve this contradiction is to understand that you are a part / *sareeram* / *amsam* of *Paramaathmaa*. You should understand '*Chidh achidh visishta: Vishnu:*' | Every *jeevaa* is a small limb of the big *Vishnu*. You are like a minute insect, hanging on to one corner of *Vishnu* and every individual is a distinct small *jeevaathmaa*'. And, according to *visishtaadvaitam*, the size of *jeevaathmaa*, is that of an atom.

Earlier, the *Visishtaadvaitin* was under the impression that his *aathmaa* is as big as his body; but after a study of *mahaa vaakyam*, his concept of the size of the *jeevaathmaa* changes from *madhyama parimaanaa*, to *anu parimaanaa*. Instead of 'expanding' and understanding "I am limitless, *nithya:*, *sarvagatha:*, *sthaanu:*", he runs away with the idea that he is an *anu* / an atom. His interpretation is: "Every living individual is an *anu jeevaathmaa*; there is one infinite *Paramaathmaa*; all of us, '*jeevaathmaa-s*', are 'sticking' to that infinite *Paramaathmaa*".

What is the cause of this misinterpretation of the *Visishtaadvaitin-s*? Ans: It is because, they see a permanent contradiction between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*; they do not realize that the contradiction is only because of the reason, that, while interpreting the *mahaa vaakyam*, they have retained the misconception that the word '*thvam*' (in the *mahaa vaakyam*) is equal to *jeevaa*. The *jeevaa* adjective has been retained by them. *Mahaa vaakyam* is to be used not to retain the *jeevathvam*, but to displace the *jeevathvam*, similar to the 'smallness' of the star being displaced by 'vastness', in the example. If you retain the *jeevathvam*, the only conclusion you will come to, is, that, *jeevaa-s* are all parts of

Paramaathmaa, as they have done. But, that conclusion is not going to save the *jeevaa*, because the 'miserable' adjective will continue. Previously, I was a 'miserable individual'; now, I know I am a 'miserable part of *Paramaathmaa*'. The only improvement is that the 'individual' becomes a 'part of *Paramaathmaa*'. But the 'miserable' adjective will not be replaced; it will go away, only when the *jeevathvam* is displaced. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says: "The 'seeming' contradiction, you have to know, how it is not".

The first sentence 'yasmaath srothru prasiddha anuvadhi eva thvamithi padahm thasmaath uddhisyaamaanasthathvaath dhu:khithvaadhe: avivakshithathvam eva', can be split into two short sentences, by removing the word 'yasmaath' and re-writing the sentence as: 'Srothru prasiddha thvamithi padham anuvaadhi eva (bhavathi) | Thasmaath uddhisyaamaanasthathvaath dhu:khithvaadhe: avivakshithathvam eva |'

ॐ श्रोतृप्रसिद्धं त्वं इति पदं अनुवादि एव (भवति) - When the mahaa vaakyam uses the word 'thvam', even though the word refers to the jeevaathmaa only, the use of the 'jeevaa' adjective is only 'quoting' our misconception. 'Srothruprasiddha anuvaadhi' is adjective to the word 'thvam'.

The implication of the sentence: "It is not a 'teaching' of 'my' *jeevathvam*"

ॐ तस्मात् - Therefore,

ॐ उद्दिश्यमानस्थत्वात् - since the word 'jeevaa' is used by the Vedaa for the sake of 'quoting' the misconception,

'*uddhisyaamaanam*' is a technical word and means 'quoting'. By the adjective '*jeevaa*', *sruthi* is only 'quoting' the view / perception of the student.

ॐ दुःखित्वादेः अविवक्षितत्वं एव - the sorrow etc., connected with the jeevaa are not intended to be taught by the Vedaa.

'*Dhu:kithvam*' means 'sorrow' and includes *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam*, *samsaaraa* etc.; '*avivakshithathvam*' means 'not intended to be part of the teaching'. The *sruthi mahaa vaakyam* does not intend to include *dhu:kithvam*, *karthruthvam*, *bokthruthvam*, *samsaaraa* etc. in the *jeevaathmaa*. This can be understood by recollecting the example statement 'the 'small' star is a big star', where the word 'small' is used by the teacher, but is not to be included in the nature of the star.

Then, why does the *guru* use it? Ans: As already explained, he is quoting the misconception of the student, for elimination and displacement, not for inclusion.

Visishtaadhvaithin-s do not note this point; so, they include / retain the *dhu:kithvam* in the *thvam padha jeevaathmaa*. What will happen? Ans: '*Jeevaathma-Paramaathma eikyam*' will not be acceptable. How can the ever-sorrowful *jeevaathmaa* be equal to the *nithya aanandha Paramaathmaa*?

Therefore, (i.e. since the sorrowful *jevaathmaa* cannot be the joyous *Paramaathmaa*), they say that the sorrowful *jeevaathmaa* can be only a part of the joyous *Paramaathmaa*. But, in this approach, a big disservice is done by them. What is that? Ans: The joyous *Paramaathmaa* will be subject to misery. If, as a miserable individual you go to any *lokaa*, you will be *samsaari* and you will make all others around you also, including *Paramaathmaa, samsaari-s*.

Swamiji's exhortation to the students: "You should understand: "I' am *asamsaari*". When? Ans: Not by going to *Vaikuntaa*, without ever returning. You should have the convictions: 'I am *asamsaari* here and now. What are called sorrow, misery etc. are nothing but *maayaa naama roopaani*. *Goudapaadhaacchaaryaa* asserts in his *Maandookya kaarika* (*vaithathyaprakaranam* – verse 31) – '*svapnamaaye yathaa dhrushtey gandharvanagaram yathaa | Thathaa visvamidham dhrushtam vedhaantheshu vichakshanai:*' – 'In *Vedhaanthaa*, this universe is seen by the wise in the same way as dream and magic are seen or the 'city in the sky' is seen'. All miseries are like dreams or magic shows. The world and events in the world will be seen by *Vedhaanthin-s*, only as real as the images formed by the clouds in the sky. As long as you are 'miserable' / a *samsaari*, wherever you go, even at the feet of *Bhagavaan Vishnu*, you will not be comfortable. '*Samsarithvam* and '*jeevathvam*' should be eliminated from the system. And, there is only one way, which is, that, the implied word '*jeevaa*' in the *mahaa vaakyam*, should be understood as *anuvadhaa* and not 'teaching'".

Reverting to the text:

ॐ विधीयमानत्वे हि सति - If the 'jeevathvam' of 'thvam padhaartha' is taken as part of the 'teaching',

ॐ विरोधप्रसङ्गः (भवति) - then there will be contradictions.

As a consequence, *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiykyam* will be unacceptable. That would mean that *jeevaathmaa* would remain *jeevaathmaa* and *samssari*. Wherever you go, you will continue to be a *samsaari*. Then, where is *vimochanam*?"

181: Chapter III, Verse 75 (10-04-2010)

A number of different branches of science will have to be applied while analyzing *Mahaavaakyaa-s*. In these portions, Sureswaraacharya is indicating the modes of application of those different branches of science, especially *Meemaamsaa saasthram* and *Vyaakarana saasthram*.

Meemaamsaa saasthram is the 'science of interpretation' in general and the 'science of Vedic interpretation' in particular. By applying the *meemaamsaa saasthram*, we have to first find out whether the '*thathvamsi*' *vaakyam* is used by the *saasthraa-s* seriously (i.e., with *thaathparyam* / a teaching) or casually (without any *thaathparyam*) / whether it is a *thaathparya vaakyam* or an *athaathparya vaakyam*?

The following example for an *athaathparya vaakyam* was presented in earlier contexts: In a Mathematics text book for schools, a number of problems or sums are given. One particular sum goes "A pen costs Rs.37/50P. Then find out what will be the cost of 53 pens?" When this sum is given in the text book, what is the intention of the author? **Ans:** "He wants to find out whether the student knows how to multiply (37.50 x 53) and arrive at the right answer i.e., the questioner wants to know whether the student can do 'multiplication' properly or not". In other words, the focus of the author is on 'multiplication'. For that purpose, he requires some incidental data for the multiplication exercise; and, therefore, in a purely hypothetical manner, he states that a pen costs Rs.37/50P, which figure may not at all reflect the true prevalent market price of a pen. Therefore, we should not use the Mathematics text book to find out whether the current cost of a pen in the market is really Rs.37/50P. or more or less. Why do we not take the Mathematics text book as a *pramaanam* to find out the cost of a pen? **Ans:** "Because the Mathematics text book does not have the *thaathparyam* in 'teaching' the cost of a pen; i.e., the true cost of a pen is not the *thaathparyam* or the subject of the Mathematic text book". In *meemaamsaa* language, this statement in the text book, talking about the cost of a pen is an *athaathparya vaakyam* with regard to the price of the pen and not a *pramaana vaakyam*. In *meemaamsaa saasthram*, they present a general rule in similar situations, as '*thaathparya abhaavaath praamaanyam naasthi*'.

Similarly, when *Veda* is studied, care should be taken to find out as to what are the *Vedic* statements that are *thaathparya vaakyaani* and what are the statements,

which, even though they are *veda vaakyaani*, are not *thaathparya vaakyaani*. What is the intention of this extra care? **Ans:** "Just as, in the example of the Mathematic text book, the intention / *thaathparyam* is only multiplication and not the true cost of a pen, the *thaathparyam* of a given *Vedic* statement may, at times, be different from the literal text of the statement". For arriving at this *thaathparyam* alone, we have an elaborate method, consisting of six indicatory factors, viz., *upakrama-upasamhaarau*, *abhyaasa:*, *apoorvathaa*, *palam*, *arthavaadha:* and *upapatthi:* | By resorting to these six indicatory factors, which belong to *meemaamsaa saasthraa*, we aim to find out whether a particular statement is *thaathparya vaakyam* or not.

After such an analysis only, *Advaitic Aachaaryaa-s* have come to the conclusion that '*thathvamasī*' is a *thaathparya vaakyam* and not an *athaathparya vaakyam*. '*Thathvamasī vaakye praamaanyam asthi*' is the conclusion arrived at, by them, through application of *meemaamsa saasthraa*.

Thereafter, they enter into *Vyaakarana saasthram* or grammatical analysis, which alone, Sureswaraachaaryaa is entering into, in this portion.

This topic had been discussed by us, in earlier contexts also.

To elaborate on this grammatical analysis:

Every sentence has to have a 'subject'. Without a 'subject', a sentence is not possible. Similarly, any sentence should have a predicate also. An example was given in earlier discussions, viz., the sentence 'the Everest peak is 8844 meters high'. In this sentence, 'Everest' is the subject and '8844 meters' is the predicate.

In *Vyaakaranaa*, they make an analysis as to which one of the two, namely, the 'subject' and 'predicate' in a statement, is the information that is conveyed and which one is not the information conveyed. Suppose the person listening to the above sentence, does not know that there is a peak called Everest. In that case, i.e., when he does not know the subject itself, obviously, the predicate cannot have any relevance at all, since the listener does not even know that such a peak is existing. In that situation, what should be the speaker's approach? How should he frame his speech? **Ans:** "He should start with saying 'there is a mountain peak called Everest'". That will be the appropriate method.

If, therefore, a speaker just says 'Everest is 8844 meters high', obviously, his assumption is that Everest is a peak known to the listener. Such a 'known subject' is called '*uddhisyamaanam*' in Sanskrit grammar. The '*uddhisyamaanam*' has always to be a 'known factor' and not a 'revealed information'.

Rule no. 1 in Sanskrit grammar, is, thus, "The 'subject' of a sentence / the '*uddhisyamaanam*' is not a 'revealed information'; it is only a 're-stated information'". In the example given, the listener already knows that there is a peak called Everest. Therefore, in the sentence given as example, the subject 'Everest' is '*uddhisyamaanam*'.

To generalize: The subject in any sentence is only a re-statement of an already known factor. Using Sanskrit terms, this can be stated as "an *uddhisyamaanam* is always *anuvadhakam*", the term *anuvadhakam* meaning 're-statement of a known factor'.

Proceeding to the next step, since the 'subject' of a sentence is only a re-statement of an already 'known factor', it is not revealing any new thing. To use Sanskrit terms, since *uddhisyamaanam* is an *anuvadhakam*, it is not a *pramaanam*, since the very definition of a *pramaanam* is 'that which teaches you something new'. '*Pramaa janakam pramaanam*' meaning '*Pramaanam* is a producer of knowledge'.

To consolidate all these, in Sanskrit: "yathra yathra uddhisyamaanathvam thathra thathra anuvadhakathvam; yathra yathra anuvadhakathvam thathra thathra apramaanathvam".

Thus, in any statement, the 'subject' is always 'apraamaanam'. Uddhisyamaanam = anoodhyamaanam / anuvadhakam = apramaanam.

(There is a text called *samkshepa saareerakam*, authored by a disciple of Sureswaraacharya, called Sarvagnayaathmendra Saraswathi. Those who read this work will feel that he is literally a *sarvagnya*: | Sarvagnayaathmendra Saraswathi has written this work '*samkshepa saareerakam*' in verse form, summarizing the *Brahma Soothra Bhaashyam* of Sankara *Bhagavadh Paadhaa*. In this text, he elaborately discusses this topic, viz. *uddhisyamaanam* = *anoodhyamaanam* = *apraamaanam*).

To go back to the example, when the statement 'Everest is 8844 meters high' is made, if the listener already happens to know that information, viz., the height of the peak also, then the sentence becomes redundant and purposeless, since both the 'subject' and 'predicate' are known to the listener. Therefore, when a speaker makes a statement, his assumption is that the 'predicate' in the sentence, is an unknown matter or a new information to the listener. This 'unknown' predicate is called '*vidheeyamaanam*', which means a 'new information given to listener, which the listener does not know'. And, therefore, a *vidheeyamaanam* is *pramaanam*, i.e., the information that is being generated by the speaker.

To consolidate these facts: In any meaningful sentence, *uddhisyaamaanam* and *vidheeyamaanam* will be there. *Uddhisyaamaanam* is *apraamaanam*; *vidheeyamaanam* is always *pramaanam*.

Now, of these two, viz., '*apraamana-uddhisyaamaanam*' and '*pramana-vidheeyamaanam*', which one is stronger? This may appear to be a strange question, which will be explained later. The stranger answer, which is also explained later, is: "The *vidheeyamaanam pramaanam* part alone is stronger". And, therefore, if there is a contradiction between *uddhisyaamaanam* and *vidheeyamaanam*, the *vidheeyamaanam*, being *pramaanam* and stronger, should not be changed at all; *uddhisyaamaanam* alone, being *apraamaanam* and weaker, will have to be 'adjusted' to resolve the contradiction.

Sureswaraachaaryaa will be applying this principle in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam* and conclude, that, in the *mahaa vaakyam 'thaththvamas'*, the word '*thvam*' is '*uddhisyaamaanam*' and therefore *apraamaanam*; and, that, '*thadh*' is '*vidheeyamaanam*' and therefore *pramaanam*.

Now, to explain this principle (the 'strange' question and the 'stranger' answer), applying it first to the example discussed in the earlier session will help.

The example given was: "The 'small star' in the sky is a 'big star'". As pointed out, for a primary-school-going child, the perceived 'smallness' of the star is a result of *prathyaksha anubhava pramaanam* and also of the popular nursery rhyme 'twinkle twinkle little star' which the child has been taught to recite. To correct this mistaken perception of the child, the child is to be told "That 'small star' in the sky is a 'big star'".

In this statement, viz., "That 'small star' in the sky is a 'big star'", what is the *uddhisyaamaanam* / the subject? **Ans:** "The 'small star', as known to the child, is the *uddhisyaamaanam*, *anoodhyamaanam* and *apraamaanam*". What is the '*vidheeyamaanam*' in the statement? **Ans:** "The 'big star' is *vidheeyamaanam*". Out of the two adjectives, 'small' and 'big', one has to be false; otherwise, there will be contradiction. If you have to resolve the contradiction, viz., the 'smallness' and the 'bigness' of the star, you have to reject one as false and accept the other as right. Now, the question is, which one should be rejected as false? Will you correct the 'big star' in the *vidheeyamaana* portion as 'small star', or will you understand the 'small' adjective in the *uddhisyaamaanaa* portion as false?

You cannot simply choose to say "Falsify the 'bigness', to say, 'the small star is a small star' ", since another person may equally simply respond " Why do you not take 'small' as false, and say 'the big star is the big star?'". The contradiction will still not be solved. So, there has to be a rule acceptable to both; and, there *is* a grammar rule. What is that grammar rule? **Ans:** "The rule is '*vidheeyamaana viseshanam pramaanathvaath abhaadhyam; uddhisyaamaana viseshanam apramaanathvaath bhaadhyam*', indicating that, *uddhisyaamaanam* is weaker". Therefore, the 'smallness' adjective belonging to the *uddhisyaamaana padham* has to be negated and the 'bigness' belonging to the *vidheeyamaana padham* has to be retained.

Now, in '*thatthvamas!* *mahaa vaakyam*, we have got the statement '*jeevaathmaa*' is equal to '*Paramaathmaa*'. *Jeevaathmaa* has to have an adjective, '*samsaari*', because *jeevaathmaa* is always associated with *samsaaraa*. *Paramaathmaa* is always associated with the adjective *asamsaari*. Therefore, what is the equation of the *mahaa vaakyam*? **Ans:** "*Samsaari jeevaathmaa is asamsaari Paramaathmaa*". This, seemingly, is the gist of the statement '*thatthvamas!*'.

Now, this *samsaari* adjective and *asamsaari* adjective are diagonally opposite to each other. Therefore, it is a contradiction to say *samsaari jeevaathmaa* and *asamsaari Paramaathmaa* are identical. Obviously they cannot be. Therefore, one adjective will have to be falsified. The questions are: "Where we should make the change? Can we bring *Paramaathmaa* also to our fold, pull Him down and make Him join us and say 'The '*asamsaari*' adjective is false'. If we do that, the equation will be: '*samsaari jeevaathmaa is samsaari Paramaathmaa*'. Alternately, should we say that

samsaarithvam of the *jeevaathmaa* is a mistaken notion and really speaking, *jeevaathmaa* is *asamsaari*? Should we make a correction in the adjective *samsaari* of the *jeevaathmaa*? Which one should be corrected? What rule do we apply to resolve this contradiction?" **Ans:** "This is where, the grammar rule (discussed above), viz., '*vidheeyamaana viseshanam pramaanathvaath abhaadhyam; uddhisyamaana viseshanam apramaanathvaath bhaadhyam*' has to be applied. And, therefore, '*samsaarithvam*', which is an adjective of the *udhisyamaana* '*thvam padhaartha*' should be taken as *adhyasa*: / misconception. This is the essence of this paragraph, the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 75:

ॐ यस्मात् - Since

ॐ त्वम् इति पतम् - the word 'thvam', in the mahaa vaakyam

ॐ चोत्रु प्रसित अनुवाति एव - is only 'restating' the jeevaathmaa,

Who is the '*srothru* or '*jeevaathmaa*? **Ans:** "The word '*srothru* refers to the student listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*. It is the student who is talked about by the word '*thvam*', which word is only a re-statement, not teaching a new reality".

Why is '*thvam*' not teaching a new reality? **Ans:** Would anyone say "Only after I heard the '*thvam padha* in the *vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*, I realized I am there" or "Because the *saasthraa*-s say '*thvam*', I have to be existing"? The answer, evidently, is 'no'. One does not need any external 'evidence' or 'reminder' to be 'aware' of one's own existence. Swami Dayaananda Saraswathi puts this message across, in his unique manner. He asks jocularly: "Do you ever tell yourself 'I must be existing, because I have a wife. No wife will marry a non-existing entity and since I am married, I must be existing?" We do not say 'I am existing, because *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* says '*thvam*'. The word '*thvam*' is not proving 'you'; it is only talking about the already existing *jeevaathmaa*. Therefore, it is *apraamaanam*.

ॐ तस्मात् उद्दिश्यमानस्थत्वात् - and, since it is the subject of the sentence,

The words '*uddhisyamaanam*' and '*anoodhyamaanam*' are synonymous. Both refer to the 'subject' of a sentence and therefore invariably '*apraamaanam*', meaning 'they do not teach you anything new'. Therefore:

दुःखित्वादेः अविवक्षतत्वं एव - the 'sorrow' or 'samssarithvam' (belonging to the jeevaa) should not be taken as a 'revelation of fact' by the mahaa vaakyam.

'*Dhu:khithvam*' means sorrow or '*samsaarithvam*'; '*avivakshitham*' means 'not an information revealed'. '*avivakshithathvam*' means 'it is not *pramaanam*'.

The sorrow belonging to the *jeevaa* should not be taken as a 'reality' / 'information' revealed by *mahaavaakyam*. What is the reason? "Because the *samsaaram*-endowed *thvam padham* is existing in *uddhisyaamaanaa* position, the *samsaarithvam* of '*thvam*' is not intended to be conveyed as 'reality'". To understand this statement, the example should be recollected. When the father or the teacher of a child wants to correct the misconception of a child about the size of a star, he says "the 'small' star is a 'big' star". In this sentence, the word 'small' is, of course, used by the father/ teacher; but, the word is not intended by him for the sake of 'teaching'. Then why does he use it? "Because 'smallness' is the misconception of the child. That misconception is only 'quoted, *not* 'taught'". In a similar manner, the *samsaarithvam* of the *jeevaa* is quoted only for negation and not intended for 'teaching'.

ॐ विधीयमानत्वे हि सति - If '*thvam padham*' also comes under *vidheeyamaanam*,

ॐ विरोधप्रसङ्गः - there will be contradiction, invalidating the equation itself.

ॐ तु - But,

ॐ विधीयमान अनूध्यमानयोः - when one is *vidheeyamaanam* (therefore, *pramaanam*) and the other is *anoodhyamaanam* (and, therefore, *apraamaanam*),

ॐ न (विरोधप्रसङ्गः) - there can be no contradiction.

If both *thvam padham* and *thadh padham* are *vidheeyamaana pramaana padhaani*, what will be the problem? **Ans:** "Thadh padhaa' is *vidheeyamaanam*; therefore, *asamsaari* adjective is *pramaanaa* and cannot be negated. If *thvam padham* also comes under *vidheeyamaanam*, *thvam padhaa* also will become *pramaana padham*; then, *samsaari* adjective also will become *pramaanaa*. If *samsaari* adjective becomes *pramaanaa*, it can also be not negated. Since, thus, both the adjectives, '*samsaari*' and '*asamsaari*' cannot be negated, they will stick to the *jeevaathmaa* and the *Paramaathmaa* respectively. Then the equation will become a contradiction and invalid".

This problem would have resulted, if *thvam padhaa* also is *vidheeyamaanam* and *thadh padhaa* also is *vidheeyamaanam*. But, fortunately, that is not the case.

The problem of 'contradiction' is not there, because *thvam padhaa* is not *vidheeyamaana padham*; it is only *uddhisyaamaana padham*.

(In a lighter vein: The *Samsaarithvam* part – not the *chaithanyam* part- is only very loosely attached to *jeevaathmaa*. A mundane example is a perforated receipt book, from which, it is easy to 'tear off' the receipt. The *jeevaathmaa* and its *samsaarithvam* are attached to each other with perforations at the 'joint'. Therefore, the *guru*, using the *vidheeyamaana thadh padham*, can tear off the *samsaarithvam* part of the *jeevaathmaa* with ease and discard it. Thus, he can easily validate the *mahaa vaakyam*.)

The same is re-stated in the next sentence of the *sambhandha gadhyam*.

ॐ स्वप्रधानयोः हि पदयोः - Only if both *thvam padham* and *thadh padham* become equally prominent (*pramaanam*),

If both *thvam padham* and *thadh padham* get *vidheeyamaanathvam* status and become *pramaanam*, then, both '*samsaarithvam*' and '*asamsaarithvam*' will be facts. Then the *mahaa vaakyam* will have a contradiction and become invalid, just as in the example of the star, if both the adjectives 'small' and 'big' are considered facts, the statement will become invalid.

ॐ विरोध आशङ्का (भवति) - the fear / possibility of contradiction (will result),

ॐ तयोः सामान्य आलिङ्गितत्वात् - since, in that case, the primary meanings have to be applied for both *thvam padhaa* and *thadh padhaa*.

'Saamaanya', here, means 'primary meaning'. 'Aalingathathvam' means 'association with'. If primary meaning is applied for *thvam padhaa*, *samsaarithvam* will also come and there will be contradiction.

ॐ न विपर्यये - Not otherwise (i.e. if both *thvam padham* and *thadh padham* are not equally *pramaanaa*).

Chapter III: Verse 75 –

अनालिङ्गितसामान्यौ न जिहासितवादिनौ ।

व्युत्थितौ तत्त्वमौ तस्मादन्योन्याभिसमीक्षणौ ॥ ७५ ॥

Therefore, the terms ‘That’ and ‘Thou’ used appositely, in the proposition, give up their normal meanings and do not signify anything contrary to the intended unitary purport and thus are divested of their mutually conflicting general connotations, being mutually conditioned.

“Therefore” Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes “when *mahaa vaakyam* is studied, the student should not take the primary meanings of these two words; he has to take only the secondary or implied meanings”.

(*Swamiji* says: Though the topic has been discussed in earlier contexts, in view of its importance in this context, I will briefly deal with the topic of ‘primary and secondary meanings’ once again, now.)

‘Primary meaning’ of a word is called *vaachyaartha:* and ‘secondary meaning’ is called *lakshyaartha:* | ‘Primary meaning’ / ‘*vaachyaartha:*’, is the direct and obvious meaning which is generally / popularly taken. But, in certain contexts, an ‘implied meaning according to the given context’ is also possible for a word, which meaning is called ‘secondary meaning’ / ‘*lakshyaartha:*’.

‘*Lakshyaartha:*’ or the ‘secondary meaning’ can be of three types: (i) *Jahathi lakshyaartha:* or *jahallakshyaartha:* (ii) *ajahathi lakshyaartha:* or *ajahallakshyaartha:* and (iii) *bhaagathyaga lakshyaartha:* |

‘*Jahathi lakshyaartha:*’ or ‘*jahallakshyaartha:*’: If in a particular context, when the listener is expected to totally give up the primary or direct meaning and take another meaning which is closely connected to the primary meaning (the ‘closeness’ is important – obviously a totally unconnected meaning cannot be taken), that implied, intended meaning is called ‘*jahathi lakshyaartha:*’ | The word ‘*jahathi*’ indicates ‘total rejection of primary meaning’. To cite an example: Suppose a report in a newspaper reads “In the Rajya Sabha, to-day, the Chair objected to the remark of a member”. Obviously, chairs, made of inert materials, cannot even ‘speak’, much less ‘object’. However costly a chair may be, it can never respond to a situation. But it is a trustworthy newspaper which has made this report. So, if the sentence has to be made meaningful by the reader, he should totally give up the primary meaning of the ‘chair’ and should take another meaning, which is *chethanam;* that *chethanam*

also cannot be any living being. It must be someone connected to / associated with the chair, obviously, the Chairperson. This example explains the *jahathi lakshyaartha:*, where the 'primary meaning' of the word used is totally given up and an implied meaning is given to the word.

There can be any number of examples. One more example is: "The context of a host offering a cup of coffee to the guest and the guest responding by saying 'I have already consumed three cups'". Obviously, the guest could not have consumed the 'cups', but has consumed 'cups of coffee'. Here, the word 'cup' means 'the contents of the cup'. This is also an example of *jahathy lakshyaartha:* |

'*Ajahathi lakshyaartha:*' or '*ajahal lakshyaartha:*': This is when 'the primary meaning is totally **retained** and something more is also added'. If primary meaning **alone** is given for a word, the meaning is *vaachyaartha:* | When the 'primary meaning' is totally rejected and an implied secondary meaning is taken, that meaning is *jahathi laksyaartha:* | In *ajahathi lakshyaartha:*, the whole primary meaning should be there and in addition to that, something must be added in the understanding of the word.

Number of examples can be given for *ajahathi lakshyaartha:* also. One example is: "The context of someone saying 'I had *idly* for breakfast'. Here, the listener of the statement, since he is aware that *idly* cannot be eaten without a side-dish, will, as a matter of fact, understand that the speaker consumed *idly* with a suitable side-dish, even though the speaker did not specifically mention it . In this context, the 'side-dish' is added in the meaning of '*idly*', retaining the primary meaning of '*idly*'".

Another example is a person saying "I just had coffee". 'Coffee' cannot be consumed direct either in its seed or powder form. The coffee powder has to be boiled in water and the filtered decoction consumed either as 'black coffee' or as more commonly done, consumed with added milk and sugar. So, the word 'coffee' in the sentence "I just had coffee" does not mean 'mere coffee'. It means 'coffee + some other constituent'.

In such situations, when a word is understood not only with its primary meaning but with some additional meanings also, that resultant meaning is called '*ajahathi lakshyaartha:*' or '*ajahal lakshyaartha:*' | 'Total **rejection** of the primary meaning and attribution only of a secondary meaning' is '*jahathi laksyaartha:*' and 'total

retention of the primary meaning and addition of a secondary meaning' is '*ajahathi lakshyaartha:*'|

Then, what is *bhaagathyaagha lakshyaartha:*? **Ans:** "It consists of 'partial rejection and partial retention of the primary meaning". When, of the primary meaning of the word, one part is rejected and another part alone is retained and accepted as the meaning (*thaathparyam*) of the word, that process is '*bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa*' or '*jahathy-ajahathy- lakshanaa*'.

An example for *bhaagathyaagha lakshyaartha:*: When someone says "I consumed a banana", the statement does not mean that the person consumed a banana wholly or totally, since the skin / peel of a banana is generally not consumed. (In a lighter vein: Elephants do; but, not humans. A jack fruit or a mango, as an example, will probably be a more appropriate example, since, the skin of a jack fruit or the seed of a mango can certainly be not consumed by any being). So, even though the speaker makes the statement "I consumed a banana", he refers only to the consumable part of the banana.

Another example for *bhaagathyaagha lakshyaartha:* is the statement: "I am in India". In this context, the speaker does not certainly pervade the whole of India. He is only in a part of India. When you say 'I consumed the fruit', the *lakshyaartha:* of the word 'fruit' is only the consumable part of the fruit and similarly, when you say 'I am in India', the *lakshyaartha:* of the word 'India', is only a part of India. Such a *lakshyaartha:* is *bhaagathyaagha lakshyaartha:*|

To consolidate: (1) If primary meaning alone is given for a word, the meaning is *vaachyaartha:* | (2) When the primary meaning is totally rejected and a closely associated secondary meaning is given to the word, it is *jahathi lakshyaartha:* | (3) When the primary meaning of the word is retained and one or more secondary meanings are also added in understanding the word, it is *ajahathi lakshyaartha:* | (4) When part of the primary meaning is rejected and part of the primary meaning is retained, it is *bhaagathyaagha* or *jahathi-ajahathi lakshyaartha:* | And, depending on the context, one has to take one of the four types of meanings.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out, that, in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*, the 'primary meaning's of both '*thadh*' and '*thvam*' will not fit.

The primary meaning of '*thvam*' or '*jeevathmaa*' has five components; i.e., '*Jeevaathmaa*' is a composite entity, consisting of five components, viz., (1) the physical or gross body, (2) the subtle body (3) the causal body (4) the reflected Consciousness or *chidhaabhaasaa* and (5) the Original Consciousness or *chith*. In the same manner, '*Thadh*' or '*Paramaathmaa*' also is a composite entity, consisting of (1) the physical universe (2) the subtle universe (3) the causal universe (*maayaa*) (4) reflected Consciousness (*Isvara*) and (5) Original Consciousness (*Brahman*.)

If you include all these five components in understanding '*thvam*' and '*thadh*', the resultant meanings will be called 'primary meanings' or *vaachyaarthaa-s*; i.e., the primary meaning of '*jeevathmaa*' includes the five components mentioned above and, in the same manner, the primary meaning of '*Paramaathmaa*' includes *His* five components mentioned above. And, if the *vaachyaarthaa-s* are equated, it will be a blunder, because the first four components of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are all different from one another. Physical body *is* different from physical universe, subtle body *is* different from subtle universe and causal body *is* different from causal universe. The fourth components, viz., the 'micro Reflected Consciousness' and 'macro Reflected Consciousness' are also different. In all these four levels, there *is* contradiction. The *viswa-thyjasapraagnyaa* are contradictory / diagonally opposite to the *viraat-hiranyagarbha-antharyaami*. Therefore, what should the student do? **Ans:** "He should not take *vaachyaarthaa-s*; he has to take only the *lakshyaarthaa-s*". But, once he decides to take the *lakshyaarthaa-s* for the sake of the equation, he will have the question, "which type?" Sureswaraacharya will answer: "The third type, viz., the *bhaagathyaagha lakshyaarthaa-s*". This would mean that the first four components of *jeevaathmaa* and the first four components of *Paramaathmaa*, which are mutually contradictory – physical body / physical universe, subtle body / subtle universe, causal body / causal universe, micro Reflected Consciousness / macro Reflected Consciousness - will all have to be rejected . What is left behind is the fifth component, namely, the Original Consciousness in both. And, very importantly, in the context of the Original Consciousness, there is no micro-and-macro divisions. At the levels of 'Reflected Consciousness' there *is* division, whereas the 'Original Consciousness' is indivisible *akanda chaithanyam*.

Therefore, there is only one *ekaathmaa*, which does not deserve either the *jeevaa* adjective or *Paramaa* adjective. '*Jeevaa*' and '*Paramaa*' adjectives are also 'torn off'

and what is left behind is *ekaathmaa*. The equation '*Jeevathmaa = Paramaathmaa*' means 'there is only *ekaathmaa*'.

Reverting to the text (verse 75):

ॐ तत्त्वमौ - The words 'thath' and 'thvam'

'Thaththvamau' is a compound word formed as "'thath cha thvam cha'='thaththvamau'" |

ॐ व्युत्थितौ - having rejected their primary meanings,

'Vyutthi:' means 'rejecting' / dropping. They have to give up their primary meanings, because, as long as they retain their primary meanings, the other four components will also join and the equation will not work.

ॐ अनालिङ्गित सामान्यौ - and, (therefore), not associated with their primary meanings,

'*aalingitham*' literally means 'embraced'. '*anaalingitham*', would, therefore, literally mean 'not embraced' and in this context, implies 'not associated with'.

Since the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' have given up their primary meanings, they are not associated with them. '*Saamaanyaau*' means '*vaachyaarthau*' or 'literal / primary meanings'. '*Anaalingithau saamaanya arthau yaabhyam thau*' is '*anaalingitha saamaanyaau*' | This is a *bahuvreehi* compound, qualifying '*thaththvamau*'.

Therefore only, the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' take up secondary meanings, in which secondary meanings, they reject parts of their primary meanings. Therefore,

ॐ न जिहासितवादिनौ - do not desire to / intend to reveal irrelevant portions.

'*Haathum ishtam*' is '*jihaasitham*', which means 'desired to be given up'. '*Na vaadhinau*' means 'they do not reveal'. What do they not reveal? **Ans:** "The irrelevant portions".

And, what are the irrelevant portions to be given up? **Ans:** 'The eight components, viz., (1) sthoola sareeram, (2) sthoola prapancham, (3) sookshma sareeram, (4) sookshma prapancham, (5) kaarana sareeram, (6) kaarana prapancham, (7) vyashti chidhaabhaasaa and (8) samashti chidhaabhaasaa.

All these eight components are gone. What is left out is only the Original Consciousness – *chith* – in which there is no *vyashti* – *samashti* division.

ॐ तस्मात् - Therefore,

ॐ अन्योन्य अभिसमीक्षणौ - without any contradiction, they can have eiykyam.

182: Chapter III, Verses 75 and 76 (10-04-2010)

In this portion, Sureswaraachaaryaa is introducing the classical *advaitic* understanding of the *mahaa vaakyam*, by showing that, while studying the *mahaa vaakyam*, the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' cannot be interpreted with their primary meanings. If their primary meanings are taken, the *mahaa vaakyam* will not convey any logical idea.

The primary meaning of the word '*thvam*' is *jeevaathmaa*, which includes *sareerathrayam* and *vyashti chidhaabhaasaa*. The primary meaning of the word '*thath*' is *Paramaathmaa*, which includes *prapanchathrayam* and *samashti chidhaabhasaa*. And, if these *anaathmaa* parts, *sareerathrayam*, *prapanchathrayam* and *chidhaabhasaa*, are included in the *jeevaathmaa* and the *Paramaathmaa*, certainly *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* cannot be identical.

Still, the *Upanishad*-s make repeated assertions of the *mahaa vaakyam*-s; and, through *meemaamsa vichaaraa* (consisting of the six factors, starting with *upakrama-upasamhaarau*), we come to know that *mahaa vaakyam* is not a casual statement and that, *Upanishad*-s seriously intend to convey something profound.

When we approach *mahaa vaakyam* with this awareness and conviction, we come to recollect the fact, that, very often, we have a *lakshyaarthaa* / target or implied meaning also, for many words, as quite commonly understood by the people. In all languages, the concept of 'implied meanings' / '*lakshyaarthaa*-s' is there.

As discussed in the earlier session, the *lakshyaarthaa*-s are of three types - *jahathi*, *ajahathi* and *bhaagathyaaaghaa*. Detailed explanations of the three types were also given, in the earlier session.

Remembering them, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*, what we have to apply is *bhaagathyagha lakshanaa*. A classical, oft-quoted example for *bhaagathyagha lakshanaa* is the statement '*sa: ayam devadhattha:*', which means 'this Devadhatthaa whom you are seeing now, is that same Devadhatthaa, whom you have seen years before'. Superficially, the Devadhatta of the yore and the present Devadhatthaa cannot be 'equated', since their ages are different, their looks are

different and their bodies are different. Even the complexion of Devadhatta's physical body would have changed. At the physical level, we do see differences, in all respects, between the former Devadhatthaa and the present Devadhatthaa and as such, they, cannot be equated. But, if we are still equating the two and accepting the equation, it is because of the 'person' inside the two different types of the physical body. The superficial bodily difference is ignored and the identity of Devadhatthaa is recognized, considering the inner person of the bodies.

The same principle is applied in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*. *Kaarana Paramaathmaa* has got *prapanchathrayam* as the body and *kaarya jeevaathmaa* has got *sareerathrayam* as the body. The two bodies – *sareerathrayam* of *jeevaathmaa* and *prapanchathrayam* of *Paramaathmaa* – are to be removed . Both the adjectives '*Paramaa*' and '*jeevaa*' are to be detached and dropped. The *vyashti chidhaabhaasaa* and *samashthi chidhaabhaasaa* are also to be set aside. What is left behind is *aathmaa* ; that *aathmaa* is *ekaathmaa* only. This is the idea conveyed.

Reverting to the text (verse 75):

ॐ तत्त्वमौ - The 'thath padhaartha' and 'thvam padhaartha'
'thath' + 'thvam' = 'thatthvamau' (dhvandha samaasam).

ॐ व्युत्थितौ - going above their vaachyaartha-s or primary or direct meanings,

'व्युत्थयन्नम्' (व्युत्थानं) means 'rising up against' / 'going above'. An example of the use of this word can be found in the Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad in a popular manthraa, which runs "Etham vai tham aathmaanam vidhithvaa Braahmanaa: puthraishanaayaascha vitthaishanaayaascha lokaishanaayaascha vyuththaaya atha bhikshaacharyam charanthi" (III.v.1) – " Knowing this very Self, the Braahmanaa-s renouncing the desire for sons, for wealth and for the worlds, lead a mendicant's life". Though the word 'vyuthyaaya' literally means 'going above' , in this manthraa, it implies 'going above grahastha aasramaa' or 'renouncing'. In the context of this verse 75, of Naishkarmya Siddhi (CH. III), the term 'Vyutthithau' conveys, that, the two words 'thath' and 'thvam' go above or beyond their primary meanings. They drop their vaachyaartha-s and assume their lakshyaartha-s.

ॐ अनालिङ्गित सामान्यौ - and dropping their *vaachyaartha*-s,

'Saamaanyau' means 'vaachyaartha-s' or 'primary meanings'. 'aalingitha' means 'embracing' or 'adopting / taking' ; 'anaalingitha' means 'dropping'.

ॐ न जिहासित वादिनौ - do not convey the irrelevant portions like the 'superior' attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and inferior attributes of *jeevathmaa*.

Once their *vaachyaartha*-s are dropped, those two words do not communicate the *sareerathrayam* through *thvam padhaartha* and the *prapanchathrayam* through *thath padhaartha*. *Sarvagnyathvam* of *Pramaathmaa* is not communicated by the word '*thath*' and *alpathvam* of *jeevaathmaa* is not communicated by '*thvam*'. All these get communicated only when *vaachyaartha*-s are attributed to the words. When the *vaachyaartha*-s are dropped, along with the *vaachyaartha*-s, the superior attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and the inferior attributes of *jeevaathmaa* are also divested.

'*Haathum ishtam*' is '*jihaasitham*', which means 'desired to be given up'. '*Jihaasitham vadhathi ithi jihaasitha vaadhin*'. '*Na jihaasitha vaadhinau*' means 'they desire to give up conveying the irrelevant portions of their *vaachyaartha*-s viz., the superior and inferior attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* respectively'. Once the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' drop their *vaachyaartha*-s, their mutual antagonism or opposition will go away. They remain opposed to each other only as long as their *vaachyaartha*-s are taken. The moment the *vaachyaartha*-s are removed, the *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* can be equated. This is conveyed dramatically as : "The words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' who were looking at opposite directions, turn around towards each other, with a readiness for merger into one".

ॐ तस्मात् अन्योन्य अभिसमीक्षणौ - Therefore, they look at each other, with expectance.

That means they are no more opposed to each other. They are non-antagonistic terms now. '*Anyonya abhisameekshanam*' means 'looking at each other'. '*abhi*' means 'in the direction of the other'. '*Thath padhaa*' is 'looking at' '*thvam padhaa*' and '*thvam padhaa*' is 'looking at' '*thath padhaa*'. Once they are 'looking at' each other, the irritants are gone ; '*asi*' will come and join each other.

The verb is not there in this verse. We have to supply the verb '*bhavatha.*'| '*Thathvamau* is the subject of the sentence and all other words in the verse are subjective complements. Each of them should be read with the verb '*bhavatha.*', as '*vyutthithau bhavatha.*', '*anaalingitha saamaanyau bhavatha.*', '*jijaasitha vaadhinau bhavatha.*' and '*(thasmaath) anyonya abhi sameekshanau bhavatha.*' |

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 76 :

अपास्त सामान्यार्थत्वात् अनुवादस्थत्वात् विधीयमानेन च सह विरोधात् दुःखित्वादेः अस्तु कामं जिहासितार्थयोः असंसर्गः यथोपन्यस्त दोष विरहात्
तत्त्वमर्थयोः सम्सर्गः अस्तु नीलोत्पलवत् इति चेत् न एवम् उपपद्यते । तस्मात् ।

Let the terms 'That' and 'Thou' be interpreted this way as not meaning a complex of many items, for avoiding the difficulty specified, on the ground that they signify no universal as usual and that the connotation of 'subjection to misery' etc. carried by the term 'Thou' is simply for reference and is in conflict with what is predicated by the term 'That'. But the signification of a complex whole may still be admitted on the part of their implied meanings, as in the case of the term 'Blue Lotus'. If it is thus claimed, we reply that this is not tenable.

Now, a *poorva pakshin* who does not want to accept total *eiikyam* between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* comes for a compromise. His aim is to somehow reject the concept of *total eiikyam*. He says "Let us assume that *vaachyaarthaa-s* have contradiction; and, therefore let us remove *vaachyaarthaa-s* ; let us come to *lakshyaarthaa-s*. *Jeevaathmaa* has got *thvam padha lakshyaarthaa*; *Paramaathmaa* also has got a *lakshyaarthaa*. Now, I concede that the *lakshyaarthaa-s* do not have a contradiction. Therefore, let them come together. I am willing to bring the *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* together. Even so, I do not want to accept *total* identity between them. I want to say 'let *jeevaathmaa* be a *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa* or let *Paramaathmaa* be a *viseshanam* of *jeevaathmaa*".

'*Viseshanam* and *viseshyam*' mean 'attribute and substance'. Substance and attribute never become one. They exist only in proximity to each other. An example is 'cloth' and its 'colour'. The two exist in proximity to each other; but, they never have merger into oneness. Cloth does not become colour; colour does not become cloth. But, both of them are co-existing so intimately, that they are treated as one by the people. Cloth and colour are *treated* as one; but there is no total *eiikyam*, because colour happens to be *viseshnam* and cloth happens to be *viseshyam*.

This is the approach suggested by the *poorva pakshin*. This approach to have *jeevaathmaa* as a *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa* is called '*visishta advaitham*'. '*Visishtaadvaitin-s*' say "We are not totally against *advaitam*. We do accept *advaitam* partly; we reject *dvaitam* totally; but, not *advaitam*. At the same time, our acceptance of *advaitam* is also not total. Let *jeevaathmaa* be an adjective, dependent on *Paramaathmaa*."

The *visishtaadvaitin-s* want *jeevaathmaa's* perpetual dependence on *Paramaathmaa*. The *bhakthaa* should always supplicate *Bhagavaan*: "I am Yours; I am always dependent on You". They call this attitude '*naichchiya bhaava:*', which is considered to be a virtue of a *bakthaa*. One of the virtues in *Visishtaadvaitam* is *naichchiya bhaava:*, which means 'attitude of belittling oneself to a subordinate position'. The devotee consistently considers himself inferior to *Bhagavaan*. He says to *Bhagavaan* : "I am useless; I am nothing by myself. If at all I am something, it is only because of Your grace. I am always at Your feet".

The *chinmudhraa* is ingeniously modified by the *visishtaadvaitin-s* to suit this attitude. In this modified *mudhraa*, the forefinger, representing *jeevaathmaa*, will not touch the top of the thumb, representing *Paramaathmaa*. Instead, it will touch the root of the thumb, meaning "*Jeevaathmaa* is *Paramaathmaa's viseshanam*; *Paramaathmaa* is the *Viseshyam*".

With this approach in mind, the *visishtaadvaitin-s* tell the *advaitin-s*: "Why do we not compromise? Let us have neither total *dvaitam* nor total *advaitam*. We will have a special relationship between *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* - *viseshana vishesya sambhandha:*"

This is termed '*samsarga thaathaathmiyam*' - 'merging into one, retaining separateness', like the cloth and its colour. The two have joined together; but, even after joining, they are distinct from each other. Colour is colour and cloth is cloth.

The technical word for the *visishtaadvaitin's* *abedhaa* is '*samsarga abedhaa*'; *advaitin's* *abedhaa* is called *adhyantha abedhaa*.

This compromise is offered by a *poorva pakshin* in this *sambhandha gadhyam*. But, *Sureswaraachaaryaa*, being a ruthless *advaitin*, rejects this compromise. He says:

"No way; the *eykyam* / oneness between *jaavaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* is absolute. *Jeevaathmaa* is not a *viseshanam*. *Jeevaathmaa* is *Paramaathmaa*. *Paramaathmaa* is *jeevathma*. Words are different; but *vasthu ekam eva*"

Reverting to the text (the *poorva pakshin's* compromise offer):

ॐ अपास्त सामान्य अर्थत्वात् - Since the primary meanings (of 'thvam' padhaa and 'thath' padhaa) are dropped,

Through this term, the *poorva pakshin* indicates his willingness to compromise. Compromise means partial acceptance. He implies: "I have accepted your view partly. I agree to drop *vaachyaartha's*. This is acceptable".

ॐ अनुवादस्थत्वात् - and since 'thvam' padhaa is accepted as 'subject' of the mahaa vaakyam,

The *poorva pakshin* further concedes: "I do accept that the word *thvam*, meaning *jeevaathmaa*, is the subject / *uddhisyaamaana padham* of the *mahaa vaakyam*".

To recollect part of our earlier discussions: We saw, that, according to the *Advaitin*, in the *mahaa vaakyam*, *thvam padhaa* is *uddhisyaamaana padham*; therefore it is *anoodhyamaanam* / *anuvaadham*; it is a reference to a known thing; not a new teaching. Whatever is new will have more power. Therefore, *thvam padhaa* must be available for a compromise.

An example was also cited in this context, viz., 'the 'small' star is big star'; we saw, that, in that statement, the adjective 'small' should be knocked off, for removal of contradiction. What was the grammatical reason given? **Ans:** "The adjective 'small' belongs to the *uddhisyaamaana padham* / *anoodhyamaana padham*, while the adjective 'big' is adjective to the *vidheeyamaana padham*. The adjective to the *uddhisyaamaana padham* is *anuvaadha padham* and therefore the adjective 'small' should be knocked off for removal of contradiction. Whereas the adjective to the *vidheeyamaana padham* is *pramaana padham* and therefore, it should be retained". All these are based on the general rule, that the adjective of *vidheeyamaanam* is *pramaanam* and should not be dropped, while the adjective of *uddhisyaamaana padham* can be dropped.

Moving over to the *mahaa vaakyam*, '*samsaari*' is adjective to the *uddhisyaamaana jeevaathma thvam padhaarthaa*. For *Paramaathmaa*, '*asamsaari*' is the adjective. Since the two adjectives are contradictory in nature, when *jeevaathmaa* is equated to *Paramaathmaa*, one of the adjectives should be dropped to avoid the contradiction. Which one? **Ans:** '*Asamsaari*' is the *viseshanam* of *vidheeyamaana padham* and should not be dropped ; '*Samsaari*' is *viseshanam* of *uddhisyaamaana padham* and can be / should be dropped to validate the equation. This is the *Advaithin's* stand.

The *poorva pakshin* has understood this grammatical argument and is now willing to accept it. Therefore, he says '*anuvaadhasyathvaath*', implying "I do know that *thvam padhaa* is *anuvaadha padham*; therefore, I am willing to drop the *samsaari* adjective of the *uddhisyaamaana / anoodhyamaana / anuvaadha padham*, '*thvam*', referring to the *jeevaathma*, by *bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa*. I am willing to compromise. Now, after dropping *samsaari* adjective, there is no more contradiction. Only when the both the adjectives *samsaari* and *asamsaari* are there, there will be contradiction. Now that *samsaari* adjective has been taken from *thvam padhaa*, there is no contradiction". The *Advaithin* has obviously made some progress, in convincing the *poorva pakshin*, who concedes all these, for the sake of compromise. The *poorva pakshin* says:

ॐ विधीयमानेन च सह - with *thath padham* being the *vidheeyamaana padham*,

The English word for '*vidheeyamaanam*' is 'predicate' and the English word for '*uddhisyaamaanam*' is 'subject'. Subject is always weaker; predicate is always stronger, because predicate is the *pramaanam*.

ॐ (वाच्यार्थे) विरोधात् (लक्ष्यार्थे अविरोधात्) - and since contradiction will be there when primary meanings are given for the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' , and there will be no contradiction when primary meanings are dropped and target meanings are given to the words,

Though the text contains only the word '*virodhaath*', the student should supply the other words and read it as '*(vaachyaarthe) virodhaath (lakshyaarthe avirodhaath)*', since the implied statement of the *poorva pakshin* is '*poorvam vaachyaarthe virodhaath idhaaneem lakshyaarthe avirodhaath*' meaning 'earlier with the primary meanings, there was contradiction; now, with the secondary meanings, the contradiction is not there'.

'Virodhaa' will be there, if *samsaarithvaa* of the *jeevaathmaa* is retained. The *poorva pakshin* says "There also, I am compromising and dropping *samsaarithvam*".

Because of these reasons,

ॐ दुःखित्वादेः असंसर्गः अस्तु - let there be the rejection of the unwanted attributes like sorrow etc. of the *jeevaathmaa*,

'Asamsargha:' means 'rejection'. 'dhu:kithvam' means 'sorrow' or 'misery'. 'Sorrow' does not belong to *jeevaathmaa*, if you take the *lakshyaartha* of the word *jeevaathmaa*. Therefore, 'dhu:kithvaadhe: asamsarga: asthu' |

ॐ कामं - as desired by you ;

The word '*kaamam*', in this context, means 'as you like' / '*yatheshtam*'. It is not a noun here; but, is 'indeclinable'. This word, in this context, indicates compromise, implying the opponent's response: "All right. You can maintain your view on this. I am willing to come down to your view half way".

ॐ जिहासित अर्थयोः (असंसर्गः अस्तु) - not only the irrelevant part of *thvam padhaa*; similarly, let there be rejection of the irrelevant part of the *thath padhaa* also;

'Jihaasitha arthayo:' is 'dual' in number, 'jihaasitha arthayo: (asamsargha: asthu)' implying 'let there be rejection of the irrelevant meanings of belonging to both '*thvam*' *padhaa* and '*thath*' *padhaa*.

'*Dhu:kithvaadhe:*' should be connected to '*virodhaath*'. That should be taken as one clause and read as '*dhu:kithvaadhe: vidheeyamaanena saha virodhaath*' | And, thereafter, '*jahasitha arthayo: asamsarga: asthu*', should be read together, meaning 'let us drop / reject the irrelevant meanings of both of them, viz., the '*thvam*' *padhaa* and '*thath*' *padhaa*.

How much should be the 'rejection'? **Ans:** "Till the *eiyyam* can be brought in. Both *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* should keep on shedding weight, until their mutual 'repulsion' goes away and the 'repulsion' gives way to 'attraction'".

The *sareerathrayam* of the *jeevaathmaa* and the *prapancha thrayam* of the *Paramaathmaa* are both dropped, till the repulsion between them gives way to attraction. Now both of them are without any attribute. They have become *nirguna jeevaathmaa* and *nirguna Paramaathmaa*. *Jeevathmaa* has become *nirguna chaithanyam* and *Paramaathmaa* has become *nirguna satthaa* – Pure Existence.

The *poorva pakshin* says: "All these I accept. *Jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are attracted to each other and they are coming closer and closer. But, how close can they come? They should not become totally one. They should come and join like *anjali mudhraa*. *Jeevaathmaa* should come and join *Paramaathmaa*, but, without merging ; it should become an attribute of *Paramaathmaa*, because attribute is always intimate with the substance".

An attribute is never a separate substance; but, is always intimate with a substance. The substance and its attribute are inseparably intimate, just as the colour of the cloth cannot be isolated from the cloth. You can never see an adjective standing separate from the noun.

"Therefore" the *poorva pakshin (visishtaadvaitin)* suggests: "Let *jeevaathmaa* become an inseparable *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa*". He argues:

ॐ यथोपन्यस्त दोष विरहात् - since, now, (by taking lakshyarthaa-s), all the previously mentioned defects of 'contradiction' are gone, 'yatho upanaystham' means 'previously mentioned' and refers to the 'previously mentioned contradictions'. 'Virahaath' means 'since absent'.

ॐ संसर्गः अस्तु - let there be intimate contact (not eiykyam)

ॐ तत्त्वमर्थयो : - between thvam padhaartha jeevaathmaa and thadh padhaartha Paramaathmaa,

ॐ नीलोत्पलवत् - like a blue lily flower.

In this term '*neelothpalam*', denoting the flower 'blue lily', the word 'blue' and the word 'lily' are used in *saamaanaadhikaranam*. They are inseparable. They are intimate.

The *poorva pakshin* suggests to the *Advaitin*: "In a similar manner, why do you not choose to be intimately, but separately, in the presence of the Lord, always enjoying

that *mokshaa*. Why are you so adamant about *eiikyam*? Let *jeevaathmaa* be the adjective and *Paramaathmaa* be the noun / substance. Let us compromise"

A common argument of the *visishtaadvaitin*, to stress this view: "Why do you want to become sugar? Why cannot you be separate from the sugar and enjoy the taste of sugar? In fact, between 'becoming' sugar and 'tasting' sugar, which is better? If you become sugar, somebody else will eat you. On the other hand, if you decide to taste sugar, it will be wonderful." The *Advaitin's* answer to this, will be: "Even if you decide to taste / take sugar, where will it culminate? Where will it end? When you take sugar, the sugar is going to become one with you. Even if you are separate before tasting, when you keep on tasting sugar, ultimately, it merges into you. Therefore, you are becoming sugar or sugar is becoming you ultimately".

Up to this is the *visishtaadvaitin's* question. Sureswaraacharya gives his answer.

ॐ इति चेत् - If you ask such a question,

ॐ न एवं अपि उपपद्यते - it is not possible / not logical / not scriptural.

ॐ तस्मात् - Therefore: (my answer is in the verse)

(Swamiji says: "*Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* covers all these in a beautiful work called *Vaakyaavritthi*, a small text consisting of 53 verses, which text is purely an analysis of *thvam padhaa*, *thadh padhaa* and *asi padhaa*. In this text (verse 38), he nicely says '*Samsargo vaa visishto vaa vaakyartho naathra sammatha: / akanda eka rasathvena vaakyartho vidhushaam matha:*' – 'What is meant by the sentence (viz., the *mahaa vaakyam 'thath thvam asi'*) is not accepted either to be connected with or qualified by anything else. The meaning of the sentence, according to the wise, is an indivisible Being consisting of Bliss only'

"During an earlier study of this portion of the text, *Vaakyaavrutthi*, I have talked a lot on grammar. I mentioned, that, sentences are of three types, called (i) *samsargaartha bodhaka vaakyam* (ii) *visishtaartha bodhaka vaakyam* and (iii) *akandaartha bodhaka vaakyam*. I had analyzed and explained each type. In the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*, I had ruled out the first two and had shown how the *mahaa vaakyam* is *akandaartha bodhaka vaakyam*. I, therefore, do not intend to get into a detailed grammatical discussion now. That is explained by Sureswaraacharya here").

Chapter III: Verse 76 –

तदर्थयोस्तु निष्ठात्मा द्वयपारोक्ष्यवर्जितः ।

नाद्वितीयं विनात्मानं नात्मा नित्यदृशा विना ॥ ७६ ॥

The two terms have as their final import, the Self, which is at once without a second and is immediately revealed. To be without a second is not possible without identity with the Self and being the Self is impossible without identity with the eternal consciousness.

Sureswaraachaarya gives the answer: "Between jeevaathmaa and Paramaathmaa, viseshana-viseshya-sambhandhaa is never possible".

Viseshanam means 'attribute' or 'adjective'. Jeevaathmaa can never become a viseshanam of Paramaathmaa or Brahman. For that matter, nothing else also can. This is because Upanishad-s repeatedly declare that Brahman is nirgunam or nirviseshanam. Brahman does not accommodate any type of adjective or attribute. Mundakopnishad (manthraa I. 1 . 6) refers to Brahman as: "Yadh thath adhresyam agrahyam agothram avarnam achakshu:srothram thadh apaani paadham" – "That which cannot be perceived, which cannot be grasped, which is without a source, without properties, without eyes and ears, without hands and legs" etc. In Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad – Akshara Brahmanam (III.viii.8), the most powerful definition of the Immutable Brahman is given, as "asthoolam ananu ahrasvam adheergam alohitham asneham acchaayam athamo avaayu anaakaasam asangham arasam agandham achakshushkam asrothram avaag amano athejaskam apraanam amukham amaathram anantharam abhaahyam" - " (It is) neither gross, nor minute, neither short nor long, neither red in colour, nor oily, neither shadow nor darkness, neither air nor ether, unattached, neither with savour nor with odour, without eyes or ears, without the vocal organ or mind, non-luminous, without the vital force or mouth, without any measurement, without interior or exterior." Twenty-three words are given in this manthraa, indicating that the absolute Brahman does not accommodate any type of adjective.

The moment *Brahman* accommodates any adjective, it will become *savikaaram*, because, when an attribute undergoes a change, it will affect the substance which is intimately connected to the attribute. Therefore, *jeevaathmaa* cannot join *Paramaathmaa* as a *viseshanam*. *Jeevaathmaa* . can join *Paramaathmaa* only as *Paramaathmaa* itself - not as *viseshanam* . Thus, the concept of *jeevaathmaa* being

an 'adjective' of *Paramaathmaa* is not admissible, in *jeevaathmaa-Paramaathmaa* relationship, since *Paramaathmaa* does not accommodate any type of adjective.

The alternative, *Paramaathmaa* being a *viseshanam* of *jeevaathmaa* is also not possible. Why not? The explanation is as follows: The very definition of *Paramaathmaa*, the term '*thath*' in the *mahaa vaakyam*, is '*sath*'. The *mahaa vaakyam* '*thath thvam asi*' occurs in the sixth chapter of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*. There, *Uddhaalaka Aaruni*, the *guru* and father of *Svethakethu*, begins his teaching with the statement '*sadeva soumya idham agra aaseetthi*' (VI. 2.1) " O ! good looking one! In the beginning, this was Existence alone'. He, thus, defines *Paramaathmaa* / *Brahman*, as '*sath*', the 'Existence' principle. And, '*sath*' cannot be an adjective of any noun, including *jeevaathmaa*. Why not? **Ans:** "Suppose there is a substance, for which '*sath*' has to be an adjective. Obviously, the substance has to be different from '*sath*', since, only when a 'substance' and its 'adjective' are different, there can be 'noun-adjective' relationship between the two. Now, if there is a substance different from '*sath*' / other than '*sath*', what will be its nature? 'Other than *sath*' means '*asath*'. If at all '*sath*' is to be adjective to some substance, that substance has to be '*asath*', and '*asath*' means 'non-existent'. That means there is no such noun, for which '*sath*' can be adjective. No substance is possible for which '*sath*' can be adjective. Since the very definition of *Paramaathmaa* is '*sath*', *Paramaathmaa* cannot be a *viseshanam* to anything, including *jeevaathmaa*.

To put in a nutshell: (1) *Jeevaathmaa* cannot be *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa*, because scriptures describe *Paramaathmaa* or *Brahman* as '*nirgunam*' and '*nirviseshanam*'. When *Brahman* cannot have any *viseshanam*, according to *Vedic* scriptures, *jeevaathmaa* also cannot be considered as *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa*. (2) *Paramaathmaa* cannot be *viseshanam* of *jeevaathmaa*, since, *Paramaathmaa* being '*sath*', any substance to which it becomes adjective will have to be different from it / other than '*sath*' / '*asath*' / non-existent. Other than '*sath*' nothing else can exist.

Therefore, *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* cannot have *viseshana - viseshya-bhaava sambhandhaa*, one because of logical reasoning and the other because of scriptural statements. Therefore, what can be the *sambhandhaa* between the two? '*Abedha sambhandhaa*' can be the only answer, which means they are one and the same. *Paramaathmaa* can never be away from *jeevaathmaa*; *Paramaathmaa* has to be identical with *jeevaathmaa*. Therefore, neither *dvaitham* is acceptable nor

visishtaadvaitam is acceptable. *Nirvisesha advaitam* alone is acceptable and that alone is revealed by *mahaa vaakyam*.

Therefore who am 'I'? Am 'I' different from *Paramaathmaa* or adjective of *Paramaathmaa*? **Ans:** 'I' am neither different nor a *viseshanam*; *aham Brahma asmi*.

Reverting to the *slokaa* (verse 76):

ॐ तदर्थयोः निष्ठा - The convergence of the meanings of the two words 'thath' and 'thvam'

'nishtaa' means 'convergence' / 'culmination' / 'destination'. Of what? 'thadharthayo: - 'thath padha thvam padhayo:' / 'of the meanings of the two words 'thath' and 'thvam'".

ॐ आत्मा भवति - is the one *nirvisesha aathmaa*.

Their convergence is in one single *nirvisesha aathmaa*; their convergence is neither *jeevaathma-visishta-Paramaathmaa* nor *Paramaathma-visishta-jeevathmaa*. And, what is the nature of that *nirvisesha eka aathmaa*?

ॐ द्वय वर्जितः - which *ekaathmaa* does not allow any type of duality,

'dhvaya varjitha:' means 'ekam eva adhvitheeyam'. The *eka aathmaa* does not stand or allow any type of duality – *sajaatheeya bedhaa* , *vijaatheeya bedhaa* or *svagatha bedhaa*.

'Sajaatheeyaa bedhaa' means 'difference between two members of one and the same species – such as , 'manushya-manushya-bedhaa' / the difference between one human and another.

'Vijaatheeya bedhaa' means 'difference between two members, each belonging to a different species' – for example, 'manushya-vruksha bedhaa' / the difference between a human and a tree.

The third type is 'svagath bedhaa', like 'differences existing within one member', like *manushya avaanthara bedha:* / differences between the head of a man, the hand of the same man etc.

Eka aathmaa does not allow sajaatheeya bedhaa or vijaatheeya bedhaa or svagatha bedhaa. That means that **any** bedhaa such as viseshana-viseshya-bedhaa, anga-angi-bedhaa, amsa-amsi-bedhaa, sareera-sareeri-bedhaa etc., is not acceptable. No form of bedhaa is acceptable. The teaching of Katopanishad (I.ii.22) is: "Asareeram sareereshu anavastheshu avasthitham mahaantham vibhum aathmaanam mathva dheera: na sochathi" – "Having known the aathmaa, which is bodiless, which is the permanent one in the impermanent bodies, which is big, and which is all-pervading, the discriminative one does not grieve". Eka aathmaa is asareeram; where is the question of sareera-sareeri-bhaava:? In the Chaandhoghya Upanishad also, the teaching in the 8th chapter (VIII.12.1) is "na vai sasareerasya satha: priyaapriyayo: apahathi: asthi asareeram vaava santham na priyaappriye sprusatha:" – "Surely, for that which remains embodied, there can be no elimination of the desirable and the undesirable. But, the desirable and the undesirable cannot surely touch (It) which has become un-embodied". It is also said "asareero vaa ayam aathmaa" – "This aathma, indeed, is bodiless" | Thus, where is the question of sareera-sareeri-sambhandha:? Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa avers "dhvaya varjitha:" | So visesha-viseshya concept is not acceptable. And,

ॐ पारोक्ष्य (वर्जितः) - and, in that ekaathmaa there is no remoteness also.

'Paarokshyam' means 'distance' or 'remoteness'. Before the aspirant takes to *mahaa vaakyam* he can say '**that** Paramaathmaa'; you can use the term '**that**' to qualify *Paramaathmaa* and look up beyond the clouds, hoping to go 'there' through *sukla gathi*. But, all such approaches are only until the aspirant is exposed to *mahaa vaakyam* and imbibes its import. Thereafter, the adjective 'that' must be removed. No more should he say '**that**' God. Therefore, distance is also removed. And, when the word 'that' is removed, the word 'this' also will become redundant, because there is only one *aathmaa*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says "*dhvaya paaarokshya varjitha ekaathmaa nishtaa bhavathi*" – "non-dual and non-remote *ekaathmaa* is the culmination of the understanding of the *lakshyaartha*-s of '*thadh*' and '*thvam*'.

And, this conclusion is arrived at also because,

ॐ आत्मानं विना न अद्वितीयं (भवति) - (Paramaathmaa) cannot become non-dual, without merger or identity with jeevaathmaa.

Unless the aspirant merges the *jeevaathmaa* into *Paramaathmaa* absolutely, *Paramaathmaa* cannot be non-dual or *nirviseshanam*, as declared in the scriptures. If he joins *Paramaathmaa* as an adjective to *jeevaathmaa*, then there will not be non-duality; if you join *Paramaathmaa* as *viseshanam* also, there will be duality. What type? **Ans:** *Viseshana viseshya dhvayam* / Therefore, if *advaita siddhi* should take place, as stipulated by scriptures, *jeevaathmaa* should not stand as *viseshanam* or *viseshyam* but should become one with *Paramaathmaa*. The '*anavayam*' for this portion of the verse is '*aathmaanam vinaa (Brahma) adhvitheeyam na (bhavathi)*'

Therefore *jeevaathmaa* should merge into *Paramaathmaa* totally and not like *neelothpalam*. Similarly,

ॐ नित्यदृसा विना आत्मा न (अस्ति) - Without *jeevaathmaa* merging totally into *Paramaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* cannot even exist.

'*Nityadhruk*', here, refers to *Paramaathmaa*. Without *Paramaathmaa* merging into *jeevaathmaa* totally (that has to be supplied) *aathmaa naasthi*. *Aathmaa* cannot even exist . What is the reason? Because *Paramaathmaa* is the *sath* principle and if *sath* does not join *jeevaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* cannot have even existence.

In brief: Without *jeevaathmaa* merging into *Paramaathmaa*, *Paramaathmaa* cannot become non-dual and without *Paramaathmaa* merging into *jeevaathmaa*, *jeevaathmaa* cannot even exist. Therefore, the aspirant has to merge them totally, for the existence of *jeevaathmaa* and for the non-duality of *Paramaathmaa*. Then alone, scripture will be happy.

183: Chapter III, Verses 76 and 77 (05-06-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is continuing to analyze the *mahaa vaakyam*.

In this 76th verse, he is answering a possible grammatical question. In Sanskrit language, sentences are classified into 3 types (1) *samsargaartha bodhaka vaakyam* (2) *visishtaartha bodhaka vaakyam* and (3) *abedhaartha bodhaka vaakyam*.

Sureswaraachaarya wants to establish that *mahaa vaakyam* is an *abedhaartha bodhaka vaakyam* and not the other two. This topic has been dealt with, in detail, during an earlier study of the text '*Vaakyaa vrutthi*'. Those details should be remembered here.

A sentence, by definition, is a formation using different words. In the *samsargaartha bodhaka vaakyam*, the first type of sentences, the words in the sentence will reveal different objects and the relationship existing among the various objects.

An example of *samsargaartha bodhaka vaakyam-s*, is the sentence: "Rama cut the fruits with a knife". In this sentence, there are three nouns (1) Rama (2) fruits and (3) knife. 'Rama' is the 'subject' of the sentence; the word 'fruits' is the 'object'; and, 'knife' is the instrument. The word 'cut' is the verb of the sentence. The verb talks about an action, which involves an accessory or instrument, viz., the 'knife'. The relationship of the nouns with the instrument is revealed by the word 'with', which word, as is known, is called a 'preposition', in the English language. 'From', 'in', 'at', 'through', 'for', 'with', 'by', 'of' etc., are some of the different prepositions in English. The prepositions in a sentence will reveal the relationships existing between the different nouns in the sentence.

In Sanskrit, 'prepositions' are conveyed through what are called '*vibakthi*' in Sanskrit grammar, translated as 'case endings or 'case terminations'. If this sentence, "Rama cut the fruits with a knife", is expressed in Sanskrit, '*thrutheeyaa vibakthi* / 'third case ending' will be used for the 'knife', which use will show that 'knife' is the instrument; '*Dvithaayaa vibakthi* / 'second case ending' will be used for the 'fruits', which *vibakthi* will show the word as the 'object'.

Now, in this sentence, several objects are talked about or revealed; in other words the sentence reveals 'plurality' – not *advaitam*. This is true of all such sentences; several words will be there, revealing several objects / revealing *dvaitam* or *bahuthvam*. And, the relationship among those objects, as already pointed out, will be indicated by various prepositions in the language. All such sentences revealing plurality, with internal relationships, are called *samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyani*.

The second type of sentence is 'visishta advaita bodhaka vaakyam', in which also, there are many nouns in the sentence, which nouns do not reveal many objects, but only one object with different qualifications, indicated by adjectives in the sentence.

The well-known Githaa Dhyana Slokam "Prapanna Paarijathaaya thothra vethraika paanaye jnaanmudhraaya Krishnaaya Geethamruthadhuhe nama:" is a classical example. In this sentence, several words are there: 'Prapanna paarijaatha:', 'thothra vetraika paani:', 'Jnaanamudra:', 'geethaamruthu dhuk" etc. Words are many; but, all of them reveal only one Krishna, with different qualifications. Therefore, the sentence can be said to reveal *advaitam* – i.e. one Krishna.

Since, thus, the words do not reveal different objects, but one Krishna, but, with various attributes of the one and same Krishna, we conclude that *visishta advaitam* is revealed by the sentence. The sentence reveals only one; but that one is qualified with various attributes. Such sentences are called *visishta artha bodhaka vaakyani*.

The third and last type of sentence is '*abedha artha bodhaka vaakyam*', where also, the sentence will have several nouns, again revealing only one entity, but, without any qualifying adjectives. The usual example given for this type of sentence is "*soyam Devadhattha:*" – "That Devadhatthaa whom you met fifteen years before and who was your friend, is this Devadhatthaa". In this sentence, what is revealed is one Devadhatthaa, who is the common entity between the past and the present; and, while understanding that Devadhatthaa, we forget all his past physical features as well as all his present physical features. This is because if you remember his past features, you cannot equate with present Devadhatthaa and if you keep in mind his present features, you cannot equate with past Devadhatthaa. So, from the sentence "*soyam devadhattha:*", you understand a common Devadhatthaa, who is stripped of both the past features and the present features; the Devadhatthaa understood, is without the attributes of the past as well as the attributes of the present.

Devadhatthaa does have attributes; but, the 'understood Devadhatthaa' is *nirvishesha* Devadhatthaa. This sentence is, therefore, called '*nirvishesha advaita bodhaka vaakyam*' or '*abedha artha bodhaka vaakyam*'.

Thus, 'samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam' reveals 'dvaitham' or 'bahuthvam'; 'visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam' reveals 'visishta advaitam'; 'abedha artha bodhaka vaakyam' reveals 'nirvishesha advaitam'.

Now, the debate or controversy is: "Under which category does *mahaa vaakyam* come?"

We can straightaway negate the first possibility, viz. *samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam*. That possibility is not there, because, in whichever sentence *samsargaathmakam* is there, in that sentence, there must be 'case endings' or 'prepositions'. Whereas, in '*thatthvamas!*', there are no case endings at all. '*Thatth*' is a noun; so is '*thvam*'. '*As!*' is the verb. There is no preposition at all – 'from', 'with', 'for', 'in', 'at' etc. The *mahaa vaakyam* is not revealing '*jeevaathmaa and Paramaathmaa*', because the preposition 'and' is not there. Nor does the *mahaa vaakyam* say '*jeevaathmaa is from Paramaathmaa*'; nor, '*jeevaathmaa is with Paramaathmaa*'; nor, '*jeevaathmaa is existing for Paramaathmaa*'. As we saw already, prepositions alone will reveal two separate and different entities having a relationship. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* is not a '*samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam*'. In Sanskrit, this conclusion can be expressed as "*saamaanaadhikaranya prayogaath mahaa vaakyam na samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam*" or as "*vibhakthi abhaavaath mahaa vaakyam na samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam*". "*Saamaanaadhikaaranya vaakyam*" means 'a statement without any prepositions'.

Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* does not reveal *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* as two separate entities having a relationship. It only says "*jeevaathmaa is Paramaathmaa*".

Having thus concluded that the first option is ruled out by the rule '*vibhakthi abhaavaath mahaa vaakyam na samsarga bodhaka vaakyam*', what is the next or second possibility? Can you take it as *visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam*, like *neelam uthpalam*? That was the suggestion the *poorva pakshin* makes in the introduction to the 76th verse, now being discussed.

The *poorvapakshin* suggests "*thaththvamarthayo: neelothpalavath samsarga: asthu*" – "Let there be a relationship between *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*, similar to the 'blue' colour of a lotus and the lotus". In other words, he asks "Why cannot you take *mahaa vaakyam* as a *visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam*?" When you say 'blue lotus', there is no preposition between the two words, 'blue' and 'lotus'; there *are* two words, but, the two *together* reveal only one substance, viz., 'a blue lily'. The word 'blue' is an adjective to the substance 'lotus'. 'Blue' is not 'lotus'; it does not become a lotus. It is only an attribute of lotus. The *poorvapakshin* asks the question "Why cannot you take '*thaththvamasl*' as a *visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam*, like the term '*neelothpalam*'?" His suggestion is: "Similar to the 'blueness' not being the 'lotus', but is only an attribute of the lotus, *Jeevaathmaa* is not *Paramaathmaa*, but, is an attribute of *Paramaathmaa*. There is one *Paramaathmaa* and all the *jeevaathmaa*-s, as well as the entire universe are His *viseshanam*-s / attributes. This, in my opinion, fits in very well. I agree, that, there is only one *Isvara - eka: Isvara: |* World is an adjective of that *eka Isvara:* and all of us *jeevaathmaa*-s are also adjectives of that *eka Isvara: |* Both the world and the *jeevaa*-s are dependent on *Paramaathmaa*, because adjectives or attributes can never exist independent of the substance. *Paramaathmaa* is *svathanthra: | Jeeva:* is *paranthanthra viseshanam* to *Paramaathmaa*. *Jagath* is also *paranthanthra viseshanam* to *Paramaathmaa*. Why can't we take it that way? You should accept 'I am *paranthanthra:*' and supplicate *Paramaathmaa* '! Lord! I am dependent on you'. Why can't you do that?"

The *Advaitin's* reply to this would be: "I wish I could take it that way; but, if I do that, there will be several problems. If *mahaa vaakyam* is to be understood as a *visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam*, what are the two possibilities? We should either take *Paramaathmaa* as *viseshanam* to *jeevaathmaa* or take *jeevaathmaa* as *viseshanam* to *Paramaathmaa*. But, both are not possible. Why not? **Ans:** To suggest *Paramaathmaa* as *viseshanam* of *jeevaathmaa* is comical / laughable, because, it would mean *Paramaathmaa* is dependent on *jeevaathmaa*. Such a consideration is more in the nature of a 'joke'. When *samsaari jeevaa* himself is miserable, how can he accept *Paramaathmaa* as 'dependent' on him? So, that possibility is ruled out. Then, can we take *jeevaathmaa* as attribute or *viseshanam* of *Paramaathmaa*? I say that is also not possible, because of two reasons. (1) The first reason: If *jeevaathmaa* becomes an attribute of *Paramaathmaa*, *samsaarithvam* which is the attribute of *jeevaathmaa*, will become an indirect attribute of *Paramaathmaa* also. And, if all the *jeevaa*-s become attributes of *Paramaathmaa*, the *samsaaraa* of all the *jeevaa*-s will be the *samsaaraa* of *Paramaathmaa* also. And,

since the *jeevaa*-s continue eternally, *Paramaathmaa's samsaaraa* will also continue eternally. *Bhagavaan* will be subject to constant worry, without any relief. This situation is not tenable. (2) The second and the more important reason: *Upanishad*-s declare *Paramaathmaa* as free from all attributes. Any number of *Upanishad manthraa*-s can be cited to show that *Paramaathmaa* is *nirvishesham*. That being the case, how can *jeevaa* or *jagath* be considered as *viseshanam* to *Paramaathmaa*?"

Therefore, what is the conclusion? **Ans:** "Mahaa vaakyam can neither be a samsarga artha bodhaka vaakyam nor a visishta artha bodhaka vaakyam. It has to be an abedhaartha bodhaka vaakyam only, similar to the statement 'soyam Devadhattha:'".

In the statement '*soyam Devadhattha:*', one understands the single Devadhatthaa, who is common to the past and to the present, by removing from one's mind, the past features of Devadhatthaa and also his present features. In a similar manner, when the aspirant tries to understand the *mahaa vaakyam*, he should drop both the superior attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and the inferior attributes of *jeevaathmaa*. Both the superior attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and the inferior attributes of *jeevaathmaa* belong to *maayaa* and are therefore *mithyaa*. *Advaita Vedhaanthee* does not say that the attributes are *never* there. It only proclaims that both the superior attributes of *Paramaathmaa* and the inferior attributes of *jeevaathmaa* belong to *vyaavahaarika sathyam / mithyaa* and are, therefore, not inherent. What are left behind, when the aspirant, thus, drops the attributes? **Ans:** "*Paramaathmaa* minus superior attributes, remains as *Sath / 'Pure Existence'*. *Chaandoghya Upanishad* refers to *Brahman* as '*sath*', in its declaration '*sadheva idham agra aaseeth*'. *Jeevaathmaa* minus inferior attributes, remains as '*Chith / 'Pure Consciousness'*".

And, *Upanishad*-s declare, that *Sath* and *Chith* are not two separate entities, that, "*sadheva chith chideva sath*". The teachings "'I', the *chith*, am non separate from *Sath*, in all the three periods of time", "that 'I', *Brahman*, alone am appearing as *vyavahaarika jeevaa*" and "that 'I' alone am appearing as *vyavaharika Isvara* also" are what *Vedhaanthee* reveals.

"'I', the attribute-less *Brahman* alone, am appearing in the empirical plane as the attributed *jeevaa*" is one statement of *Vedhaanthee*. And, the next mind- boggling /

frightening statement is "I, the *nirvishesham Brahman* alone, am appearing as the *savishesha Isvara* also".

The first part of the 2nd verse of Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa's Maneeshaa Panchakam runs: "Brahmaivaaham jagath cha sakalam chinmaathravisthaaritham sarvam cha ethadh avidhyayaa thrigunayaa asesham mayaa kalpitham" – "I am Brahman, the Pure Consciousness; it is 'Pure Consciousness' which 'appears' as this universe; all this / universe is only something conjured up by me, because of avidhyaa (nescience), which is composed of three gunaa-s (sattva, rajas and thamas)".

All the three, viz., savishesha-saguna jeevaa, savishesha - saguna jagath and savishesha - saguna Isvara are 'appearing' in 'me', the nirvishesham Brahman, because of maayaa.

Kaivalya Upanishad (manthraa 19) also declares : "Mayyeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvam layam yaathi, thadh brahma adhvayam asmi aham" – "Everything is born in 'me' alone; everything is based on 'me' alone; everything is resolved in 'me' alone. 'I' am that non-dual Brahman".

"This alone can be taken as the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*" points out Sureswaraachaaryaa, in this verse 76 (of Chapter III – *Naishkarmya Siddhi*).

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 77:

अत्राह । किमिह जिहासितं किं वोपादित्सितमिति । उच्यते । प्रत्यगात्मार्थ अभिधायिनः त्वंपदादुभयं प्रतीयतेऽहं दुःखी प्रत्यगात्मा च । तत्र च प्रत्यगात्मनोऽहं दुःखीत्यनेनभिसंबन्ध आत्मयाथात्म्यानवबोधहेतुक एव । अतोऽहमर्थः अनर्थ उपस्पृष्टत्वात् अज्ञानोत्थत्वाच्च हेय इति प्रत्यक्षतः अवसीयते । तदर्थं किं हेयं किं वोपादेयमिति नावघ्नियते । तत इदमभिधीयते।

It is to be decided as to what aspects of the meanings of the two terms 'Thou' and 'That' are to be rejected and what are to be taken up. By the term 'Thou', reference is made to the fact that the subject is in misery and that it is the immediate Self. The connection of the immediate Self with misery, is only due to the non-apprehension of the real nature of the Self. Therefore, by perception itself, it is established that the ego must be discarded, as evil enters into its being and as it arises from ignorance. What is to be accepted and what is rejected in the import of 'That' is not determined. Hence the next statement:

Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa explains how the *mahaa vaakyam* should be operated as *abedha artha bodhaka vaakyam*. It is exactly as in the case of the statement '*soyam Devadhattha:*'| When Devadhattha, the person whom you had known years before, is brought before you and introduced by another person as 'this is that same Devadhattha, whom you had known years before', you recollect the past Devadhattha, which Devadhattha had a set of features, totally different from the features of the Devadhattha now in front. So, when the introducer equates them – the past and the present Devadhattha - what phenomenon happens in your mind? To understand both of them as one, what should you do? **Ans:** "Temporarily, you should forget both the past and present features, and understand the featureless Devadhattha, behind the past and present features. The term '*featureless Devadhattha*', of course, does not mean that Devadhattha and his features are to be 'physically' separated. It cannot be done. You can do it only mentally / intellectually. This mental/ intellectual stripping of features which are different, is called *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa* / Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, while interpreting *mahaa vaakyam*, this '*bhaagathyaagha*' has to be done, with reference to both *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*, when they are 'equated'. First, he takes up the case of *jeevaathmaa* for this 'stripping off' exercise

The aspirant should strip *jeevaathmaa* of all its *mithyaa* features, which are irrelevant in the *mahaa vaakyam* context. In mundane existence, he can give an appropriate introduction of himself, as the situation demands. But, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam*, he should know what should be stripped off from the *jeevaathmaa*. That is what Sureswaraachaaryaa is explaining. In other words, '*Thvam padha bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa*' is talked about, in this introduction.

ॐ अत्र - In this context of operating the *mahaa vaakyam* as *abedha artha bodhaka vaakyam*,

ॐ आह - the following points are to be noted.

ॐ किं इह जिहासितं - - 'Which all features should be dropped?'

We should first ask the question "Which all features of 'mine' (the *jeevaathmaa*) should be dropped from 'me', for *ejykyam* with *Paramaathmaa*, for boldly claiming "I am *Paramaathmaa*", without any hesitation / reservation / fear? Which all features

should I disclaim or de-identify with?" '*jihaasitham*' is derived as '*haathum ishtam*' meaning 'desired to be disclaimed/ rejected / handed over to the *anaathmaa*'.

But, in the process of 'rejection', the aspirant should not 'throw the baby away with the bathwater'; he has to retain certain other features. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ किं वा उपादित्सितं - (and) 'What are the features that are to be retained?';

'Upaaditsitham' means 'that, which should be retained'.

This 'partial rejection with partial acceptance' is termed 'bhaagathyaaghaa'.

ॐ इति - if these questions are asked,

ॐ उच्यते - I will answer in detail .

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मार्थं अभिधायिनः त्वंपदात् - When the aspirant listens to the word 'thvam', in 'thath thvam asi', from that word 'thvam', which is revealing the prathyag aathmaa primarily,

ॐ उभयं प्रतीयते - two components are grasped together, (viz.,)

When the teacher addresses the student as '*thvam*', the student naturally has to understand the word as referring to him; i.e. as 'I'; and, there are two components belonging to that word 'I'. What are the two components? **Ans:** "One is *aathmaa* and the other is *ahamkaara*." | And, it is this *aathmaa-ahamkaara* mixture, which is listening to the teaching of the *mahaa vaakyam*. *Aathmaa* cannot listen to the *vaakyam*, by itself. Why not? **Ans:** "Because, it does not have the mind or the ears. *Aathmaa* by itself, cannot hear, because it does not have hearing instruments". Then, why not *ahamkaara* hear the *mahaa vaakyam*? **Ans:** "No, because, *Ahamkaara*, by itself, cannot even have existence or consciousness without *aathmaa*. *Ahamkaara* is a *mithyaa jada padhaartha*. This *mithyaa jada ahamkaara* borrows *sath* also from *aathmaa* and *chith* also from *aathmaa*. In other words, behind the *ahamkaara*, *aathmaa* is always there, lending it *sath* and *chith*". Since, thus, neither *aathmaa alone* nor *ahamkaara alone* can listen to *mahaa vaakyam*, who is listening? **Ans:** "It is the *aathma-ahamkaara-misraa*, which is listening to the teaching of *mahaa vaakyam*. When the teacher says '*thvam*', the

student converts that into '*aham*' and that word '*aham*' or 'I', is now *aathma - ahamkaara - misra:*" | That is what is conveyed by the term '*ubhayam pratheeyathe*'. Both are grasped from the word '*thvam*'. What type of '*thvam*'? Ans: "*Prathyagaathmaartha abhidhaayina:*" - "which should be revealing the *prathyag aathmaa* primarily". Even so, **both** *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* are understood from the word '*thvam*'. That is what Sureswaraachaaryaa points out. He first refers to *ahamkaaraa*, since *ahamkaaraa* is dominant in any individual, because of which, the individual finds it almost impossible to get over his mundane worries.

ॐ अहं दुःखी - ahamkaaraa

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मा च - and the inner aathmaa.

'*Dhu:khee*' refers to *ahamkaaraa*. The phrase '*Prathyagaathmaa cha*' conveys, that, behind the *ahamkaaraa*, *prathyagaathmaa* is also there.

(Really speaking, such words 'behind', 'inner' etc. should not be used in the context of the *sarvagatha* (omnipresent) *aathmaa*, since, if understood literally, they can be misleading. Nevertheless, their use is inevitable in particular contexts.)

Both the components, '*ahamkaaraa*' and '*aathmaa*', are understood from the word '*thvam*', at the time of the student listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*. What should the student do, then? **Ans:** He should realize the following important fact.

ॐ तत्र च - While thus understanding (he should also understand, that),

ॐ प्रत्यगात्मनः - for 'me', the prathyak aathmaa,

ॐ अभिसम्बन्धः - identification

ॐ अहं दुःखी इति अनेन - with mithyaa ahamkaaraa, which is generally miserable,

ॐ आत्म याथात्म्य अनवबोध हेतुक एव - is caused only by ignorance of the nature of the Self, that it is the Reality.

'*aathma yaathaathmyam*' means 'nature of the Self, viz., that it is the only Reality'; '*anavabodham*' means 'ignorance' and '*hethuka*' means 'caused by'.

What is the idea? When I use the word 'I', in that word, the *aathmaa* part is also there; *ahamkaaraa* part is also there. Which one is the real 'I'? Is it *aathmaa* or *ahamkaaraa*? *Veda* wants to tell us (i) that, *aathmaa* is the real 'I' (ii) that, the *ahamkaaraa* part is the unreal / *mithyaa* 'I' and finally (iii) that, the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* part cannot have any real relationship with the *sathya aathmaa* 'I'.

Why cannot *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* have any real relationship with the *sathya aathmaa* 'I'? **Ans:** "Because anything unreal can never have a relationship with reality. To understand this statement, imagine an individual who dreams of having a son in his sleep. When the dreamer wakes up, he obviously does not have any relationship with the 'dream son' and conversely the *mithyaa* 'dream son' also cannot have any 'father-son' relationship with the *jaagrath* individual. In a similar manner, the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa* cannot have any *sambhandhaa* with the real 'I'".

So, what is the aspirant's ultimate knowledge? **Ans:** "'I' do not have any *sambhandhaa* with the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*". This is the knowledge which he has to gather. But, ironically, to make this statement, he will have to use *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, he *can* use the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*; but, even while using the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*, he should be aware of the fact, that, it is not his inherent part. A mundane example for this is the false dentures: "I use the *mithyaa* denture; but I also understand, that the *mithyaa* denture is not a part of me". *Ahamkaaraa*, similar to the denture, can be used for all transactions; but, by *mahaa vaakyam*, the aspirant should understand the *mithyaathvam* of *ahamkaaraa* and should desist from claiming the *ahamkaaraa* as his integral or inherent part. That is what Sureswaracharyaa conveys by this statement.

'*Aathma yaathaathmyam*' means 'the higher Self'. The '*anavabhodhakam*' or 'ignorance' is of the fact that 'I', the *aathmaa*, am the only Reality and '*ahamkaaraa*' is *mithyaa* / *vyaavaharika sathyam* / a lower order of reality. Also, because of the 'ignorance', the 'lower order of reality' will appear as of the 'higher order of reality', similar to the dream appearing as real at the time of dreaming.

Therefore, what should the aspirant do, after *mahaa vaakyasravanam*? **Ans:** "At the time of *sravanam*, for the purpose of *sravanam*, he has to have both the *aathmaa* and *ahamkaaraa* together only; but, instantaneously, he should peel off the *ahamkaaraa* part". An example from mundane existence is that when someone wants to eat a banana and, therefore, buys one, the 'bought' banana has two

components in it, viz., (i) the edible fruit part and (ii) the inedible skin part, which the buyer cannot avoid at the time of buying. But, later, he peels off the skin, discards it and eats only the fruit. Similarly, the *aathmaa* fruit has to be kept and the *ahamkaaraa* skin will have to be 'peeled off', which is '*bhaagathyaagaa*'.

'*Ahamkaaraa*' is not only the '*mithyaa*' skin; it always creates problem also. There is no 'comfortable *ahamkaaraa*' possible. Why? **Ans:** "Because *ahamkaaraa* is always / doggedly attacked by *karmaa*. Even if the *praarabhdha karma* is exhausted, the *sanchitham* is waiting to take effect and give results. Therefore, the very term 'comfortable *ahamkaaraa*' is an oxymoron. 'Comfortable *ahamkaaraa*' does not exist. If **at all** there is a comfortable *ahamkaaraa*, it is only that *ahamkaaraa* which says "I am not *ahamkaaraa* but *aathmaa*; which disclaims *ahamkaaraa* and claims '*aham aathmaa*'". Without claiming the *aathmaa*, *ahamkaaraa* per se can never exist as comfortable *ahamkaaraa*, because *praarabhdha karmaa* is continually chasing. This may be compared to the oft-quoted episode from *Uddhava Githaa* : A bird got hold of a piece of animal flesh and was holding it in its beak ; before, it could eat it, other birds crowded around it, each trying to snatch away the piece of flesh. The first bird tried to escape with the piece, flying from place to place, and, it was getting chased by all other birds. As it was flying, by accident, it dropped the piece of flesh. Upon which, the other birds gave up chasing the first bird and went instead after the piece of flesh. The first bird was left in peace. That is liberation. '*Ahamkaaraa*' is similar to the 'piece of flesh' in the story and all the *karmaa*-s are similar to the chasing birds. The uninformed individual holds on to *ahamkaaraa* and then works for freedom from the chasing '*karmaa*-s' / *dhasaa*-s. Sureswaraacharya says that it does not work, because 'comfortable *ahamkaaraa*' does not simply exist. This is true even for *Bhagavaan*. Even *Bhagavaan*, as '*Bahagvaan* – with-ego', will not be comfortable as a Creator. He will also have complaints; He will regret "I created human beings; I taught them *dharma saasthraa*; but, nobody is listening to me". Even *Bhagavaan's ahamkaaraa* will have only complaints. If *Bhagavaan* is free, it is only because He knows "I am not the Creator *ahamkaaraa*; I am the *sacchidhaanandha aathmaa*; therefore, I am free". As *ahamkaaraa*, the cosmic ego, *Bhagavaan's ahamkaaraa* also will have maximum complaints. Therefore, the only way out, is to drop the *ahamkaaraa* from the meaning of the word 'I'. When you use the word 'I', *make use* of the *ahamkaaraa*, but, mentally exclude the *mithyaa ahamkaaraa*, which *ahamkaaraa* is 'assumed' because of ignorance.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ अतः - Therefore,

ॐ अहं अर्थः - this ahamkaaraa,

ॐ अनर्थ उपस्पृष्टत्वात् - because it is constantly afflicted by problems,

This is a very significant and important statement. '*anartham*' means 'problems' and includes *praarabhdha karmaa*; '*upasrushtaa*' means 'constantly afflicted / contaminated / polluted / chased' etc. Not only that; another very important reason follows:

ॐ अज्ञान उत्थत्वात् च - and, also because it is born out of ignorance,

The entire *ahamkaaraa* is born of and sustained by the ignorance of three facts., viz., that (i) it is '*mithyaa*' (ii) it does not have an existence of its own and (iii) it is inessential *naama* and *roopaa* only. *Katopanishad* (II. i. 11) declares "*Neha naanaasthi kichana*" - "There is no plurality at all here" and *Kaivalyopanishad* (*manthraa* 22) declares "*na bhoomiraapo na cha vahnirasi na caanilo mesti na chaambaram cha*" – " For me, (the *jnaani*) earth and water are not there. Fire is not there. Air is not there. Space is also not there". *Ahamkaaraa* has got only an 'apparent', borrowed existence; it does not have a 'real' existence of its own. The more you enquire into that, the more it will disappear. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says "*ajnaana utthathvaath*".

ॐ हेयः - (ahamkaaraa) has to be disclaimed / rejected.

'*Heya:*' is the most powerful word here, meaning 'to be disclaimed' / 'to be rejected'. The advice is "Never claim *ahamkaaraa* as 'I' or as 'mine'. *Ahamkaaraa* is neither me nor mine". In fact, this is the ultimate *vedhaanthic saranaagathi*. In *Vedhaanthee*, *saranaagathi* means offering *ahamkaaraa* to *viswaroopa Isvara* and telling Him "Whatever *ahamkaaraa* has to go through, according to your cosmic drama, let it go through. I am offering the *ahamkaaraa* to you and I want to abide as *Brahman*". That is called "*aathma nivedana roopa sarva dharma parithyajyam*". Here, the word '*dharmaa*' represents *ahamkaaraa*, because both *dharmaa* and *adharmaa* belong to *ahamkaaraa* only. Therefore, '*dharmaan parithyajaya*' means '*dharmam adharmam sahitha ahamkaaram parithyajaya*' | *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* has dealt with this

topic in his *Bhaashyam* to the well-known *slokaa* (Ch. XVIII- verse 66) '*sarva dharmaan parithyajya maamekam saranam vraja*' |

'Dharmaan parithyajya' means 'ahamkaaram api praithyajya' | Rejecting 'ahamkaaraa', the aspirant should abide as aathmaa, which aathmaa is defined as 'anyathra dharmaath anyathra adharmaath' (Katopanishad I. ii. 14) | He should claim to be the 'aathmaa' which transcends both 'dharmaa' and 'adharmaa". This is the significance of the statement 'heya:' |

ॐ इति प्रत्यक्षतः अवसीयते - This should be clearly understood.

This is called '*thvam padha bhagathyaaga lakshanaa*'. Then, what about '*thadh padhaa*'? That also Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces in the *gadhyaam*.

Just as the *ahamkaaraa* part of *jeevaathmaa* has to be dropped, the *ahamkaara* part of *Paramaathmaa* also has to be dropped. What are the *ahamkaaraa* features of *Paramaathmaa*? Sureswaraachaaryaa says "I shall talk about them in the following verse".

ॐ तदर्थे - In the import of 'thath' (viz., Paramaathmaa),

ॐ किं हेयं - what are the mithyaa features to be given up

Isvara also has got a mithyaa part called *aparaaprakruthi* and a sathyam part called *paraa prakruthi*.

ॐ किं वा उपादेयं - and which part is to be retained,

ॐ इति न अवघ्नियते - have not yet been ascertained.

'Thvam padhaa' part had been discussed. 'Thadh padhaa' has not been discussed yet.

ॐ ततः इदं अभिधीयते - Therefore, I want to talk about it (in the following slokaa).

Sureswaraachaaryaa introduces the topic in this *gadyam*, with the details following in the verse.

184: Chapter III, Verses 77 and 78 (12-06-2010)

In these verses (verses 76 to 78), Sureswaraachaaryaa is explaining the well-known *bhaagathyaghalakshanaa* or *jahadajahal lakshanaa*, which is to be employed while studying the *mahaa vaakyam*.

The word '*thvam*' / '*jeevaathmaa*' has two components. One is *aathmaa* and the other is *ahamkaara*: | Both of them are directly revealed, by the word '*thvam*'. Similarly, by the word '*thath*', the *Paramaathmaa*, both *aathmaa* and macro *ahamkaaraa* of *Isvara* are revealed. *Isvara* also has got a macro *ahamkaaraa*. When He proclaims "*aham srushti sthithi laya karthaa*", it is macro *ahamkaaraa*.

Ahamkaaraa means 'anaathmaa + chidhaabhaasaa (Reflected Consciousness)'. 'Anaathma Sareerathrayam' + chidhaabhaasaa' is jeevaathmaa's ahamkaaraa. 'Anaathma Prapancha thrayam + 'chidhaabhaasaa' is Isvara's ahamkaaraa.

And, if you retain the *ahamkaaraa* of *Isvara* and the *ahamkaaraa* of *jeevaa*, in the meanings of '*thath*' and '*thvam*' respectively, while trying to understand the *mahaa vaakyam*, the *eiyyam* will not function. Therefore, we have to reject the *ahamkaaraa* from both *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, while equating them. And, since the rejection is partial, i.e. since we are to retain the *aathmaa* part of both, while rejecting the *ahamkaaraa* parts, the nature of the rejection is called '*bhaagathyaaagha lakshanaa*', literally meaning 'partial rejection'. What is meant by 'rejection' is not any physical event. The 'rejection' is: 'Understanding the *ahamkaaraa* (of both *jeevaa* and *Isvara*) as *vyaavahaarika sathyam* and *aathmaa* as *paaramaarthika sathyam*'. This '*satthaa bedhaa*' understanding alone is *bhaagathyaaagha lakshanaa*, which exercise should be done with respect to both '*thath*' and '*thvam*'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, is dealing with '*thvam padhaa bhaagathyaaagaa*' in the *sambhandha gadhyam* of verse 77 and the '*thath padha bhaagathyaghaa*' in the verse.

To recollect the discussion in the earlier session, on the latter portion of the *sambhandha gadhyam*: The phrase '*aham artha*:' (in the text) refers to the

ahamkaaraa of *jeevaathmaa* or of the '*thvam padhaa*'. As mentioned, 'I' / '*aham*' is a composite / mixed entity, consisting of *Paaramaarthika chaithanyam* and *vyaavahaarika ahamkaaraa*. But, here, Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the term '*aham artha:*' to refer only to the *ahamkaaraa* portion, since that is the more popular meaning of '*aham*'. And, he says : '*aham artha: heya:*', meaning '*ahamkaaraa* should be rejected as *vyaavahaarika sathyam*'. '*Heya:*' means 'should be rejected'.

The *ahamkaaraa* will continue for experience and has utility also. But, it is *mithyaa*. '*Mithyaa*' means that which is subject to experience, which has got utility, which has got orderliness, but, which does not have an existence of its own and therefore, cannot be counted.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says that '*ahamkaaraa*' should be dropped as *mithyaa*. "But, why?" the layman student might wonder; and ask: "I love *ahamkaaraa*; as a father, I enjoy my children; as a grandfather, I enjoy my grandchildren. *Ahamkaaraa* is lovable and enjoyable. Why do you want me to drop it?"

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives reasons as to why the *ahamkaaraa* should be dropped. The reasons are very important. The first reason is:

ॐ अनर्थ उपस्पृष्टत्वात् - Because, *ahamkaaraa* is afflicted / tainted by the problems created by *sanchitha-aagaami-praarabhda karmaa-s*.

'*Anartha*' denotes 'the problems of *sanchitha-aagaami-praarabhdaa*. *Ahamkaaraa* is under the grip of *karmaa*. And, 'problems of *praarabhdha karmaa*' include the effect of the different *jyothisha dhasaa-s* like *raahu, kethu, sani* etc. This is one reason.

There is a second reason, which is equally or more important:

ॐ अज्ञान उत्थत्वात् - Because *ahamkaaraa* is born out of *ajnaanam*.

'*Ajnaanam*' means '*moolaavidhya*' or '*maayaa*'. *Ahamkaaraa* is a product of *maayaa* and therefore *mithyaa*. Therefore, the *mithyaa*-problematic *ahamkaaraa* should be discarded at the time of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*.

And, whenever we talk about discarding *ahamkaaraa*, we have to remember the corollary also (this was discussed earlier, but being important, is repeated):

“Dropping or falsifying *ahamkaaraa* looks like an ordinary, innocent job. But, it has got serious repercussions which the aspirants have to be aware of. To understand this, an example will help. Imagine a ‘tabular statement’, showing the temperatures on a given day, in different cities. There are two columns in the ‘Table’, with the titles of the columns shown on the top of the ‘Table’, as ‘City’ for the left column and ‘Temperature in Centigrade’, for the right column. Suppose you are making a correction in one line. The temperature in a particular City is shown as 38.40 and you correct it as 38.80. That correction does not cause any major change to the entire table; you have made a correction only against one City. But, suppose, instead, you make a correction to the title of the right column, from ‘Centigrade’ to ‘Fahrenheit’. Now, even though you have made a change again only in one line, there is a serious repercussion to this change. As a consequence of changing the title of the ‘temperature column’, the unit of measurement, you have to change the ‘temperatures’ shown for every city, i.e., in each line. Thus, there is a difference between ‘changing the temperature of one City’ and ‘changing the unit of the temperature’.

“Similarly in the *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa* in *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, when we talk about discarding / falsifying *ahamkaaraa* of ‘*thvam*’, it is not an ordinary change, but a change with serious repercussions. This is because the definition of *samsaaraa* and the definition of *mokshaa*, are both based on the definition of ‘I’, since ‘I’ am the one who is *samsaari* or *muktha*: | Therefore, the definition of *mokshaa* will also have to be changed when the *ahamkaaraa* is dropped. In the beginning stage of *Vedhaanthic* teaching, the superimposition of *ahamkaaraa* on ‘I’, (termed *adhyaaropa*) is temporarily accepted. Therefore, at this stage, the concept of *mokshaa* is based on ‘I’, the *ahamkaaraa*. *Mokshaa* is defined, either based on *karmaa*, which is connected to *ahamkaaraa* or based on the state of the mind, which is also connected to *ahamkaaraa* or to events in life, like death etc., which are also based on the *ahamkaaraa*. As a consequence, we know *mukthi* as *jeevan mukthi* and *videha mukthi*. But, at the time of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, the ‘superimposition’ of *ahamkaaraa* should end and what is termed as *apavaadha* (negation of *ahamkaaraa*) should start.

"Thus, since during *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, the aspirant should discard *ahamkaaraa*, he should discard the *ahamkaaraa* based *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* format *mokshaa* also. At the time of this *apavaadhaa* (rejection of *ahamkaara*), the new definition of *mokshaa* is '*nithya mukthi:*' or '*siddha mukthi:*' or '*svaroopa mukthi:*', i.e., the understanding, 'I' am of the nature of *mokshaa* itself. This is the new definition that we have to come to."

To consolidate: *Adhyaaropaa* (superimposition of *ahamkaaraa* on 'I' or '*aham*') should be followed by *apavaadhaa* (negation of *ahamkaaraa*), at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. This is *baahghathyaaghaa*, which consists not only of disclaiming *ahamkaaraa*, but also of discarding *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* concept of *mokshaa* and discovering, that, '*nithya mukthi*' is 'my' very nature; that, *Mokshaa* is not a *saadhyam* ; that, *mokshaa* is not something to be accomplished ; that, it is not an event to happen; and that, *Mokshaa* is my very nature.

But, the problem with most students is that they refuse to change the *mokshaa* format, even at the time of *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. They do not change the *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* concept of *mokshaa*, since it gets deeply entrenched in their minds, during their initial stages of *Vedhaanthic* study. If they do not drop this concept during *sravanam*, they should do so at least during subsequent *mananam* or at least during *nidhidhyaasanam*. Ironically, instead of discarding the *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* format during *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, most try to use *mahaa vaakyam* for *getting jeevan mukthi* and *vidaha mukthi*.

The application of *mahaa vaakyaa* should be for the purpose of discarding the old *mokshaa* format (*jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* concept) and claiming the new *mokshaa* ('*nithya mukthi:*' or '*siddha mukthi:*' or '*svaroopa mukthi:*'). And, if an aspirant does not apply the *mahaa vaakyam* in this direction and instead tries to use *mahaa vaakyam* for *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* promotion, he will find that he is failing / that, it is not working at all.

As a result, he tends to think: 'I have been studying *Vedhaanthaa* for a number of years, without making any tangible progress towards *mokshaa*. Perhaps mere knowledge is not enough. Perhaps I require some mystic experience. Or, perhaps I have not got *samaadhi* or my *samaadhi* is not enough'. He tries to 'adjust' all the 'knobs'; but, miserably fails.

"A senior student, who has completed several *Geethaa* and *Upanishad* courses told me '*Swamiji!* I have dropped the idea of achieving *mukthi* in this life. I think it is not possible for me. So, I have re-set the goal of my life as *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*. After 30 years of *Vedhaanthic* study, this student drops the idea of *mukthi* as his goal and decides that, instead, *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* will be his goal. Why? **Ans:** 'Because he has not understood that he has to do *apavaadhaa*, with regard to the definition of *mokshaa*'. This will happen to all such aspirants, who, in frustration after a long study, will shift their goal, thinking 'I am never able to hit the goal. So, let me change the goal post itself'".

So, what is the *mahaa vaakyaa* slogan? **Ans:** 'Disclaim *ahamhaaraa*; discard *jeevan mukthi-vidaha mukthi* concept of *mokshaa*; and, discover *nithya mukthi* as *svaroopaa*'. This is a very, very important corollary of *bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa*.

As Lord Krishna declares in the Bhagavadh Geethaa (Ch. V – 8 & 9): 'Naiva kinchith karomi ithi yuktho manyetha thathvavith pasyan srunvan sprusan jighran asnan gacchan svapan svasan pralapan visrujan gruhnan unmishan nimishannapi indriyaani indriyaartheshu varthanthe ithi dhaarayan'– 'Even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, reclining, breathing, talking, evacuating, receiving, opening the eye and closing the eye, the disciplined knower of the Truth understands that he does not do anything at all, bearing in mind that sense organs remain in sense-objects'.

In (Ramana Mahrishi's) *Sadh Dharsanam* also, there is a beautiful slokaa (verse 40): "roopini aroopini ubhayaathmikaa cha mukthi: thriroopethi vidho vadhanthi | idham thrayam yaa vivinaktyhamdhee: thasyaa: praanasa: paramaatha mukthi:" - "Some people talk about roopini mukthi: (i.e., 'same people say I am interested only in jeevan mukthi: ; I do not care about videha mukthi:'); some people talk about aroopini mukthi: (which means 'some people say I care about videha mukthi: only; let there be jeevan mukthi: or not') ; some people talk about the mixture of the two as the mukthi: (meaning 'some people want both')| Thus, mukthi is looked upon in three different ways. But, the real mukthi / the paramaatha mukthi is the falsification of the ahamkaaraa, which is the basis for all these divisions". That mukthi: is siddha mukthi: / nithya mukthi:, with regard to which, there can be no failure. | With regard to 'saadhya mukthi', there can be failures, whereas 'siddha mukthi' cannot be a failure, because, whether one likes it or not - either fortunately or unfortunately- mukthi happens to be 'my' nature. And, even if an aspirant

changes his mind and decides to forego his liberation, he cannot, because that is 'my' svaroopaa.

Mahaa vaakyaa is meant for claiming this *nithya mukthi*, forgetting *jeevan mukthi- videha mukthi* concept, by the dropping / rejection of *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says '*ahamartha: heya: eva*'"

Having completed *thvam padha bhaagathyagaa*, we have to come to the *thath padhaa*, which is done in the verse that follows. Reverting to the text:

Chapter III: Verse 77

पारोक्ष्यं यत्तदर्थं स्यात् तद् हेयमहमर्थवत्।

प्रतीचेवाहमोऽभेदः पारोक्ष्येणात्मनोऽपि मे ॥ ७७ ॥

Ahamkaaraa is mixed up with *aathmaa*, when we use the word 'I'. In a similar manner, 'remoteness' is mixed up with '*thath* / *Paramaathmaa*, which is really myself. That remoteness should be discarded from the meaning of '*thath*', similar to discarding '*ahamkaaraa*', while understanding '*thvam padhaa*'.

The second line is to be taken up first.

ॐ अहमः प्रतीचा अभेदः (वर्तते) - *Ahamkaaraa* is mixed up with *aathmaa*, when we use the word 'I'.

This is something which we had discussed already. '*ahama:*' means '*ahamkaarasya*'; '*abedha:*' means 'non-distinction / *thaadhaathmyam* / *eiyaam* / *abhimaanam* / 'mixing up'; '*pratheechee*' means 'with *prathyag aathmaa*'; '*prathyang*' is the noun. This is '*thaadhathmya adhyaasa:*' | '*Ahamkaaraa*' is mixed up with '*prathyag aathmaa*'. The consequence is localization / limitation of *aathmaa*.

ॐ इव - In a similar manner,

ॐ आत्मनः मे अपि पारोक्ष्येण (अभेदः : वर्तते) - 'remoteness' is mixed up with *Paramaathmaa*, though *Paramaathmaa* is really myself.

'*Aathmaa*, in this context means '*Paramaathmaa* / '*thath padhaartha*'. '*Paramaathmaa*' includes '*moksha*', because the nature of *Paramaathmaa* is

mokshaa. *Paramaathmaa* and *mokshaa* are identical. '*Paarokshyam*' means 'remoteness, both in terms of time and space'. *Mokshaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are mixed up with remoteness. That is the reason that when the term *Paramaathmaa* is mentioned, a layman immediately thinks of *Vaikuntaa*, *Kailaasaa* etc. But, when we, thus, consider *Paramaathmaa* remote, we automatically make *mokshaa* also remote. We tend to think "I have to die and travel, go through *sukla gathi* and through *Vaikunta vaasal*, reach the *Paramaathmaa* there; and, when I reach and sit on the lap of the Lord, then I will get *mokshaa*".

The irony is that we say that *Paramaathmaa* is all-pervading and, at the same time, believe, that, that we should '*reach*' that all pervading *Paramaathmaa* by travelling. Is this not a contradiction? Thus, *jeevaathmaa* is mixed up with an unwanted thing, '*ahamkaaraa*' and *Paramaathmaa* is mixed up with an unwanted thing, 'remoteness'. *Mahaa vaakyam* should remove the unwanted *ahamkaaraa* from '*thvam padhaartha*' and the unwanted remoteness from '*thath padhaartha*'.

The 'discarding of remoteness' is called *bhagathyaagha lakshanaa* with regard to *thadh padhaa*. That is said in the first line.

ॐ यद् पारोक्ष्यं (तद्) That remoteness (which is associated with *Paramaathmaa*),

Spatial remoteness will cause time-wise remoteness also, because once *Paramaathmaa* is considered to be located in a higher *lokaa*, the aspirant has to travel to reach that *Paramaathmaa*, which travel is, obviously, time-consuming. Not only is the *Paramaathmaa* physically away; but, time-wise also *Paramaathmaa* and *mokshaa* are away. The aspirant believes "I should get *jeevan mukthi* by reaching *Paramaathmaa*". Therefore, the concept of 'remoteness' should be dropped.

ॐ तदर्थं हेयं स्यात् - should be discarded from the meaning of 'thath' (at the time of *mahaa vaaky sravanam*),

ॐ अहं अर्थवत् - similar to discarding 'ahamkaaraa', while understanding 'thvam padhaa'.

Thus, spatial and time-wise remoteness (wrongly) associated with *Paramaathmaa* should be discarded and *ahamkaaraa* (wrongly) associated with '*aham*' or '*jeevaathmaa*' should be discarded.

Once *ahamkaaraa* is discarded from *thvam padhaa* and remoteness is discarded from *thath padhaa*, by the application of *bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa*, what is left behind is '*eka aathmaa*' which is here and now. That conviction is *nithya mukthi:* / Therefore, I am liberated, not due to 'meditation' afterwards, but *sravana kaale eva*.

A significant point to be noted: Sureswaraachaarya has mischievously and quietly added an adjective '*mey*' to '*aathmana:*', meaning 'that *Paramaathmaa* is really 'myself'. He says "remove the remoteness from *Paramaathmaa*, which is really myself and claim "I' am *Paramaathmaa*' and be free. What is the difficulty?"

This is being elaborated in the following portions also.

Sambhandha gadhyam (Part) to Verse 78:

कथं पुनः तदर्थोऽद्वितीयलक्षणः प्रत्यगात्मोपाश्रयं सद्वितीयत्वं दुःखित्वं निरन्वयमपनुदतीति ।
उच्यते।

How can the idea of being without a second conveyed by the term 'Thou', cancel without residue, the connotation of having a second and being miserable, that is embodied in the term 'Thou'? It is explained this way.

The student looks for further clarity. He asks "Even though I claim '*aham brahma asmi*', on listening to *mahaa vaakyam*, and also take care to continue to remember this fact, I am not able to avoid sorrow in my life, during my day-to-day transactions. Very often I experience sorrow, and, when I am, thus, solidly experiencing sorrow, how can I boldly claim I am *aanaanda svaroopam*? The idea is so jarring. It looks like a 'conditioning' that I am asked to practice. How can I get convinced about my *nithya aanandha svaroopam*? Simultaneously experiencing sorrow in life and claiming I am *nithya aanandhaa* - how is that possible?"

What is the answer? **Ans:** The statements 'I experience sorrow' and 'I am sorrowful' are not synonymous. If, to an aspirant, they appear synonymous, it is because *bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa* has not worked for him; he has not really understood or assimilated the message. When he says 'I experience sorrow', the meaning of the

word I, is the *aathmaa*; but, 'sorrow' is an attribute which belongs to the *anaathmaa* mind, which *anaathmaa* mind will have the three *gunaa*-s and as a result of that, fluctuating emotions *will be* there. *Vedhaantha* never promises freedom from fluctuations, at the level of *anaathmaa*. *Anaathmaa is* subject to fluctuations. What *Vedhaantha* says is: "'I', who am the observer of the *anaathmaa*, am only observing the emotional fluctuations of the *anaathmaa* mind; 'I' am not subject to any fluctuations ; but, at the time when the emotional fluctuations are there, 'my' *aanandha svaroopam* will not be reflected in that mind". Experiential *aanandha* is *prathibhimbhaa aanandhaa* / reflected happiness. That *aanandha* will be fluctuating. 'Reflected happiness' *will be* fluctuating. Nobody can stop it. Even *Bhagavaan*, when He looks at the terrible sufferings of His devotees, will be subject to misery. *Vedhaantha* never talks about the permanence of experiential *aanandha*. What *Vedhaantha*. says is : "When experiential *aanandha* is there, I understand 'I' am *aanandha* manifested in the mind and when sorrow is there, 'I' am still *aanandha*, but, not manifested in the mind". The mind has got its own fluctuations just as the physical body has got its own fluctuations. At *anaathmaa* level, we can only try to maintain 'health', as best as possible'; but, there is no question of a perfect physical body; or a perfect mind reflecting *aanandha* all the time. As an instance, imagine that you try to be 'smiling' all the time, because you have been told that you are *nithya aanandha svaroopam*: / But, when you have to attend a condolence meeting, you cannot continue to smile. At that meeting, the mind has to take a different *vrutthi*. But, that *vrutthi* does not negate the *Vedhaanthic* teaching that 'I' am ever *aanandha*.

The student has failed to capture these subtle points , viz., (i) that 'I' am original *aanandha* (ii) that does not mean 'I' am *eternal* experiential *aanandha* (which, as we saw, is not possible even for *Bhagavaan*) (iii) experiential *aanandha* will have to be fluctuating; but, the teaching is that, that does not touch my *svaroopam*.

Because of this failure, the student asks the question "How can *mahaa vaakyam* remove my sorrow?" This student is not able to differentiate between *bhimbha aanaadhaa* and *prathibimbha aanandhaa*. When *Vedhaantha* talks about the permanence of *bimbha aanandhaa*, which is 'myself', this student, without properly comprehending this, looks for permanence in the *prathibimbha aanandhaa*, which does not exist. He works for the non-existent and when his attempt naturally fails, he criticizes *maha vaakyam*.

Referring to the text,

ॐ कथं पुनः - How (does)

ॐ अद्वितीय लक्षणः तदर्थः - the non-dual thadh padhaartha / Paramaathmaa

ॐ अपनुदति - eliminate

ॐ सद्वितीयत्वं - (my) limitations (and)

'*sadvitheeyathvam*' means 'limitation'; and the 'limitation' talked of, is one's inability to solve one's problems. The student's question is: "I have a number of problems in my day-to-day life. And, in spite of whatever I do to solve them, those problems continue. Thus, I have a limitation. How can that limitation, viz., my inability to solve my problems, be eliminated, by merely claiming '*aham Brahma asmi*'?"

ॐ दुःखित्वं - the sorrow that I am experiencing intensely

'*dhu:kithvam*' means 'sorrow'. The *samsaari* student is always under the grip of sorrow, constantly working in his mind like the '*sruthi*' of the '*thamburaa*' in a musical concert. So, he wonders "How can this sorrow be eliminated, by my mere claim 'I am *Parmaathmaa*'?" And, even if he is able forget his sorrow, during the time of *Vedhaanthic* study, he fears that it will be only for that brief period and, therefore asks,

ॐ निरन्वयं - without a trace?

The student's doubt is: "How can the mere belief in *jeevaathma -Paramaathma-ejykyam*, the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*, eliminate my inability to solve my problems and my sorrow, without a trace?"

This doubt may lead him to think that he is missing out on some other *saadhanaa*. He may even come to the conclusion that taking to *sanyaasa aasramaa* might help. All these wrong conclusions are because of the fact, that, he had not understood the true meaning of the word 'I'.

ॐ इति - If such a question is raised,

ॐ उच्यते - (Sureswaraacharya says) I will answer.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 78 of Chapter III:

न च एतयोः निवर्तकनिवर्त्यभावं वयं ब्रूमः । कथं तर्हि । त्वमर्थं प्रत्यगात्मनि प्रागनवबुद्धाद्वितीयता सानेनावबोध्यते । अतोऽनवबोधनिरासेन तद्व्यस्य सद्वितीयत्वस्य त्वमर्थस्थस्य परोक्षत्वस्य च तदर्थस्थस्य निरसनात् न वैयधिकरण्यादिचोध्यस्यावस्रोऽस्तीति । तदिदमभिधीयते ।

We do not assert that the meanings of the two terms stand in relation to the sublator and the sublated. How else then? In relation to the Self, signified by 'Thou', the term 'That' intimates that it is secondless, a fact not apprehended before. By this removal of the basal non-apprehension, the two consequences of that non-apprehension, namely, the sense of not being one without a second in the case of 'Thou' and of not being immediate in the case of 'That' stand negated. Hence objections like this one, urging diversity in the imports of the two terms, do not apply at all. This is explained:

The essence of Sureswaraacharya's answer to the student's question is as follows:

"*Mahaa vaakyam* never promises to totally eliminate the experiential sorrow of the mind. That is not the intention or promise of the *mahaa vaakyam*. The experiential sorrow of the mind is claimed as 'I am sorrowful'. This claim 'I am sorrowful', is a result 'my' *adhyasa* identification with the 'mind', which mind, in reality, is the one that is sorrowful. 'Mind' is part of *ahamkaaraa*. Because of the existence of *ahamkaaraa*, 'I' am identified with the mind; and, the experiential sorrow, which actually belongs to the mind is claimed as 'my' sorrow. When this wrong identification and consequent wrong perception are there, the direct and immediate aim of *mahaa vaakyam* is to correct the aspirant, by detaching 'I' from the mind and making the aspirant claim (i) 'I' am not the mind and (ii) the sorrow of the mind does not belong to 'me'. This is the first and direct purpose of *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., to point out that "Neither am 'I' the mind; nor is the experiential sorrow which belongs to the mind, 'mine'. On the other hand, 'I' am only the witness of both the mind and the sorrow belonging to the mind". This is the first aim of *mahaa vaakyam*.

"The second aim of *mahaa vaakyam* is to point out that this mind and the sorrow, both being the products of *maayaa*, are *mithyaa* i.e. they are only *vyaavahaarika sathyam*. The adjective '*ajnaana uththathvaath cha*' (used by the *Aachaaryaa*, in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 76) is important. *Ajnaanam* means *moolaavidhyaa* which means *maayaa*. '*Maayaa uththathvaath*' means '*mithyaathvaath*'. Thus, 'objectification of mind and sorrow' is aim no.1 and 'falsification of mind and sorrow' is aim no. 2 of *mahaa vaakyam*.

"And, once we have done these two, two other things will happen as by-products. Even without any direct effort, the intensity and impact of sorrow will come down. And, because of the objectification, the solution also will become simpler. This is because; it is the 'subjectivity' which makes the problems complex. For instance, let us assume that a neighbor of ours runs into many problems. He is confused and unable to find solutions for them. But, since we are not directly affected by the problems, and are, therefore, in a position to view the problems more 'objectively', we find that we have many solutions for the neighbor's problems, which we are able to suggest to him.

"Conversely, we have no solution for *ahamkaaraa's* problems, if we do not neighborise / falsify / objectify *ahamkaaraa*. Therefore the impact of the sorrow / the problems is more and the solution also is complex or almost impossible.

"*Mahaa vaakyam*, therefore, tells us: 'Before trying any solution, before making any complaint, in any situation, remember 'I' am free, because 'I' am neither the mind nor the sorrow of the mind. 'I' am *aathmaa*; 'I' am the *sathyam*; 'I' I am *aanandha svaroopaa*: | Yes, the mind has got issues, which it *will* have; issue-less mind does not exist just as issue-less body does not exist. Therefore, objectify the mind / falsify the mind and enjoy the challenge of solving the problems - successfully or unsuccessfully- since, whatever happens, it does not affect the fact that 'I' am free'.

"An oft-discussed teaching of *Vedhaanthic Aachaaryaa-s* should be remembered in this context, viz., 'If I forget 'my' real nature, life becomes a burden; by remembering 'my' real nature, I convert life into an entertainment / a blessing/ an admirable and enjoyable *viswa roop dharsanam* / an interesting challenge'".

Thus, *mahaa vaakyam's* role is 'objectification' and 'falsification' of *ahamkaaraa*, by which you remove the word sorrow from 'I', the *aathmaa*.

"Dayaananda Swami often used to say 'Sorrow is not the problem. It is the statement 'I am sorrowful' which is the problem. The moment you say 'I am sorrowful'; you superimpose sorrow on 'I', the witness, making the whole situation complex'.

"Therefore, to put it in a nutshell: "'Objectivity' is what I get, by assimilation of *mahaa vaakyam*. The so-called problems of 'mine' become less worrisome, as if they were my neighbour's problems".

Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys all the above ideas, discussed by us in mundane language, in classical *Vedhaanthic* language.

185: Chapter III, Verse 78 (19-06-2010)

Analyzing the mahaa vaakyam, 'thatthvamasi', Sureswaraachaaryaa is pointing out how the proximity of 'thatth padhaa', revealing Paramaathmaa, is removing the limitations of jeevaathmaa. He holds, that, when Paramaathmaa is identified or equated with jeevaathmaa, the limitation belonging to jeevaathmaa is eliminated by this equation ; and, that, similarly, when jeevaathmaa is equated to Paramaathmaa, the remoteness attributed to Paramaathmaa is eliminated, because jeevaathmaa happens to be here itself. To sum up: The proximity of Paramaathmaa to jeevaathmaa removes the limitation and dhu:kithvam of jeevaathmaa and the proximity of jeevaathmaa to Paramaathmaa removes the remoteness or paarokshyam of Paramaathmaa. This is the idea that Sureswaraachaaryaa is presenting.

And, now, a student or *poorva pakshin* is raising a question: "How can, a mere equation of *Paramaathmaa* with *jeevaathmaa* eliminate this sorrowfulness and limitation of *jeevaathmaa*? My very experience that I continue to have sorrow and other problems, even after accepting the suggestion at face value, reveals that the mere equation of *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* will not solve the problem. How are you making such a promise?"

Quoting the question from the text (sambhandha gadhyam to verse 78): "katham thadhartha adhvitheeya lakshana: prathyagaathma upaasrayam sadhvitheeyathvam dhu:kithvam (cha) niranvayam apanudhathi?" - "How can jeevaathmaa being one with Paramaathmaa, eliminate without a trace, the limitation and sorrow of the jeevaathmaa?"

'*Prathyagaathma upaasrayam*' means 'belonging to the *jeevaathmaa*'; '*sadvitheeyathvam*' literally means 'duality' and 'duality' implies 'limitation' / '*paricchedha:*'; '*Dhu:kithvam*' means 'sorrowfulness'; '*niranvayam*' means 'without any residue or balance' ; '*apanudhathi*' means 'eliminates'

"How can *mahaa vaakyam* or *mahaa vaakya jnaanam* totally eliminate the limitations and sorrowfulness of the *jeevaathmaa*?" is the question of the *poorva pakshin*.

Sureswaraacharya is giving his answer. He starts with: "*Vayam ethayo: nivarthaka nivarthya bhaavam na cha bhrooma:*"- "We do not say that the *jeevaathma-Paramaathma- eikyam* will eliminate the sorrow".

This statement would literally 'shock' the student / *poorva pakshin*, since, the *Aacharya* suddenly seems to withdraw from all *vedhaanthic* promises. Therefore, an explanation is in order. These are all technical subjects, which the student should very clearly understand. *Mahaa vaakyam* is *pramaanam* and *pramaanam* can generate *jnaanam*. But, no *pramaanam* or *pramaana janya pramaa* can ever physically eliminate something from any substance. An example is the annoying fact, that, the mere *jnaanam* / knowhow of a rigorous physical exercise cannot eliminate the excess weight from the body, by itself. The *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *mahaa vaakya pramaana janya jnaanam* also cannot eliminate sorrow from the mind.

Why not? **Ans:** 'Elimination of sorrow from the mind' will come under either 'transformation of the mind' or 'refinement of the mind', which is called '*samskaaraa*' or '*vikaaraa*', in Sanskrit. Will *samskaaraa* and *vikaaraa* come under *karma palam* or *jnaana palam*? The fundamentals of *vedhanthaa* should be remembered here. (A student of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* is expected to know these fundamentals). It was already seen in an earlier chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, that it is *karmaa* alone, which can produce four types of results, viz., *aapthi*, *uthpatthi*, *samskaaraa* and *vikaaraa*. Any type of *samskaaraa* or any type of *vikaaraa* will come under *karmapalan* only. No *jnaanam*, however sacred it might be, can produce *karmapalan*. That being so, how can *mahaa vaakyam* or *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam* bring about *samskaaraa* or *vikaaraa* in the mind? Therefore, knowledge cannot eliminate sorrow from the mind.

And, therefore, Sureswaraacharya warns: "Do not misunderstand *Vedhaanthaa* and have any false expectations and thereafter complain".

Jnaanam is not meant to transform the mind; nor the body. *Jnaanam* is not meant to transform any *anaathmaa* constituent. *Jnaanam* is only meant to educate the mind about a new fact. As a result of the '*jnaanam*' / 'knowledge', ignorance can go away and ignorance-based misconceptions can go away. Removal of ignorance and ignorance-based misconception alone are, thus, the utilities or even aims of any *pramaanam*.

What is accomplished by equating *Paramaathmaa* with *jeevaathmaa*? In other words, what happens when the *Upanishad*-s convince the student "'*Paramaathmaa*', which is the *sath* and *chith*, is 'me' "? **Ans:** "A student with total faith in the *Upanishad*-s learns to claim the fact "'I' am the *sath-chith- saakshi- chaithanyam*", and, when he learns this fact "'I' am the *sath-chith- saakshi- chaithanyam*", three misconceptions go away".

What are the three misconceptions?

The first misconception is: "mind is 'me' ". *Vedhaanthaa* does not change the mind; but, *Vedhanthaa* tells me, that, mind is not 'me', that, 'I' am only the *saakshi* of the mind. By furnishing this clarity, *Vedhaanthaa* removes the misconception "mind is 'me' ". *Vedhaanthaa* neither improves the mind ; nor transforms the mind.

The second misconception which is removed, is : "mind belongs to 'me' ". The *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (IV.iii.15) declares "*asangho hi ayam purusha:*" – "This Infinite being (*Brahman / aathmaa*) is indeed unattached" and, again "*ananvaagatham punyena ananvaagatham paapena theermo hi thadhaa sarvaan sokaan hrudayasaya bhavathi*" (IV.iii.22) – "(*Brahman / aathmaa*) is indeed untouched by good actions and untouched by bad actions, for, he is then beyond all the woes of his heart (intellect)". By *avasthaathraya vivekaa*, the *Upanishad*-s reveal the fact that mind does not belong to 'me', since 'I' cannot be attached to or bound to anything.

The first misconception "'mind is 'me' " goes away; the second misconception "mind belongs to 'me' " also goes away, because of *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*.

The third misconception that goes away is: "mind is as real as 'me' ". The fact is otherwise – "mind is **not** as real as 'me' ". *Vedhaanthaa* gives the aspirant the crucial message: "*Brahma sathyam jagan mithyaa jeevo Brahmaiva na apara:*". The serious student should study and understand the *Vaitthithya Prakaranam* and the *Advaita Prakaranam* of the *Maandookya Kaarika*. He should understand and experience the effect of '*adhyaaropa – apavaadhaa*' implementation. When *Vedhaanthaa* convinces him of *jagan mithyaathvam*, through all these elaborate methods, he should carefully note and remember, that, '*jagan mithyaa*' is not just a phrase for *japaa*, but a fact to be assimilated. At that time, he should understand that 'mind' is also

included in the 'world' and therefore 'mind' is also *mithyaa*. In contrast to the mind, 'I' come under the maxim "*Jeevo Bramaiva naapara:*", and, therefore, 'I' belong to the *sathyam* category. Mind belongs to the *mithyaa* category. Therefore, mind is not / cannot be as 'real' as 'me'.

Thus, the misconceptions (i) "mind is 'me'" (ii) "mind belongs to 'me'" and (iii) "mind is as real as 'me'" are eliminated by *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*. And, that is all the job that *mahaa vaakyam* does. *Mahaa vaakyaa* does not promise to change or remove any conditions of the mind, since any refinement or transformation will come under *karmaa* and not *jnaanam*. But, once these misconceptions are eliminated, then, even when the mind gets different conditions / disturbances, the informed aspirant will never, never say "*I am disturbed*". A non *Vedhaanthic* student may say "I am disturbed", when the mind has got even some minor flutter. The benefit of *Vedhaantha* is, that, once *Vedhaantha* is assimilated, the aspirant, will never, never say "*I am disturbed*", whatever be the condition of the mind.

In other words, *Vedhaantha* does not remove sorrow from the mind; *Vedhaantha* removes the false conclusion "I am sorrowful". *Vedhaantha* never even promises to remove sorrow from the mind; it only promises to remove the false notion "I am sorrowful". No promise is made by *Vedhaantha*, at the level of *anaathmaa* - reformation, refinement or transformation.

Now, suppose a *Vedhaanthic* student says "I am not interested in that; I am interested in the transformation of the mind and not in educating the mind. I am interested *only* in the transformation of the mind". To such a student, the *guru* will say "In that case, your travel should be in a different direction. The *Jnaana kaandam* of the *Vedaa-s*, is a wrong place for attempting transformation of things. *Jnaana Kaandam* is useful for educating; but, *jnaana kaandam* will never bring about any transformation of the mind or the body. Any 'transformation' comes under *karmapalan*; and you can get any *karama palan* only from *karma kaandaa*. Only *Karmaa* can give results such as *aapthi*, *uthpatthi*, *samskaaraa* and *vikaaraa* etc." The *guru* will, therefore, advise this student: "Therefore, go back to *karma kaandaa*. But, practice *karmya yogaa*. Be a *karma yogi* and not a mere *karmi*. You will be able to transform the mind; but, I have to add a warning note, that, all *karmapalan-s* will have three *dhoshaa-s*, namely, *dhu:kha misrithathvam*, *athrupthikarathvam* and *bhandhakathvam*. The most important defect among them, is '*athrupthikarathvam*'. You will be never satisfied with any amount of transformation. There will always be

some residual worries / disturbance / problems". He will also add "Of course, you have the freedom to go after *karma palan* or *jnaana palan*".

The *guru* would further tell the student: "If, even after knowing (i) mind is *mithyaa* (ii) mind is not 'me' and (iii) mind does not belong to 'me', you say 'I want to change the mind', you are, of course, free to do try it. If you desire to shed some of your excess weight and make your body fitter, you can, of course, use the treadmill and achieve that. It is possible. But, do not hope to keep the body fit all the time; the body will have ups and downs; after a certain age, even walking may become difficult. In a like manner, the mind also will have ups and downs. Therefore, you *can* attempt transforming the *anaathmaa*, but, without expecting perfection; you *can* enjoy transforming the mind, but, without expecting perfection. You can attempt all these, after understanding (i) mind is not 'me' (ii) nor does it belong to 'me' and (iii) nor is it as real as 'me'. If you attempt to improve the *anaathmaa* mind after understanding these facts, you will have no stress. But, if you do not understand these, you will imagine a perfect mind as a future possibility and you will think that, that perfect mind is *mokshaa*; which will never, never, never happen. As you may be aware, Lord Krishna says in the *Bhagavadh Geetha* (Ch. XIV – verse 22) '*prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha Paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaankshathi*' - 'Oh! Arjuna! (The *jnaani* who transcends the three *gunaa*-s) does not hate 'brightness' (allegory for *jnaanam / sathva gunaa*), activity (indicating *rajo gunaa*) and delusion (result of *thamo gunaa*), as they arise ; nor, does he desire for them, as they withdraw', indicating that even a *jnaani*'s mind will have these three *gunaa*-s. The *gunaa*-s will be fluctuating also, because the nature of the *gunaa*-s is to fluctuate. You can / should try to manage the fluctuations; but, you should also know, that, you can never perfectly maintain *gunaa*-s. They will keep on changing".

Then what is *jnaanam*? The above *Bhagavadh Githaa* verse gives the clue, in the statement '*na dveshti sampravrutthaani na kaankshathi nivrutthaani*'. The *jnaani*'s mind may not be free from *thamo gunaa* also ; but, the *jnaani* does not react to the *gunaa* fluctuations of the mind, because of his threefold understanding (i) mind is *mithyaa* (ii) mind is not 'me' and (iii) mind does not belong to 'me'. Of course, keeping the mind in reasonable health is useful and also necessary for transactions, just as keeping the physical body reasonably healthy is useful and necessary, both for the individual and the people around him. One should try to keep the mind reasonably fit, not for *mokshaa*, but for *loka sangraham* (harmony of the society).

'*Mokhsaa*' is freedom from the conclusion "'I' am sorrowful". This statement "'I' am sorrowful" is wrong, because, it is only the mind which is sorrowful, and, 'I' am not the mind. 'I' am only the witness of the conditions of the mind.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa warns: "Do not misunderstand or mix up the *jnaana palam* and *karma palam*".

The aspirant should be very clear that he should not have false expectations from *Vedhaanthaa* and suffer the consequent disappointments. If anyone complains "even after learning '*aham brahma asmi*', I do not find any improvement at all", his problem is that he is mixing up the 'I' that *Vedhaanthaa* reveals and the I that he uses, when he talks about the non-improvement. He wrongly assumes that '*aham brahma asmi*' will transform / refine the mind.

Sureswaraachaaryaa identifies this problem of the aspirant. Therefore, he proceeds:

ॐ कथं तर्हि - In that case, what does *Vedhaanthaa* do?

ॐ त्वमर्थे प्रत्यगात्मनि - With regard to the prathyag aathmaa, which is the meaning of the word 'thvam',

ॐ (या) प्राग् अनवबुद्ध अद्वितीयता - the limitlessness or infinitude, which was not known before, '*adhvitheeyathaa*' means 'limitlessness' or 'infinitude'; '*praag*' means 'earlier' ; '*anavabuddha*' means 'not known'.

ॐ सा (अद्वितीयता) - that unknown limitlessness

ॐ अनेन अवबोध्यते - is revealed by the equation of *Paramaathmaa* with *jeevaathmaa*, asserted by the *mahaa vaakyam*.

'*anena*' means 'by that' and refers to the '*mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*'.

The 'infinitude' of 'me', the *aathmaa*, which is not known to the aspirant before *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, is revealed by the import of the *mahaa vaakyam*. But, it should be carefully noted, that, even when the aspirant gets to know "'I' am infinite", that knowledge will not remove the finitude of the *mind*. The aspirant may think that after knowing "'I' am infinite", he will suddenly start experiencing happiness, because "'I' am infinite". (In a lighter vein: He might even think 'Being infinite, I will be everywhere; without going to Europe or America, I can experience

the pleasures of travel' etc.) But, even as he claims 'I am infinite', *Vedhaanthaa* never removes the *finitude of the mind*. *Mind* will have only finite knowledge. If the mind has to enjoy, it has to travel. *Vedhaanthaa* removes only the 'finitude' that is superimposed on 'me', the *aathmaa*. Only *that* finitude is removed. At the *anaathmaa* level, all limitations will continue. There is no procedure by which the body or the mind can be made infinite. There is no infinite body or mind. When it is said '*saa adhvitheeyathaa avabodhyathe*', it only means that 'that limitation / finitude that had been superimposed on 'me', the *aathmaa*, (because of which 'I' suffered '*apoornathaa*' – 'a sense of want') will be removed'. That *apoornathaa* is removed and *poornathvam* claimed as '*aham poorna: asmi*'.

ॐ अतः - Therefore,

ॐ अनवबोधनिरासेन - through the elimination of ignorance,

ॐ तदुत्थस्य सद्वितीयत्वस्य - the ignorance-caused misconception of the 'limitation',

'*haduttham*' means '*anavabodha uttham*'/ 'that which is born out of ignorance'. Born out of the ignorance is the misconception '*sadvitheeyathvam*', meaning 'mental limitation' or '*parichchedha*.'"

What is 'mental limitation'? (Again in a lighter vein :) "The dissatisfaction 'I have visited only 15 countries' is an example. But, can you remove that mental limitation? Even if you are a tourist lifelong, you will never be able to exhaust all the countries. Also, it may happen, that, when you are visiting a particular place in a particular country, eagerly looking forward to attend a particular programme, it might get cancelled on that day. Your travel plans will be so tight, that you cannot extend your stay by another day to attend the programme on the next day. It may also happen that you suffer severe periodical migraine during your travels, preventing you from enjoying anything. And, you cannot repeat the tour, since costs are prohibitive.

"Therefore, where is the question of exhaustively enjoying all the places and all the events? Even on the television, you cannot enjoy all your preferred programmes, because of different causes and circumstances. 'Mental limitations' in terms of worldly experiences *will* continue. Therefore, remember that *ahamkaaraa* can never exhaust all the sense pleasures of the world and intellect can never exhaust all the branches of knowledge. *Vedhaanthaa* says 'Because their finitude can never be removed, accept their finitude without any reservation. You can never remove their

limitations. *Mokshaa* is accepting limitations as they are, remaining as the 'limitless witness'.

"In fact, sometime, limitations are also enjoyable. For instance, the birth and growth of a child. At times, the parent may feel impatient about the gradual, slow growth of the child. But, that 'limitation' also has got its own beauty; watching the child grow is a pleasure.

"Therefore, accept *anaathmaa* as it is; enjoy whatever transformations you can make, but, without expecting the *anaathmaa* to be perfect. Not only that. When *anaathmaa* is in its best condition, do not also expect it to remain in that condition always. Do not expect that also. It *will* change. The astrologer might tell you, that, your planetary positions are in their best locations for the next few months. Enjoy those few months. But, remember, the planetary positions *will* change.

"*Vedhaanthaa* is meant to teach you to understand *anaathmaa* as *anaathmaa* and also to enjoy the *anaathmaa* with all its limitations. *Vedhaanthaa* teaches you to understand *aathmaa* also as it is and claim its glory. *Aathmaa* will not have varieties of colours or forms or smells, for you to enjoy them in *aathmaa*, because, *aathmaa* is, as the *Katopanishad* (I.iii.15) declares '*asabdham, asparsam, aroopam, arasam, agandham*' etc. Therefore, enjoy *anaathmaa* as it is and enjoy *aathmaa* as it is. *Anaathmaa* is *vyaavahaarikam* (*mithyaa*) and *aathmaa* is *paaramarthika nithyam* (*sathyam*). Understand this and be relaxed. If you can do this, continue in *jnaana kaandaa*. Otherwise, go back to *karma kaandaa* and engage in action – move from *parihaaraa* to *parihaaraa*. The choice is yours".

Reverting to the text:

ॐ त्वमर्थस्थस्य - seemingly belonging to 'thvamarthaa' i.e., 'jeevaathmaa'

ॐ निरसनात् - having been eliminated,

The two words '*sadhvitheeyathvasya*' and '*thvamarthasthasya*' should be read together. The message is, that, the seeming 'limitation' of the *jeevaathmaa*, which is only a result of 'ignorance', is eliminated by the *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*. The notion "'I' am limited" is eliminated. "'I' am limited" is a misconception. But, *what* is meant by 'elimination', in this context? **Ans:** No physical transformation takes place.

Only the notion "I am limited" goes away. 'Elimination' of the thought "I am limited", is achieved.

It should again be carefully noted, that what is meant by the word 'I', is the *aathmaa* and not the mind. Mind cannot expand. So, neither the mind nor the *aathmaa* is 'made' limitless. Why not? Mind **cannot** be made limitless; *aathmaa* **need not** be made limitless. Then what do we achieve? **Ans:** We drop the notion "I am limited".

'Dropping the wrong notion' alone is achieved. You cannot expect anything else from the *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*.

And, similarly,

ॐ परोक्षत्वस्य च तदस्थस्य - and also the seeming 'remoteness' of 'that' , the
Paramaathmaa

ॐ (निरसनात्) - having been eliminated,

Just as 'limitation' is a seeming feature of *jeevaathmaa*, '*Paarokshyam*' or 'remoteness' is a 'seeming' feature of *Paramaathmaa*. Before '*jnaanam*' is attained, *Paramaathmaa* is considered 'remote' and always referred to, as, '*That Paramaathmaa*'. Even if the aspirant somehow attains *Vaikuntaa*, "*That Paramaathmaa*" may only change to "*This Paramaathmaa*". But, both 'that' and 'this' will be dropped / removed because of the *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*. *Paramaathmaa* is neither 'that' nor 'this'. Then, what is it ? *Paramaathmaa* is 'I'.

Both limitation of *jeevaathmaa* and *paarokshyam* of *Paramaathmaa* are removed by *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam*. Therefore, I do not, any more, want to 'merge' into *Paramaathmaa*.

But, what is our general concept of *mokshaa*? (Swamiji says: The mistaken general concept is so strong, that I am repeatedly discussing this.) **Ans:** "We think 'I am in *this* cosmic world; the world is '*here*'; *Paramaathmaa* is non-cosmic or supra-cosmic. I am trapped in the world, which gives me permanent sorrow. My aim, therefore, is to somehow 'escape' from this world and 'merge' with *Paramaathmaa*. And, thereafter, I should not have any more *janmaa*. And, that is *mokshaa*".

Unfortunately, this attitude is strongly entrenched even in students who have been studying *Vedhaanthaa* for more than 25 years. Of course, *Sri Dakshinamoorthy Sthothram* (verse 3) does contain a reference to this understanding of *mokshaa*, in its statement "*yath saakshathkaranaath bhaveth na punar aavrutthi: bhavaambhonidhau*" – "after direct enlightenment, through the *vedic* commandment 'that thou art', there is no more return to the 'ocean' of worldly existence". But, an advanced aspirant should not forget that, this concept of *mokshaa* is mentioned only in the initial *adhyaropa prakaranam*. This *adhyaropa-prakarana-mokshaa* is only a provisional *mokshaa* and is not the *mokshaa* of advanced *Vedhaanthic* students of treatises like *Naishkarmya Siddhi*. They should forget the concept of '*punaraavrutthi*' or 'return'. There is neither *nivrutthi* nor *punaraavrutthi*. 'I' neither 'go' nor 'come'. 'I' have been, 'I' am and 'I' ever will be the *jagath adhishtaanam Brahman, in whom galaxies 'come' and 'go'*. This is the teaching that *maha vaakyaa* wants to give. But, without realizing this, we want to use *maha vaakyam* to escape from the world and 'join' *Brahman*, similar to a wife 'joining' her spouse living abroad in mundane existence. An advanced aspirant should go beyond these ideas. His *mokshaa* is: "'I' do not go ; 'I' do not come. 'I' **am** the *sathyam*, in which the whole universe, including the mind, appears and disappears". As *Kaivalya Upanishad (manthraa 19)* puts it: '*mayyeva sakalam jaatham mayi sarvam prathistitham mayi sarvam layam yaathi thadh brahmaadhvayam asmi aham*' – 'Everything is born in 'me' alone; everything is based in 'me' alone; everything is resolved in 'me' alone. 'I' am that non-dual *Brahman* | *Vedhaanthin's* definition of *mokshaa* is not 'freedom from *punarjanmam*'; it is '*Svaroopaa avsathaanam*'. As the student advances in his study and assimilation of *Vedhaanthaa*, he should reject the provisional definition of *mokshaa* and come to the real definition.

Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, says '*nirasanaath*', meaning 'by eliminating these misconceptions, viz., 'limitation' of *jeevaathmaa* and 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* :

ॐ वैयधिकरण्यादि चोध्यस्य अवसरः न अस्ति - there cannot be objections urging diversity in the imports of the two terms ('thath' and 'thvam').

ॐ तदिदं अभिधीयते - That is being said in the following slokaa.

'*Vaidikaranyam*' means 'the state of being in different case-relations or positions', like 'the rich' and 'the poor' or 'the knowledgeable' and 'the ignorant'

If someone wonders and asks 'by knowing that Tata and Birla are rich, how will *my* poverty go?', that question may be logical. But, since, by removal of the '*upaadhi-s*' of *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*, they have been shown to be the one and the same *aathmaa*, there is no '*vaidhikaranya chodhyasya avasara:*', meaning 'there can be no objection that the meanings of the terms 'that' and 'thou' are different'. By this statement, '*Vaiadhikanyaaadhi chodhyasya avasara: na asthi*', the *Aachaaryaa* avers "There is no scope for questions like 'how can *I* become free from sorrow, by knowing *Paramaathmaa*?' or 'by knowing something else, how can the problem belonging to 'me' will go?'" .

Mahaa vaakyam's aim is not to reveal an un-related, remote *Paramaathmaa*. It is to create the awareness in the student, " '*I am Paramaathmaa*'".

The story of Karnaa, from the epic *Mahaabhaarathaa* is commonly given as an example, in such contexts. Karnaa is born to Kunthi, without the knowledge of her parents, when she is barely an adult. Kunthi , therefore, secretly abandons him as an infant; the abandoned infant is 'found' by a charioteer, who brings him up as his own child. No one else is aware of these happenings. Therefore, Karnaa also has the notion "I am Raadheya:" i.e. "I am the son of Radhaa", Radhaa being the wife of the charioteer. Radhaa's *puthra:* is Radehyaa. But, he is only a foster-son of Radhaa, though nobody is aware of it, except the charioteer and his wife, not even Kunthi, who also learns it later. Since, thus, he is known only as a charioteer's son and not a *kshakthriyaa*, he is not allowed to compete with Arjuna in warfare, because of which prohibition, Karnaa develops an inferiority complex. Karnaa gets to learn the truth of his birth, only much later, when Kunthi meets and tells him "You are not Radhaa's son. You are my son. You are not Raadheyaa. You are Kauntheyaa". Obviously, by Karnaa's getting to learn that he is not Raadheyaa, but, actually Kauntheyaa, no physical transformation takes place and cannot also take place. What does take place is that Karnaa only gets the conviction "I am not a charioteer's son; I am a *kshakthriyaa*". That '*Raadheyathva bhavanaa nivrutthi*' makes a big difference, since, because of that, whatever inferiority complex Karnaa had developed, goes away. If Karnaa is overweight, his excess weight would not go away, merely by his awareness of his excess weight, since overweight is not because of ignorance, but because of overeating. Whereas, the emotional problem of Karnaa's inferiority complex was only due to the ignorance of the circumstances of his birth and that emotional problem was eliminated by the 'knowledge' given by Kunthi.

Whatever emotional problems are purely caused by ignorance, those ignorance-caused emotional problems can be eliminated by the right knowledge. It should also be very clear, that, knowledge will remove *only* ignorance and *only* the ignorance-caused problems. Knowledge cannot solve any other problem caused by any other reason.

Chapter III: Verse 78

तत्त्वमर्थेन संपृक्तो नानात्वं विनिवर्तयेत् ।
नापरित्यक्तपारोक्ष्यं त्वं तदर्थं सिंसृप्सति ॥ ७८ ॥

The word '*thath*' in the *mahaa vaakyam*, used in proximity with the word '*thvam*', the *jeevathmaa*, eliminates the idea of '*jeevathmaa's*' plurality. Similarly, when the word '*thvam*' (meaning *jeevaathmaa*) is used in proximity with '*thath*' (meaning *Paramaathmaa*), the 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* gets eliminated.

So, only a type of education is taking place through the *mahaa vaakyam*; no other transformation in the mind can be expected. And, what is the education? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ तत् - The word 'thath' in the mahaa vaakyam

ॐ संपृक्तः - used in proximity

ॐ त्वमर्थेन - with the word 'thvam', the jeevathmaa,

ॐ विनिवर्तयेत् - eliminates / negates

ॐ नानात्वं - the idea of 'my' plurality

What will the *mahaa vaakyam* do? **Ans:** "It will educate me that 'I' am not the limited body; 'I' am not the limited mind; 'I' am not the limited intellect; 'I' am the *saakshi* / witness".

And, I can, by myself, never know the size of that witness, because that witness 'I' is not available for objectification. Therefore, I have to resort to *Vedhaantha pramaanaa*, which is talking about 'my' dimensions - not of the body, nor of the mind, nor of the intellect, but, of 'I', the, '*saakshi*'. I can know 'my' measurements only through *vedhaantha vaakyaani*. *Kenopanishad* (I.3) points out this fact as "*na thathra chakshurgacchathi na vaaggacchathi no mana: na vidhmo na vijaaneema:*

yathaa ethadanusishyaath – “The eyes do not objectify that *Brahman*; the organ of speech does not objectify that *Brahman*; the mind also does not objectify that *Brahman*. We do not know that *Brahman*. We do not know how anyone would reveal this *Brahman*”. None of the other *pramaanaa*-s also, such as *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa* or *upamaanaa* can reveal that. I have to learn about ‘I’, the *saakshi*, only from the *mahaa vaakyam*, which tells me, that, ‘I’ am the unlimited Consciousness, without any association with anything, including the *mithyaa* mind.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says, that, when the word ‘*thath*’, the *Pramaathmaa*, is used in proximity with the word ‘*thvam*’, the *saakshi-jeevaathmaa*, the idea of *jeevaathmaa*'s limitation is eliminated. The idea that there are many *jeevaathmaa*-s (such as father *jeevaathmaa*, mother *jeevaathmaa*, husband *jeevaathmaa*, wife *jeevaathmaa* etc.) is a misconception. That means *eka aathmaa* alone is there.

So, *eka athmaa* alone is there and the apparent plurality belongs only to *anaathmaa* - neither to *jeevaathmaa* nor to *Paramaathmaa*. And, this plurality belonging to *anaathmaa* can never be eliminated or avoided. Even when Rama takes *avatharaa* as an individual body, he will be limited. *Anaathmaa* plurality *is* there. But, ‘I’ am *ekaathmaa*. In the *Srimadh Bhagavadh Githaa*, Lord Krishna says (Chapter V – verse 7) “*Yogayuktho visuddhathmaa vijithaathmaa jithendriya: sarvabhoothaathma bhoothathmaa kurvannapi na lipyathe*” – “ The pure-minded *Karma Yogi*, having mastered the body and sense organs, becomes the Self, which is the Self of all beings. At that stage, though engaged in action, he is not affected”. ‘I’ am neither a *karthaa* nor a *bokthaa*. So, an advanced aspirant or *jnaani* should not even look to exhaust his *praarabhdhaa*. He has no *praarabhdhaa* also to be exhausted. That being the case, where is the question of *jeevan mukthi* or *videha mukthi*? The continuation of *praarabhdhaa* after *jnaanam*, is called *jeevan mukthi*. The exhaustion of *praarabhdhaa* of a *jnaani* is called *videha mukthi* . Both are non relevant to the *jnaani*, who has no *praarabhdhaa* to be exhausted. . For him, only one *mukthi* is relevant and that is *nithya mukthi*. |

The effect of ‘*thvam*’ on ‘*thath*’ is stated in the second line:

ॐ त्वं तदर्थं सिंसृप्सति - As the *jeevaathmaa* approaches / joins *Paramaathmaa*

'srup' is the root for the word 'sisrupsathi'. 'srup' means 'go towards' / 'approach'.

As even as the jeevaathmaa approaches Paramaathmaa, as a result of the saamaanaadhikaranyam in the mahaa vaakyam, what does it do?

ॐ न अपरित्यक्त पारोक्ष्यं - the 'remoteness' of Paramaathmaa gets eliminated.

In the phrase '*na aprithyaktham*', double negative is used; '*na*' is one negative and '*a*' is another. They are used together and so they cancel each other. The final meaning of '*na aparithyaktha paarokshyam*' is '*parithyaktha paarokshyam*'. '*Na aparthyaktha*' means 'not un-renounced' or 'renounced' or 'given up'

What is given up? **Ans:** "Remoteness of *Paramaathmaa* is given up". The consequence: 'I', myself, am *Paramaathmaa*.

When the aspirant claims "'I' am *Paramathmaa*", he has to claim *jagath kaaranathvam* also and *jagath adhishtaanathvam* also, without any reservation. Therefore, every morning he should practice claiming "'I' am *jagath adhishtaanam*" and when he makes the claim, he should not feel it is a joke, with the nagging doubts "Am I the *jagath kaaranam*? Am I *nithya muktha*? How can that be possible?" One corner of his mind should not mock at him. He should be able to make the claim and the claim should be a fact for him (Swamiji says: This is what I have been calling 'binary format').

Sureswaraachaarya warns: Do not expect any transformation at *anaathmaa* level. An attitudinal change alone is there. Of course, as a byproduct of this knowledge, there may be some reduction in the frequency and intensity of mental disturbances and also the recovery period from the mental disturbances. But, that reduction, at *anaathmaa* level, is *only* a byproduct. That is not the primary aim of *Vedhaanthaa*.

186: Chapter III, Verse 78 and 79 (26-06-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to clearly point out what the *mahaa vaakyam* and the *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam* can do.

And, while knowing what the *mahaa vaakyam* and the *mahaa vaakya janya jnaanam* can do, the aspirant should know equally well what the *vaakyam* and *jnaanam* cannot do. In fact, he should know more clearly what they cannot do, so that he does not have wrong expectations and make a conclusion that he is a spiritual failure.

Reaching the conclusion "I am a spiritual failure", after studying *Vedhaanthaa* for quite some time and that too, caused by wrong expectations, is another form of *samsaaraa*, which uniquely belongs to *Vedhaanthic* students only. This may be called spiritual *samsaaraa*, which *samsaaraa*, the lay person need not confront.

And, when a *Vedhaanthic* student suffers this spiritual *samsaaraa*, his situation becomes worse, because, already there is the regular *samsaaraa* which he shares with his other family members and now, the spiritual *samsaaraa* born out of the conclusion "I am a spiritual failure" gets added.

And, often, this conclusion results, not because the aspirant is really a failure, but because of the wrong expectations of the aspirant. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to discuss this problem in detail. If we think *samsaaraa* is a particular undesirable condition or state of *anaathmaa*, (*anaathmaa* includes the body-mind complex), and if we conclude that *mokshaa* is 'changing that condition of *anaathmaa* and bringing about a fresh and wonderful condition of *anaathmaa*', then, our understanding of *samsaaraa* is unfortunately wrong and our understanding of *mokshaa* also is consequently wrong. This is because *samsaaraa* and *mokshaa* have nothing to do with the conditions of *anaathmaa*. *Vedhaanthaa* clearly says that a transformation or refinement at the level of *anaathmaa*, can never be accomplished through *jnaanam*, because transformation and refinement, otherwise called *vikaaraa* and *samskaara*, are both *karmapalaani* – the results of action. Expecting a *karma palan* through *jnaanam* is like going to an ornament shop and asking for footwear.

Therefore, it should be clearly understood, that transformation of *anaathmaa* can be only *karma palam* and cannot be *jnaana palam*.

Then, what exactly is the *samsaaraa*, which *Vedhanthaa* is promising or offering to remove? *Vedhaanthaa* says that, the *anaathmaa*, the body-mind complex, has several attributes which are natural to *anaathmaa*, and, are, therefore, called *svaabhaavika dharmaa:* of *anaathmaa*. Some of them are favorable attributes and some are unfavorable attributes. Also, some attributes can be changed and some cannot be changed. We call these *anaathma dharmaa:* as *svaabhaavika dharmaa:*.

In the proximity of *anaathmaa*, there is *aathmaa*, that is 'me', the *saakshi chaithanyam*, the observer, the awareness. And, that 'I', the *aathmaa*, happens to be, all the time, free from both favorable and unfavorable attributes. "*Anyathra dharmaath anyathra adharmaath anyathra asmaath kruthaakruthaath*" (*Katopanishad* – I.ii.14) - "Different from *dharma*, different from *adharmaa*, different from cause and effect" is 'my' nature i.e. 'I' am ever attribute-less.

But, because of the proximity between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, the *aathmaa* '**appears**' to borrow the attributes of *anaathmaa*. The language used in this sentence must be carefully noted. The statement is not '*aathmaa* borrows the attributes of *anaathmaa*'. The expression used is '*aathmaa* **appears to** borrow the attributes of *anaathmaa*'. The term 'appears to' is crucial. The consequences: *aathmaa* appears to be 'sick' *aathmaa*, because of any sickness in the body; *aathmaa* appears to be 'depressed' *aathmaa*, because of any depression of the mind; *aathmaa* appears to be 'deaf' *aathmaa*, because of the deafness of the hearing organ. Thus, we have another set of 'seeming' attributes, called 'transferred attributes'.

The set of attributes belonging to *anaathmaa* is known as 'original attributes'. The other set of attributes which **seem** to belong to the *aathmaa*, i.e. 'me', are 'transferred attributes', termed in Sanskrit '*aaropitha dharmaa:*'. This 'transference' is indicated by my language in the statements "I am sick", "I have problems", "I am deaf", "I am old", "I have degenerated" etc. In all these expressions, the attributes are co-existing with the expression 'I am'. All these attributes which are co-existing with 'I am', will come under *aaropitha dharmaa:* and not *svaabhaavika dharmaa:* | To consolidate: All the attributes belonging to the body-mind complex are *svaabhaavika dharmaa:* / All the attributes which are **seemingly** associated with "I

am" ("I am sorrowful", "I am angry", "I am *krodhi'*", ""I am *lobhi'*", "I am *mohee'*" etc.) are called *aaropitha dharmaa:* |

The word *samsaaraa* is the collective name of the 'transferred attributes' - (to be carefully noted) **not** of the attributes of *anaathmaa* - but, of the attributes which are *falsely* seen in the *aathmaa* ; i.e. those attributes for which we use the expression 'transferred attributes' in English and , the term '*aaropitha dharmaa:*', in Sanskrit |

If we want to remove the *svaabhaavika dharmaa* from *anaathmaa*, no amount of *jnaanam* will help. If we want to remove the *anaathma svaabhaavika dharmaa* like *asthi*, *jaayathe*, *vardhathe*, *viparanimathe*, *apaksheeyathe* etc., any amount of *jnaanam* cannot eliminate them. As for *karmaa*, it **can** give some benefit or relief, in the field of *svaabhaavika dharma-s* ; but, *karmaa* also cannot totally eliminate all the unfavorable *svaabhaavika* attributes. Therefore, *Vedhaantha* never offers or promises to change the *svaabhaavika dharmaa-s* of *anaathmaa* - the body, the mind, the intellect, the sense organs etc. *Vedhaantha* promises to remove only the *aaropitha dharmaa:*, the attributes falsely transferred from *anaathmaa* to *aathmaa*.

The *aaropitha dharmaa* alone is called *samsaaraa*. And, in contrast to the *svaabhaavika dharma* of *anaathmaa*, we do not require any *karmaa*, to remove the *aaropitha dharmaa*. Nor can *karmaa* help in any manner. We only require the knowledge that *aathmaa* cannot really have any attribute at any time. This simple knowledge alone is required. *Aathmaa* means 'I'. (It is not enough to merely say *aathmaa*). Therefore, '*I*' do not have any attribute, in all the three periods of time – past, present and future ; and, therefore, even if and when '*I*' **seem** to have attributes, I need not remove the seeming attributes; I have to only understand those seeming attributes **as only** seeming attributes.

To repeat: I do not require any action to remove the favorable or unfavorable *aaropitha dharma* – 'the attributes falsely transferred' to *aathmaa*; what is required is only 'dropping the notion that '*I*' have this set of attributes'. And, 'dropping this notion' alone is called *samsaara nivrutthi:* |

For this alone, the *Aaacharya*-s give the well known *Vedhaanthic* example of a colourless crystal placed in the proximity of a coloured piece of cloth. In this situation (of a crystal in the proximity of a coloured cloth), we experience two sets of colours - one set of original colours on the cloth and the other set of colours

reflected on the crystal. The set of colours on the cloth is '*svaabhaavika dharma:*' of the cloth. If we want to change or remove the colours of the cloth, mere *jnaanam* is not enough. We have to subject the cloth to a process, to change or remove the colours. *Jnaana maathrena svaabhaavika dharma nivrutthi: na bhavathi* | If we expect to the change in the colours of the cloth through *jnaanam*, the mistake is ours; it is *our* irrational expectation.

Now, we come to the second set of colours experienced, the one that is reflected on the crystal. In the proximity of the coloured cloth, we experience the same set of colours in the colourless crystal also. And, that set of colours in the crystal are not *svaabhaavikam* to the crystal i.e., that set of colours is not natural to the crystal, which, in reality, is colourless. The colours seen on the crystal are 'seemingly transferred' from the cloth, and are, therefore '*aaropitham*'. If we do not understand this *aaropitham* as *aaropitham*, naturally, we will mistake that *aaropitha dharmaa* as *svaabhaavika dharmaa* of the crystal. On the other hand, let us assume that we do have the knowledge that the colours are not the *svaabhaavika dharmaa* of the crystal and also that, in reality, the crystal is ever colourless, in all the three periods of time. With this knowledge, if we desire to see the colourless crystal, what should we do? Obviously, we cannot try to remove the 'colours' of the crystal, since they are only an 'appearance' and so cannot be physically removed. But, should we remove the cloth from the vicinity of the crystal, to remove the colours from the crystal? This question has to be answered very carefully. Generally the reasoning will be "Because of the proximity of the cloth, the crystal is coloured. Therefore, to remove the colour of the crystal, remove the cloth". But, what *Vedhaantha* says is: "Even this is not required. To remove the colours from the crystal, you do not have to do any *karmaa*; you need not remove the cloth from the vicinity of the crystal. Let the cloth remain there. You need not even change the appearance of the crystal. Let it continue to appear as a coloured crystal. But, if you are an informed individual, even when you see the crystal as coloured because of the proximity of the cloth, you will say that the crystal was not coloured in the past, is not coloured now and will not ever be coloured".

So, to make the crystal colourless, what do you require? **Ans:** "The mere understanding that the crystal is ever colourless, even when it appears as coloured".

'I' am similar to the crystal. The phrase "*suddha spatika sankasam*" (*dhyana sloka* of *Sri Rudram*, used to describe Lord Siva) – "pure and colourless as crystal" will describe 'me' also very well. 'I' am always attribute-less.

Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa presents this fact eloquently in his *Nirvaana Shatkam* (verse 3) - "*Na mey dvesha ragau na mey lobha mohau madho naiva mey naiva maatsarya bhaava.*" - "'I' am free of hatred, attachment, greed, delusion, arrogance and jealousy". When? *Vedhanthaa* says 'I' was, 'I' am and 'I' ever will be *suddha spatika*: | Because of the ignorance of this fact (knowledge of which fact, is given by *mahaa vaakyam*) before the operation of the *mahaa vaakyam*, I have transferred the attributes of *anaathmaa* on to 'my'self. And, because of that, I say "I am sick", "I have problems", "I am old", "I am husband", "I am wife" and so on. All these are only apparent attributes of 'me' and with the apparent attributes taken as 'my' own attributes, I suffer *samsaara*. What does *Vedhanthaa* want to say? **Ans:** "It points out that the apparent attributes are only apparent attributes". And, to remove the apparent attributes from 'me', what should I do? Again *Vedhanthaa* answers: "To remove the apparent attributes from 'me', I need not do anything, other than dropping the notions that (i) the apparent attributes are 'my' attributes (ii) I am suffering from *samsaara* and (iii) I require a savior". These notions are to be dropped by *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*.

But, if a person says "I am not interested in removing the apparent attributes of *aathmaa*. I am interested in transforming the unfavourable attributes of *anaathmaa*", the *Veda*-s and the *guru* will tell him "In that case, the shop that you have to go to, is not the *Veda anthaa* shop. The *Veda poorvaa* shop is the shop for you. *Vedha anthaa* is addressing only those people who have exhausted their efforts in the *Veda Poorava* shop and have made an important discovery, that, 'straightening' *anaathmaa* is exactly like the proverbial 'straightening' of the dog's tail , in other words, 'impossible'".

'Exhausting the *Veda Poorvaa* shop' is what is conveyed by the *Mundakopanishad*, in the popular *manthraa* (I.ii.12) as "*pareekshya lokaan karma chithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath*"– "Having examined the worlds which are achieved through *Karmaa*, the *viveki* should come to dispassion". After trying the various *karmaa*-s prescribed by the *Veda Poorvaa* (*Karma Kaandaa* of the *Veda*-s), some people do discover the important fact that *anaathmaa* can never be perfected. Only those who make this discovery and therefore move over to the *Veda anthaa* will appreciate the

value of *Vedhaanthaa*. For others, it will always appear that *Karma Kaandaa* is more useful. Unfortunately,, sometimes, even an advanced student of *Vedhaanthaa* expects *Vedhaanthaa* to transform the *pancha anaathmaa*, namely, possessions, profession, family, body and mind. But, *Vedhanthaa's* aim is only to establish the *mithyaathvam* of *anaathmaa* and *samsaara abhaavaa* of *aathmaa*. The *Vedhaanthic* student should know this and therefore, be wary of having wrong expectations. He should also understand that 'perfecting' the *pancha anaathmaa* is not possible.

Mahaa vaakyam is to teach him, that, 'I', the *aathmaa*, is without any attributes, similar to the crystal without colours. This is because *Paramaathmaa* is like colourless crystal and the *mahaa vaakyam*, by equating *jeevaathmaa* with *Paramaathmaa*, gives the important message that the *ekaathmaa* is free from all the *samsaaraa* attributes. *Aathmaa* is **ever** free from *samsaaraa*; *anaathmaa* is **never** free from *samsaaraa*, even if one goes to *Brahma Lokaa*. This understanding must be there, for a *Vedhaanthic* student, if he is to be free from complaints that, he has not improved in any manner, based on his observation of the imperfections of *anaathmaa*.

Vedhanthaa never promises any change in the body or sense organs. Even an *avataara sareeram* cannot escape from the six modifications – *shad vikaaraa*. Therefore, the maxims (i) '*aham sathyam jagan mithyaa*' and (ii) '*Jagath* is eternally *sagunaa* and 'I' am ever *nirgunaa*', should be very clearly understood and remembered always by an aspirant.

The *Vedhaanthic* advice, therefore, is: "Come to the 'binary' format. See the nature of *anaathmaa* as it is; with the limited control that we have over it, learn to '*manage anaathmaa*'. Do not have too much of expectations, such as '*perfecting anaathmaa*'. The consequence of wrong expectations (as already discussed) is the new *samsaaraa*, with the apt name, '*spiritual samsaaraa*', which is unique to students of *Vedhaanthaa*, if they do not listen to and understand *Vedhaanthaa* properly".

Sambnahdga gadhyam to Verse 79:

कस्मात्पुनः कारणात्तदर्थोऽद्वितीयलक्षणस्त्वमर्थेन प्रत्यगात्मना अपृथगर्थः सन्नविध्योत्थं सद्वितीयत्वं निहन्तीति । उच्यते । विरोधात् । तदुच्यते ।

How does it happen that the significance of being one without a second carried by 'That', which is other than the Self, signified by 'Thou', puts an end to the

appearance of having a second born of nescience? We reply it does so, because of contradiction. It is explained in the next verse.

Sureswaraacharyaa continues to explain the phenomenon of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

To go back to the example: When I know and say the crystal is ever colourless, the knowledge or statement does not remove the colour from the seemingly coloured crystal. Of course, the knowledge does not remove the colour in the cloth also. The colour in the cloth will continue, because it is *svaabhavikam* to the cloth. In the crystal also, the colour will continue to be visible to the eye. Because of the proximity to the coloured cloth, the crystal will continue to appear coloured. In other words, the original colour of the cloth is not removed and the seeming colour on the crystal also is not removed. The 'knowledge' does not remove any colour at all. This is what Sureswaraacharyaa said in the previous *slokaa*, as '*nivarthya nivarthaka bhaava: naasthi*'. |

There is no question of physically removing the attribute of colour, by the knowledge 'the crystal is colourless'. The colour of the cloth cannot be removed by the knowledge, because it is *svaabhaavika dharmaa* of the cloth. The knowledge cannot remove the colour of the crystal also, because, the crystal does not have colours to be removed. Therefore, no external transformation takes place. Then what is the benefit of this knowledge? A transformation takes place in the intellect. What is that transformation? Knowing that the crystal is eternally colourless, the student gets to know, that the perception 'the crystal is coloured' is a misconception. Therefore, thereafter, he will not have the thought that the crystal is coloured. He removes from his inner thought, the expression 'coloured crystal'.

Similarly, the *mahaa vaakyam*, by equating the *nirguna Paramaathmaa* to 'me', the *aathmaa*, gives me the knowledge that 'I' am *nithya nirguna svaroopaa*: | This knowledge will not remove the *gunaa-s* of *anaathmaa*, because they cannot be removed; the knowledge need not remove the *gunaa-s* of *aathmaa*, since the *gunaa-s* are not there at all in the *aathmaa*, to be removed. The only transformation is, that, the thought "I' am a *samsaari*, seeking liberation" goes away from the aspirant's mind. And, that is supposed to be the benefit of *mahaa vaakyaa sravanam/vichaaraa*.

But, the irony is that even an advanced student of *Vedhaanthaa*, quite often, *seeks* (!) liberation by meditating on *mahaa vaakyam*. He seeks 'freedom from *samsaaraa*', through meditation, while the *mahaa vaakyam* keeps averring that he is ever free from *samsaaraa*. Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa takes pains to point out, that, 'proper knowledge' and 'freedom from bondage' are simultaneous.

And, if, for an aspirant, knowledge and liberation are not simultaneous, in that case, even if the aspirant resorts to *saadhanaa* for any length of time, liberation will not come, because his attempt is to remove a *samsaaraa*, which is non-existent. That is why *Vedhaanthaa* repeatedly says: "Do not postpone *mokshaa* for any *saadhanaa*; learn to claim **at the time of *sravanam* itself**, that 'I' am *nithya niranjana svaroopaa*."| That is being explained in this portion.

Just as we say the crystal is colourless, the *Upanishad* wants to say that, the *jeevathmaa* is *nirgunaa*. And, how does the *Upanishad* accomplish that? **Ans:** "By bringing the *nirguna Paramaathmaa* in an equation with *jeevaathmaa*".

What will happen when the *Paramaathmaa* is brought to an equation with the *jeevaathmaa*? **Ans:** "The two will be reduced to *eka aathmaa*".

But, after bringing *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa* together to an *ekaathmaa*, we will have a problem. What is that? Before bringing the *Paramaathmaa* near 'me', I had the thought "'I' am *sagunaa*". In other words, 'seeming attributes' were in 'me', before the equation. *Paramaathmaa* is known to be *nirgunaa*. Therefore, when I equate *Paramaathmaa* and *jeevaathmaa*, reducing them to an *ekaathmaa*, now, in the *ekaathmaa*, there must be two features or conditions. What are they? **Ans:** "Before bringing in *Paramaathmaa*, *sagunathvam* or *paricchedhaa* was there; when bringing in *Paramaathmaa*, *aparicchinaam* or *nirgunathvam* will also arrive. Now, *ekaathmaa* is associated with *sagunathvam* belonging to the former *jeevaathmaa* and *nirgunathvam* belonging to the former *Paramaathmaa*". How is that possible?

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out: "You are right. You cannot keep both *sagunathvam* belonging to the former *jeevaathmaa* and *nirgunathvam* belonging to the former *Paramaathmaa*, in the *ekaathmaa*, because opposite attributes cannot co-exist in one locus. Therefore, one of the two will have to be knocked off. And, it is the *nirgunathvam* of the former *Paramaathmaa*, which will knock off the *sagunathvam* of

the former *jeevaathmaa*, and hand over the *sagunathvam* to *anaathmaa*, thus, making the *ekaathmaa* also *nirgunam*".

Swami Vidyaaranyaa's *Panchadasa* calls this elimination of seeming '*sagunathvam*' from 'me', as '*anujvara nivrutthi*'

Swamiji (in a lighter vein): "I call this phenomenon of '*Paramaathmaa*' knocking off' the seeming *sagunathvam* of *jeevaathmaa* and throwing it on to the *mithyaa anaathmaa*' as 'neighbourising the problem'. 'Neighbourising' is my English. I have coined the word, based on the fact, that for any of us, a neighbour's problems do not cause much trauma or mental disturbance. We are *jeevan mukthaa*-s when a neighbor has got a problem. At best, we will extend lip sympathy. Transferring the *sagunathvam* from 'I' to the *anaathmaa*, is, therefore, nothing but 'neighbourising the problem of *sagunathvam* "

This '*Paramaathmaa* knocking off the *sagunathvam* / *paricchedhaa* / *sadvitheeyathvam* of *jeevaathmaa*' is not a physical process; it is an intellectual exercise / a matter of understanding "'I' am ever free", similar to understanding (in the example) the crystal to be always pure.

And, a similar phenomenon also takes place with regard to *Paramaathmaa*. *Paramaathmaa* is generally considered to be 'remote'. Only, because of this perceived 'remoteness', called '*paarokshyam*' in Sanskrit, the goal in life for a religious person, is to quit this world and join 'that' *Paramaathmaa*. All of us think *Paramaathmaa* is remote. *Jeevaathmaa*, on the other hand, is not 'remote', but, is most intimate. Therefore, when *jeevaathmaa* joins *Paramaathmaa*, and becomes *ekaathmaa*, what will happen? **Ans:** "The 'intimacy' of the former *jeevaathmaa* and the seeming 'remoteness' of the former *Paramaathmaa* will both become available to the *eka aathmaa*". This results in a problem as before. 'Remoteness' and 'intimacy' are mutually opposed to each other and therefore, cannot co-exist in one and the same *ekaathmaa*. Therefore, one of them will have to be 'knocked off'. Which one? **Ans:** "The 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* is knocked off by the intimacy, the *aparokshathvam* of the *jeevaathmaa*".

Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad (manthra III.iv.1) gives a clear indication of this non-difference of *jeevaathmaa* with *Paramaathmaa*, based on this 'intimacy', as "Yath saakshaath aparokshaath Brahma ya aathmaa sarvaanthara:" – "the Brahman that is

immediate and direct – the Self that is within all”. And, when the term Brahman is mentioned, the aspirant should not look around or even inside himself for that Brahman. His mind should ring with the knowledge “I am that intimate ekaathmaa, which was called jeevathmaa from one perspective and Paramaathmaa from another perspective”.

To recap: '*Nirgunathvam* and '*sagunathvam*' cannot co-exist in the *eka aathmaa*. 'Remoteness' and 'intimacy' also cannot co-exist in the *eka aathmaa*. . This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa, refers to, by the term '*virodhaathi*', in this *sambhandha gadhyam*. As explained, 'intimacy' of *jeevaathmaa* knocks off 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* and '*nirgunathvam*' of *Paramaathmaa* knocks off '*sagunathvam*' of *jeevaathmaa*. Because of this two-fold 'knocking off', there is only one thing left behind, viz., 'I', the *nirguna aparoksha nithya muktha ekaathmaa*.

What about *anaathmaa* (firm in its refusal to be 'straightened', like the proverbial 'tail of a dog')? Ans: *Anaathmaa will* continue. As mentioned earlier, human efforts can only 'manage' (partially control) the *anaathmaa*. But, there is no question of permanent 'straightening' / 'perfecting' of *anaathmaa*.

An interesting thought: *Vedhaanthetaa* itself has arisen only because the 'straightening' of *anaathmaa* is found impossible. If *karma kaandaa* of the *Vedaa-s* had succeeded in 'perfecting' *anaathmaa*, there would have been no need for the *jnaana kaandaa* at all. With diligent performance of the prescribed rituals, the performer would, ultimately, reach a stage, where he will have a perfect body, perfect sense organs, a perfect mind, a perfect spouse, perfect profession etc. If such is the case, *Veda* would be starting with *karma kaandaa* and ending with *karma kaandaa*. Unfortunately, it is not to be. The only option available is to understand *anaathmaa* as *mithyaa* and 'I' as the *sathya nithya muktha ekaathmaa* | Other than that, there is no solution.

Reverting to the text:

ॐ कस्मात् कारणात् - Because of what reason (does)

ॐ तदर्थः : - the Paramaathmaa,

ॐ अद्वितीय लक्षणः : - which has got 'limitlessness' as its nature,

'advitheeyam' literally means 'non-duality' and implies 'limitlessness' or 'poornathvam'. 'advitheeya lakshana: thadatha:', therefore, means 'poorna Paramaathmaa'.

ॐ त्वमर्थेन प्रत्यगात्मना अपृतगर्थः सन् - after joining jeevaathmaa,

'Prathyagaathmaa' means 'jeevaathmaa'. 'Jeevaathmaa' is the second component of the mahaa vaakyam.

What attribute does the *jeevaathmaa* have? **Ans:** "'*apoornathvam*' – 'sense of want / sense of inadequacy'. Of course, there is a popular song in which the devotee declares '*kurai onrum illai*' – 'I have no complaint'. But, that attitude is found only in that song. In reality, the *jeevaathmaa* has got all kinds of *apoornathvam*. But, again, the redeeming fact is that the '*apoornathvam*' is not original or *svaabhaavikam*. It is 'transferred' *apornathvam* that the *jeevaathmaa* has got, but, without knowing that it is only 'transferred'.

'*apruthagartha:*' means '*eiyyam praapya*' / 'attaining identity' / 'after becoming *ekaathmaa*' | The 'becoming' is not a physical phenomenon. It is again 'dropping the notion' alone.

How do the Paramaathmaa and jeevaathmaa become eka aathmaa? **Ans:** 'Mahaa vaakya bhalaath' - "Because of the saamanaadhikaranyam of the mahaa vaakyam".

ॐ अविध्योत्थं सद्वितीयत्वं निहन्ति - eliminate the apoornathvam (of the jeevaathmaa) born out of ignorance?

'*sadhvitheeyathvam*' means '*apoornathvam* / complaint / negative outlook on life'. Life is looked upon by a pessimist as a meaningless, burdensome, boring struggle. This negative attitude is called '*sadhvitheeyathvam*'.

The question is: "*Poornathvam* of *Paramaathmaa* 'knocks off' the *apoornathvam* of *jeevaathmaa*, after becoming *ekaathmaa*. Why is it 'knocked off'? Why should it not be retained?"

ॐ इति - If such a question is raised,

The *Aachaaryaa* himself raises the question, as if asked by a student or a *poorva pakshin*.

What is the answer? Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ उच्यते - I will give you the answer; listen carefully;

ॐ विरोधात् - it is because, poornathvam and apoornathvam being mutually contradictory, they cannot co-exist in the eka aathmaa after discerning the eiykyam.

And, the same logic will have to be applied for the phenomenon of the intimacy of jeevaathmaa knocking off the 'remoteness' of Paramaathmaa.

ॐ तदुच्यते - That is being said in the slokaa.

PLEASE NOTE

The above class notes have been typed out by Shri Viswanathan of Chennai. However, he could not proceed after class No.165; therefore the classnotes of Naishkarmya Siddhi is not complete.

Swamiji has however explained the whole of Naishkarma Siddhi in 251 classes.

As and when it is possible for someone to transcribe the rest of the audio lectures of Swamiji, the same will be posted in this site.

www.arshaavinash.in

WEBSITE FOR FREE E-BOOKS ON VEDANTA & SANSKRIT



Pujya Swami Dayananda Saraswati launched Arsha Avinash Foundation's website www.arshaavinash.in on Dec 31, 2014.

All the E-books available on the website can be downloaded FREE!

PUJYA SWAMI DAYANANDA SARASWATI- A BRIEF BIOGRAPHY BY N. AVINASHILINGAM. It is available in English, Tamil, Hindi and Portuguese.

SWAMI PARAMARTHANANDA'S TRANSCRIBED CLASS NOTES: Available class notes are Bhagavad Gita (3329 pages), Isavasya Upanisad, Kenopanisad, Kathopanisad, Prasna Upanisad, Mundaka Upanisad, Mandukya Upanisad with karika, Aitareya Upanisad, Chandogya Upanisad, Brihadarnyaka Upanisad (1190 pages), Brahma Sutra (1486 pages), Tattva Bodha, Atma Bodha, Vivekachudamani (2038 pages), Panchadasi, Manisha Panchakam, Upadesha Saara, Saddarsanam, Jayanteya Gita, Jiva Yatra, Dhanyastakam, Advaita Makaranda, Dakshinamurthy Stotram, Drg Drsya Viveka and Naishkarmya Siddhi.

BRNI MEDHA MICHKA'S BOOKS ON SANSKRIT GRAMMAR: Enjoyable Sanskrit Grammar Books- Basic Structure of Language, Phonetics & Sandhi, Derivatives (Pancavrttayah), Dhatukosah, Astadhyayi, Study Guide to Panini Sutras through Lagu Siddhanta Kaumudi, Sanskrit Alphabet Study Books- Single Letters, Conjunct Consonants.

There are many more books and articles on Indian culture and Spirituality, Chanting, Yoga and Meditation. There are also books in Tamil on Vedanta.



Arsha Avinash Foundation

104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, India

Phone: +91 9487373635

E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com

www.arshaavinash.in