



नैष्कर्म्य सिद्धि
Naiṣkarmya siddhi

of

सुरेश्वराचार्य
Surēśvarācārya

Commentary by
Swami Paramarthananda

Volume II – Chapter III (Part only)

Class Notes from 187 to 196 (pages 1940 to 2056)

The remaining classes will be uploaded as and when transcribed

Swami Paramarthananda has not verified the class notes of these talks. It has been done with his blessings by Shri S. Viswanathan, a long-time disciple of Swamiji.

Published by:



Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad,
Coimbatore 641012, India
Phone: +91 94873 73635
Email: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in

Contents

PLEASE NOTE	1940
187. Chapter III, Verses 79 (02-07-2010).....	1941
188. Chapter III, Verses 80 (10-07-2010).....	1952
189. Chapter III, Verses 81 (17-07-2010).....	1962
190. Chapter III, Verses 83 (24-07-2010).....	1974
191. Chapter III, Verses 85 (31-07-2010).....	1985
192. Chapter III, Verses 86 (07-08-2010).....	1997
193. Chapter III, Verses 88 (14-08-2010).....	2010
194. Chapter III, Verses 90 (21-08-2010).....	2023
195. Chapter III, Verses 92 (28-08-2010).....	2034
196. Chapter III, Verses 93 (04-09-2010).....	2045

PLEASE NOTE

These class notes have been typed out by Shri Viswanathan of Chennai.

Swamiji has explained the whole of Naishkarma Siddhi in 251 classes. Classnotes up to class No.186 were already uploaded last year as Volume I.

So far, Sri Viswanathan has typed out classnotes up to No.196 only. Therefore these classnotes of Naishkarmya Siddhi is not complete.

Page Nos given in the table of contents is in continuation of the Volume I.

As and when the rest of the classnotes is transcribed, the same will be posted in this site.

187. Chapter III, Verses 79 (02-07-2010)

Chapter III: Verse 79 –

संसारिताद्वितीयेन पारोक्ष्यं चात्मना सह ।
प्रासङ्गिकं विरुद्धत्वात्तत्त्वम्भ्यां बाधनं तयोः ॥ ७९ ॥

‘Limitation’ of *jeevaathmaa* gets negated by ‘limitlessness’ of *Paramaathmaa*; ‘remoteness’ of *Paramaathmaa* gets negated by ‘intimacy’ of *jeevaathmaa*; the negations, resulting from contradictory natures, take place instantaneously (on *mahaa vaakyam sravanam*), with the help of those two words (of *mahaa vaakyam*), namely, ‘*thath*’ and ‘*thvam*’ (in the *vaakyam*).

Sureswaraachaaryaa is talking about some of the corollaries of discovering *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam*, through the *mahaa vaakyam*. Before listening to the *mahaa vaakyam*, *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* were thought to be separate entities and after *mahaa vaakyam sravanam*, because of their *saamaanaadhikaranyam*, *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa* are reduced to *eka athmaa*.

When, thus, these two are reduced to one, what happens to their attributes? Before *mahaa vaakyam*, *jeevaathmaa* was associated with the attribute of ‘limitation’ and *Paramaathmaa* was associated with the attribute of ‘remoteness’. “What will happen to those attributes on *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam*?” is the question. All the attributes of *jeevaathmaa* and of *Paramaathmaa* cannot come together and join *ekaathmaa*, since some of these attributes are mutually opposed in nature, and therefore cannot co-exist in one *ekaathmaa*. Because of their mutually contradictory natures, some of the attributes will have to get knocked off. Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to indicate as to which attribute of *jeevaathmaa* knocks off which attribute of *Paramaathmaa* and conversely, which attribute of *Paramaathmaa* knocks off which attribute of *jeevaathmaa*. In the process, *jeevaathma* loses one attribute and *Paramaathmaa* also loses one attribute. And, *eka aathmaa* will have the remaining attributes. What are they? That is said in this *slokaa*.

Paramaathmaa has the attribute of ‘remoteness’ and *jeevaathmaa* has the attribute of ‘intimacy’. ‘Intimacy of *jeevaathmaa*’ and ‘remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*’ cannot co-exist in the *ekaathmaa*, because ‘intimacy’ and ‘remoteness’ are diagonally opposite natures. Therefore, what happens? Ans: “One of them has to get knocked off and does get knocked off”. Which one? Ans: “We should be careful. We cannot say ‘remoteness’ of *Paramaathmaa* knocks off the intimacy of the *jeevaathmaa*, since, in that case, after *mahaa vaakyam*, *ekaathmaa* will become remote, which is not possible. Therefore, we should conclude that it is the intimacy of the *jeevaathmaa* that has to be retained, because of which

only, *ekaathmaa* will be intimately available as “‘I’ am”. And, retaining ‘intimacy’ in the *eka aathmaa*, the ‘remoteness’ is knocked off. Thus, *thath padaartha paarokshyam* gets knocked off by *thvam padaartha aprokshathvam*”.

There is one more similar phenomenon. *Jeevaathmaa* has got ‘*paricchedhaa*’ or ‘limitation’ as its attribute. *Paramaathmaa* has got ‘*aparicchedhaa*’ or ‘limitlessness’ as its attribute. These two attributes are mutually opposed. ‘Limitation’ and ‘limitlessness’ cannot co-exist in the *eka aathmaa*. Therefore, one of them will have to be knocked off. Again, which one?

Ans: “We cannot knock off the limitlessness of *Paramaathmaa* and make the *ekaathmaa* retain limitation, because if limitation is retained after *mahaa vakyam*, *samsaaraa* also will be retained, since, limitation *is samsaara*. Therefore, the ‘limitlessness’ of *Paramaathmaa* alone should knock off the ‘limitation’ of *jeevaathmaa*”.

What is left behind is the intimate, limitless *eka aathaa*, which ‘I’ am. And, not only am ‘I’ intimate and limitless *ekaathmaa*; *anaathmaa* cannot touch ‘me’, whatever be the event happening in *anaathmaa*. This is the benefit of *mahaa vaakyam*.

ॐ अद्वितीयेन सम्सारिता - ‘Limitation’ (is knocked off) by ‘limitlessness’; ‘*samsaarithaa*’ implies ‘limitation’; ‘*advitheeyayathvam*’ implies ‘limitlessness’.

ॐ पारोक्ष्यं च आत्मना सह - ‘remoteness’ (is knocked off) by ‘intimacy’; ‘*Paarokshyam*’ means ‘remoteness’; ‘*athmaa*’ implies ‘intimacy’ / ‘*aparokshathvam*’.

Thus, ‘limitation’ (of *jeevaathmaa*) and ‘remoteness’ (of *Paramaathmaa*) are both knocked off. But, because of what reason? The *Aachaaryaa* answers:

ॐ विरुद्धत्वात् - because of contradictory / opposite natures,

The term ‘*viruddhathvath*’ conveys, (as discussed) that, ‘limitation’ of *jeevaathmaa* and ‘limitlessness’ of *Paramaathmaa* are contradictory natures and similarly ‘remoteness’ of *Paramaathmaa* and ‘intimacy’ of *jeevaathmaa* are contradictory natures. Contradictory attributes cannot co-exist in one and the same locus.

This ‘knocking off’ is possible because of another reason also, which the *Aachaaryaa* does not mention here, presumably assuming that advanced students of *Vedhaanthaa*, will know and remember that reason. That second reason is this: ‘Remoteness’ of *Paramaathmaa* can be knocked off, because the remoteness is an erroneous impression, born of our ignorance. In other words, it is possible to ‘knock off’ the remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*, because remoteness is an attribute superimposed on *Paramaathmaa* only by our ignorance. If *Paramaathmaa* is really remote, any number of *mahaa vaakyam*-s would not be able to

knock off the remoteness. An example to make this clear is the 'remoteness of *Maanasarovar*'. If someone wants to visit *Maanosarovar*, but is unable to undertake the trip because of its remoteness, can repetition / *japaa* of a *vaakyam*, similar to the *mahaa vaakyam*, such as 'this room is *Maaanasarovar*', help? Ans: "No; any amount of such *eiyya dharsanam* cannot remove the remoteness of *Maanasarovar*, because, remoteness of *Maanasarovar* is a fact and a fact cannot be knocked off by any number of make-believe statements". *Mahaa vaakyam* is able to knock off the remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*, because that *paarokshyam* is *adhyastha paarokhsyam* / *avidhyaa kalpitha paarokshyam* and not *vaasthavika paarokshyam*. Similarly, if the limitation of *jeevaathmaa* is a fact, any number of *mahaa vaakyam*-s cannot knock off the limitation of *jeevaathmaa*, because, 'fact' cannot be knocked off even by *Bhagavaan*. If *jeevaathmaa* is intrinsically limited, even the omnipotent *Isvara* cannot knock it off. *Mahaa vaakyam* is able to knock off the limitation of *jeevaathmaa*, because 'limitation of *jeevaathmaa*' is also, similar to 'remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*', *adhyastham* / *avidhyaa kalpitham* and not *vaasthavikam*.

The *mahaa vaakyam* can remove what are not intrinsic, but, what have been only superimposed by ignorance, just as a torch light can remove the 'misconception' of a snake superimposed on a rope (the popular rope-snake analogy). Therefore, the *mahaa vaakyam* removes the two superimpositions, the 'limitation' of *jeevaathmaa* and the 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa*. Both *kalpitha viseshanam*-s are knocked off by the *pramaanam*. *Pramaanam* removes errors; not facts.

Because of the contradictory natures (*viruddhathvaath*):

ॐ तयोः बाधनं (भवति) - the negation of the two attributes takes place,

thayo:' means 'of these two attributes' / '*paarokshya paricchedhayo:*'; '*kalpitha viseshanayo:* / *dharmayo:*' is implied; '*baadhanam*' means 'negation'.

ॐ तत्त्वम्भ्यां - with the help of those two words of *mahaa vaakyam*, '*thath*' and '*thvam*',

The term '*thathvambhyaam*' is a peculiar usage. As a first step, the two words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' are joined together as a *dhvandhva samaasaa*; '*thath cha thvam cha*' becomes the *dvivachanam* noun '*thatthvamau*'; the *thrutheeyaa vibakthi* of this *dvivachana* noun is '*thathvambhyaam*', meaning '*thath padhena cha thvam padhena cha*'.

It was said, that, the superimposed 'remoteness' and 'limitation' will easily get knocked off by the *mahaa vaakyam*, similar to the snake superimposed on the rope getting knocked off by the torchlight. And, how long will it take for this 'knocking off' / for the removal of the 'remoteness' and 'limitation', after *mahaa vaakya vichaara*? Ans: "This question is similar to asking 'after switching on the light on the rope, how much time will it take for the snake to

go away?' The answer to this question is obvious. The snake need not go away, because it is not there at all. Snake is an erroneous assumption and therefore its disappearance is instantaneous. The 'remoteness' of *Paramaathmaa* and the 'limitation' of *jeevaathmaa*, similar to the snake in the rope, get negated instantaneously. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ प्रासङ्गिकं - (the negation being) instantaneous.

'*Praasangikam*' means 'instantaneous' and used here as adjective to '*baadhanam*'.

Sambhandha gadhyam to verse 80:

तत्त्वमर्थयोस्तु बाधकत्वेऽन्यदपि कारणमुच्यते ।

A further reason supporting the sublating power of the meanings of 'that' and 'thou' is offered.

The *mahaa vaakyam* must be interpreted only in this manner, viz., that the mutually opposed attributes will get knocked off (as detailed so far); and, the corollaries also must be derived in a similar manner.

There is a possible wrong argument and Sureswaraachaaryaa warns against that wrong argument. What is the possible wrong argument? We said (i) *Paramaathmaa* has got limitlessness and *jeevaathmaa* has got limitation (ii) they are opposed to each other (iii) therefore, during *eiikyam*, one of them should get knocked off and (iv) it is the limitlessness of *Paramaathmaa* which knocks off limitation of *jeevaathmaa*". This is the right approach.

But, a *poorva pakshin* may argue: "Why should we do that? After all, one of them should get knocked off. Therefore, instead of the limitlessness of *Paramaathmaa* knocking off the limitation of *jeevaathmaa*, why cannot we say that the limitation of *jeevaathmaa* joins *Paramaathmaa* and knocks off the limitlessness of *Paramaathmaa*?"

If this is accepted, what happens? At the end of *mahaa vaakya sravanam/ vichaaraa*, *Paramaathmaa* also becomes limited and *samsaari*, instead of 'I' getting liberated. This is similar to a person accidentally falling into a ditch and another person, standing on the edge of the ditch, trying to pull him out, getting pulled into the ditch. *Paramaathmaa* also joins the *samsaari* group.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says "If that is the result of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, why should we waste our time in studying *mahaa vaakyam*? Not only do I not get liberated, but I add one more problematic *Paramaathmaa* also in my life. Therefore, there is no *purushaarthaa* at all, in that approach. You should interpret a *pramaanam* in such a way, that it teaches you something new and which is beneficial to you. A *Pramanaam* is defined as '*anathigatha*,

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

abhaadhitha, arthavath jnaana janakam meaning 'producing a new knowledge, not contradictory to any other *pramaanam* and useful to the *pramaathaa*'. By making *Paramaathmaa* a *samsaari*, I do not get any benefit at all".

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ तत्त्वमर्थयोः बाधकत्वे - In support of this approach of the elimination of the limitation of *jeevaathmaa* and the remoteness of *Paramaathmaa*,

To elaborate: "For this manner of interpretation, viz., that, the eliminations are caused by *thath padhaarthaa* and *thvam padhaarthaa*, '*thath padhaarthaa*' causing the elimination of the 'limitation' of '*thvam padhaarthaa*' and '*thvam padhaarthaa*' causing the elimination of the *paarokshyam* of '*thath padhaarthaa*' |

ॐ अन्यत् कारणं अपि उच्यते - I will quote additional justification.

Mahaa vaakyam is extremely powerful, only when it is employed in the manner in which it should be employed. The 'anti-venom' made by carefully extracting poison from a cobra, saves people's lives from snake bites. The same poison, if not employed in that manner, can kill people, instead of saving them. *Mahaa vaakyam* also has to be used carefully, because of its power. That is why a lot of care is to be bestowed in the interpretation of *mahaa vaakyam*.

What is the additional justification given by the *Aachaaryaa*?

Chapter III: Verse 80 –

अज्ञातपुरुषार्थत्वाच्छ्रौतत्वात्तत्त्वमर्थयोः ।

स्वमर्थमपरित्यज्य बाधकौ स्तां विरुद्ध्योः ॥ ८० ॥

Since this new, beneficial knowledge is the *thaathparyam* of *sruthi*, viz., of the words '*thath*' and '*thvam*' in the *mahaa vaakyam*, the *thathpadham* and the *thvampadham* play the role of the eliminators of contradictory attributes, but, without dropping their original essential nature.

In the *Advaita Vedhaanthin's* method of interpretation of the *mahaa vaakyam*, two types of ignorance go away. The job of a *pramaanam* is not 'changing' or 'creating' any situation or condition. As discussed already, 'change' is brought about only by *karmaa*. Change is *karma palam*; similarly production also is *karma palam*. *Aapthi*, *uthpatthi*, *vikaaraa* and *samskaaraa* are all *karma palaani* – brought about only by action. *Mahaa vaakyam*, being *pramaanam*, the *vaakyam* is not meant for changing or improving the body or the mind or any *anaathmaa*. *Pramaanam* is meant to reveal a fact, in the revelation of which,

corresponding ignorance or misconception will get knocked off. In *Advaita Vedhaanthin's* interpretation of *mahaa vaakyam*, two misconceptions get eliminated, which is a very valuable result. The first misconception to be eliminated, is: "I am a limited finite being". The fact "I am limitless *aathmaa*" is not known before *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*. This is 'ignorance no. 1'. What is the second major ignorance? Ans: "It is of the fact 'The ever-free *Paramaathmaa* is none other than 'myself'." The adjective to *Paramaathmaa*, 'ever-free' is very important. This second fact also is not known, before *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam*, in one stroke, knocks off both these pieces of ignorance. Since it thus knocks off ignorance, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin's* interpretation of the *mahaa vaakyam*, is the right interpretation.

Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ अज्ञात पुरुषार्थत्वात्- Since this new, beneficial knowledge

'*Ajnaathaa* means 'not known'. As discussed above, 'my' limitlessness and 'my' oneness with *Paramaathmaa* were not known before *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. The *mahaa vaakyam* and the *Advaita Vedhaanthin's* interpretation of the *mahaa vaakyam* remove these two pieces of ignorance and give the aspirant the knowledge of both. The *pramaanam's* job is 'knocking off ignorance' and 'conferring knowledge'.

The knowledge is not only new, but, it is beneficial also. Hence the use of the term '*purushartham*', which means 'beneficial'. *Vedaa* or *pramaanam* is giving an useful knowledge. The essence of the term '*ajnaatha purusharthathvaath*' is thus: 'since this knowledge is a new knowledge and also since this knowledge is universally useful'. Therefore the interpretation is correct.

ॐ श्रौतत्वात् - is the message / *thaathparyam* of *Vedhaanthaa*

This knowledge alone (limitlessness of *aathmaa* and its oneness with *Paramaathmaa*) is the message of *Vedhaanthaa*. Any other message derived, is a wrong message. '*Sroutham*' means 'message of *Vedhaantha*'. '*Srouthathvaath*' means '*sruthi thaathparyathvaath*'. Of what portion of the *sruthi*, is this *thaathparyam*?

ॐ तत्त्वमर्थयोः- viz., of *thath* and *thvam* (or *mahaa vaakyam*),

What is our conclusion, because of this reason?

ॐ विरुद्धयोः बाधकौ स्तां the *thathpadhaartha* and the *thvampadhaartha*) are the eliminators of the contradictory attributes (viz., limitation and remoteness),

The word '*badhakau*' means 'the two eliminators'. Of what? Ans: "'*viruddhayo:*' meaning 'of the contradictory attributes (viz., limitation and remoteness)'. Both of them stand negated. '*Sthaam*' is the verb and means 'are'.

Also, Sureswaraacharya notes that the *Paramaathmaa* should lose only the 'remoteness'; all the other features of *Paramaathmaa* - *sathyam*, *jnaanam*, *anantham* etc. - should not be knocked off. The baby should not be thrown away with the bath water. Only *parokshathvam* must be knocked off from *Paramaathmaa*. *Sath-chith-aanandam* should be retained. Similarly, in the *jeevaathmaa* also, 'limitation' alone must be dropped. The 'Consciousness' part and 'intimacy' part of *jeevaathmaa* must be retained. Only because of this partial dropping, it is called '*bhaagathyaaga lakshanaa*' meaning 'partial rejection', clearly indicating, that, some features should be knocked off and some features should not be knocked off. Therefore, Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ स्वं अर्थं अपरित्यज्य - without dropping their original essential natures

The *Aacharya*'s implied warning / advice: "Therefore, do not give any other interpretation. Taken in this manner, the *mahaa vaakyam* will be greatly useful".

Sambhandha gadhyam to verse 81:

एवं तावद्यथोपक्रान्तेन प्रक्रियावर्त्मना न प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणान्तरैर्विरोधगन्धोऽपि संभाव्यते । यदा पुनः सर्वप्रकारेणापि यतमाना नैवेमं वाक्यार्थं संभावयामः प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणान्तरविरोधत एव तस्मिन्नपि पक्ष उच्यते ।

Thus, according to the line of inquiry instituted, it has been demonstrated that the thesis propounded has no shadow of contradiction with other means of knowledge like perception. When, with the best of efforts, the import of the proposition is not grasped owing to contradiction with other means of knowledge, the course to be taken is considered.

Sureswaraacharya concludes this particular discussion, pointing out that, interpreted in this manner alone, the *mahaa vaakyam* fulfills the definition of a *pramaanam*. '*Pramaanam*' means 'a valid source of knowledge'. A source of knowledge can be called a valid source, only when it fulfills three conditions (this has been discussed earlier also): (1) It should reveal something new, i.e. something which is not known before (2) the new revelation should not contradict our current knowledge and (3) it should be useful. The *Aacharya* says: "I have shown that the *mahaa vaakyam* satisfies all these three conditions in my interpretation. The knowledge gained through the *mahaa vaakyam* (interpreted in the manner which I have put

forth) is new because the aspirant gets to know “‘I’ am *Paramaathmaa*; ‘I’ am not a creature but the Creator”, which, he did not know earlier. This new knowledge is not contradicted by any of my current knowledge. Thirdly, it is ‘liberating’ knowledge, because, as *Paramaathmaa*, ‘I’ am ever free and therefore the knowledge is beneficial. Therefore, my interpretation is *pucca* “.

ॐ एवं तावत्- In this manner,

ॐ यथा उपक्रान्तेन प्रक्रिया वर्त्मना- by taking the course of the abovementioned interpretation,

‘*Yathaa upakraanthena*’ means ‘as described in the previous portions’; ‘*prakriyaa*’ means ‘etymological formation or interpretation’; ‘*varthmaa*’ means ‘path / course; ‘*prakriyaa varthmanaa*’, therefore, means ‘by the course of interpretation’ ‘*Yathaa upakraanthena prakriyaa varthmanaa*’ means ‘by resorting to the course of interpretation described above’.

To **briefly** recollect that course / method of interpretation studied earlier: (1) Stage 1 - ‘*saamaanaadhikaranyam* (2) Stage 2 – *viseshana viseshyathaa* and (3) Stage 3- *lakshya lakshana sambhandha*: | (For details, earlier classes have to be revised).

By this, what does the student find?

ॐ विरोधगन्धः अपि न संभाव्यते - there is not even a trace of anycontradiction

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाणान्तरैः- with any other *pramaanam* / means ofknowledge.

The essence of the statement: “The new, useful knowledge gained through the *mahaa vaakyam*, interpreted in the manner described, does not, even remotely, contradict our current knowledge acquired through other *pramaanam*-s, viz., *prathyaksham*, *anumaanam*, *upamaanam*, *arthaapatthi* and *anupalabdhi*”. This ‘non-contradicting nature’ is termed ‘*abaadhikathvam*’ and (as already discussed) is one of the three conditions to be satisfied by a valid *pramaanam*. For recollection: The other two conditions are ‘*anadhigathvam*’ (being new) and ‘*arthavathvam*’ (being beneficial). All the three conditions are fulfilled.

With this, Sureswaraacharya has concluded his interpretation. But, there is another group of *Vedhaanthin*-s who says “We cannot accept your interpretation, which, in our opinion, has two defects. We have to interpret *mahaa vaakyam* in a totally different manner, which interpretation only will give greater benefits”.

Sureswaraacharya, with the object of refuting their arguments, introduces this group of *Vedhaanthin*-s. These people also are *Advaita Vedhaanthin*-s only. That is why some of the sub-commentators call their theory ‘*svayoodhya matham*’ – ‘theory of one of our own group’ | These *Vedhaanthin*-s also accept *mahaa vaakyam*; but, tell the conventional *Advaitin*:

“Your interpretation of *mahaa vaakyam* is wrong”. Philosophers belonging to this group are called ‘*prasamkhyana vaadhin-s*’. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* has elaborately discussed them in the 18th chapter of his ‘*Upadesa Saahasree*’ | Sureswaraacharya discusses the subject briefly here.

Before going into the text, the gist of this *poorva pakshin*'s arguments and the replies of Sureswaraacharya, are discussed below briefly:

The *poorva pakshin* argues: “The knowledge derived by you, from the *mahaa vaakyam* contradicts my experience; i.e., that *jnaanam* is *pramaanaanthara viruddham*. *Vedhaantha* tells me ‘You are the embodiment of happiness’, whereas ‘unhappiness’ is my ‘experience’. Similarly, *Vedhaantha* tells me ‘You are limitless’, whereas I have always been feeling limited. *Vedhaantha* says ‘You are pure’. But, I feel that I have a lot of impurities / that, I am an embodiment of ‘impurity’. I feel I have none of the virtues listed in the 16th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githaa*, to acquire which virtues only I have been resorting to different *saadhanaa-s*”.

Thus, according to the *poorva pakshin*, the first defect in Sureswaraacharya's interpretation is that ‘*mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam is pramaanaanthara viruddham*’. The *pramaanam* which is contradicted (according to him) by the *mahaa vaakyam* is *anubhava pramaanam*. *Anubhava pramaanam* can be called *prathyaksha pramaanam* also. “Your *vaakya pramaana jnaanam* and my *anubhava pramaana jnaanam* are *viruddham*. Therefore, your *vaakya pramaana janya jnaanam* is wrong” objects the ‘*prasamkhyana vaadhin*’.

He continues: “There is a second *doshaa* also, which is, that, even after gaining this *vaakya pramaana janya jnaanam*, I do not find any improvement in me. Even though I have been exposed to *Vedhaantha* and to this *vaakya pramaana janya jnaanam* for a number of years now, I continue to be the same only. I have not been able to get over my worries; nor have my unhealthy / undesirable emotions like anger etc. subsided. Therefore, *mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam nishproyajnam*. I see no benefit at all from that *jnaanam*. This ‘absence of any benefit’ is my own intimate experience. Whether I am free from problems or not, I have to declare, because my problems are known to me only. The intended *prayojanam* has certainly not resulted”. Thus, the second *doshaa* (according to the *poorva pakshin*) is ‘*nishprayojanam*’.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhin* proceeds: “But, I think I can suggest a solution. Since this *jnaanam* does not give any immediate benefit, it is my opinion, that, for gaining the benefit, the aspirant has to keep repeating the *mahaa vaakyam* to himself. He can choose any one of the *mahaa vaakyani* (*aham Brahma asmi* or *Pragjnaanam Brahma* or *ayam aathma Brahma*). Of course, he should attempt to acquire *saadhana chathushtayam*, consisting of *vivekam*,

vairaaghyam, *samaadhi shatka sampatthi* and *mumukshuthvam*. He can resort to *sanyaasaa* also. But, his main *saadhanaa* should be meditation on the *mahaa vaakyam* and repetition of the *mahaa vaakyam*". The *poorva pakshin* calls this meditation *vaakya abhyaasa*: or *prasamkhyaanam*. That is why he is called *prasamkhyana vaadhin*. His main point is '*mahaa vaakya abhyaasa roopa dhyaanam / prasamkhyaanam karthavyam*'. He says, that, the aspirant may have to do this *abhyaasaa / prasamkhyaanam* for months or even years or *janmaa-s*, but, ultimately, it will give him the desired result. This is the *poorva pakshin-s* third argument / point.

The fourth point that the *prasamkhyana vaadhin* makes, is, on how *prasamkhyaanam* works. He says: "If you keep at this *prasamkhyaanam*, in course of time, this repetition will produce another type of extraordinary *jnaanam*, which is called *sakshaathkaara*:| You may call it 'enlightenment'. '*Saakshaathkaara*:' refers to an extraordinary knowledge, a new knowledge, other than the knowledge you get by just listening to *mahaa vaakyam*. I agree that 'listening to *mahaa vaakyam*' does give one type of knowledge. But, it is ordinary knowledge, which, in my opinion, does not give liberation. *Prasamkhyaanam* will produce an extraordinary knowledge and this newly produced extraordinary knowledge alone will produce liberation. This extraordinary knowledge is not acquired immediately on *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, but, only at sometime in the future; which time is dependent on numerous factors, known and unknown. But, as an aspirant, your job is only to keep on repeating the *mahaa vaakyam*, due to which 'repetition' / *abhyaasaa*, in course of time, a new knowledge will arise, which will produce liberation".

These are the four points made by the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*. In the following verses, Sureswaraachaaryaa refutes all these points. Before going into the text, his refutations are also briefly indicated as below:

As his first argument, the *poorva pakshin* had said: "The *vaakya pramaanam* and *anubhava pramaanam* are contradicting each other. *Vaakya pramaanam* says, that, I am free from problems. On the other hand, the *anubhava pramaanam* clearly shows that I am full of problems. They are contradictory. Therefore, this *jnaanam* is not acceptable".

In reply, Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Now, I am able to see your problems. I am able to see where all you have gone wrong. Let me explain. When you are quoting *anubhava pramaanam* or *prathyaksha pramaanam* to say / conclude 'I am full of problems', the *anubhava pramaanam* is dealing with *anaathmaa*, which you unfortunately claim as 'I'. Whenever you say 'I have problems', you are referring to problems pertaining to your profession, possessions, family, body or mind. These are the factors which constitute the *pancha anaathmaa*. In short, *anubhava pramaanam* is dealing with *anaathma vishayaa*. For instance, obesity, children's marriage, knee joint pain etc., are problems pertaining to the

anaathmaa. Whereas *mahaa vaakyam* is not dealing with *anaathmaa* at all; it is dealing with *aathmaa*, which you refuse to claim as 'myself', which is one of your problems. Without realizing this, you want to improve *anaathmaa* through *mahaa vaakyam*. Expecting wrong benefit in the wrong field, you complain 'I do not get any benefit'. This is your second problem. Thus your problems are: (1) you are not making a distinction between *aathmaa* and *anaathmaa*, by mistaking your *anaathmaa* body-mind complex as 'I' and not your *aathmaa* as 'I' (2) You expect *mahaa vaakyam*, which deals only with *aathmaa*, to solve the problems of your *anaathmaa*. Can you now see the contradiction? *Anubhavaa* deals with *anaathmaa* and *mahaa vaakyam* deals with *aathmaa*. When the fields of the two *pramaanaam*-s are different how can there be any comparison between the two? May you think properly".

188. Chapter III, Verses 80 (10-07-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa has completed his *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* topic, with verse no. 80. He clearly established that if we take *mahaa vaakyaa* with *lakshanaa vrutthi*, apply *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa* properly and separate *anaathmaa* from both *jeevaathmaa* and *Paramaathmaa*, then, what is left out is *eka aathmaa*. “That *eka athmaa* alone is *sathyam*, *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa* and that *sathya eka aathmaa* is none other than ‘myself’” is the message that can be clearly grasped from proper *vichaaraa* of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

To repeat the message (in view of its importance): “*Eka aathmaa* is *sathyam*, that *eka athmaa* is ‘myself’ and *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*”. This message will become clear through proper *mahaa vaakya sravanam*. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa very firmly said that this message is more than sufficient to gain liberation.

Now, the *Aachaaryaa* is entering into the topic of an important *poorva pakshaa*, known as *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa*. This *prasamkhyanaa vadhaa* was introduced in the earlier session and the four points of this *poorva pakshin* were also explained.

To recap the earlier discussions:

The first point that this *poorva pakshin* makes, is, that, the *sravana janya jnaanam* i.e. the knowledge born from the *mahaa vaakya sravanam* contradicts our *anubhavaa* / direct experience. “That *jnaanam* is *prathyaakshaadhi pramaana viruddham*” is his view. He explains why he believes so: “*Mahaa vaakyam* declares I am totally free from problems, whereas my experience shows I am full of problems. How can ‘freedom from problems’ and ‘saturation with problems’ be ever reconciled?” Thus, the objection “*mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam pramaanaanthara viruddham*” is the *poorva pakshin*'s first point.

The second point that he mentions is “Even after gaining this *jnaanam*, I do not find any improvement in my life or attitudes. All the typical problems continue as they are. My mental problems such as fear, anxiety, sorrow etc. continue as they are. Mundane problems also continue. By *Vedhaanthic* study, I have not found any improvement / benefit”. Therefore, the second point he wants to make is “*mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam nishprayojanam*”. ‘*Nishprayojanam*’ means ‘*prayojana abhaavaa*’|

The *poorva pakshin* further says (the third point that he makes): “Since no benefit is derived from the *vaakya sravana janya jnaanam*, what the aspirant has to do is to employ *mahaa vaakyam* differently. By employing the *mahaa vaakyam* in the manner you elaborated, I have not found any benefit. At the same time, I do not desire to reject *veda* or *mahaa vaakyam*; I do not want to question its validity. But, since *sravana janya jnaanam* has been futile, I suggest, that, you employ *mahaa vaakyam* in a different way. I can suggest the right method

also. The aspirant should utilize *mahaa vaakyam* for 'meditative repetition'. He should sit in meditation following the disciplines given by Lord Krishna for *dhyaana yoga* in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Ch. VI – verses 11 to 15), withdraw from entire *anaathmaa*, bring into the mind the *mahaa vaakyam* and thereafter keep repeating the *mahaa vaakyam* mentally.

The *poorva pakshin* uses four different Sanskrit words for this 'meditative repetition'. The different names are (i) *aamredanam* (ii) *vaakya aavrutthi* (iii) *vaakya abhyaasaa* and (iv) *prasamkhyaanam*.

ॐ The word 'aamredanam' is generally used in Panini's grammar.

ॐ In the second name, 'aavrutthi:' means 'repetition'.

ॐ In the third name 'vaakya abhayaasaa', 'abhayaasaa' also means 'repetition'. This corresponds to the word 'practice' in English, which, as is known, implies 'repeating again and again'. Repetition is called *abhayaasaa*.

ॐ The fourth name 'prasamkhyaanam' is a technical word; and, because of this technical name alone, this *poorva pakshin* is called 'prasamkhyaanam vaadhin' and his philosophy called 'pramsamkhyaanam vaadha:' |

'Prasamkhyaanam vaadhin-s' were powerful philosophers, who existed during the times of *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* and *Sureswaraacharya*. That is why, *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadhaa* also takes enormous pains to refute their philosophy, in his *Upadesa Saahasree* (chapter XVIII) and *Sureswaraacharya* also deals elaborately with this philosopher. In fact, the rest of this chapter III, from verse 81 to verse 125, the penultimate verse of this chapter, is the discussion on *prasamkhyaanam* and *prasamkhyaanam vaadha niraasa:* ('niraasa:' means refutation).

While refuting that philosophy, *Sureswaraacharya* gives some incidental points also regarding knowledge / insights related to epistemology. Epistemology is the science of the study of (i) knowledge (ii) means of knowledge (iii) validity of knowledge (iv) validity of the means of knowledge (v) error (v) the cause of erroneous knowledge etc. All such analysis related to 'knowledge' will come under the science of epistemology. *Sureswaraacharya* gives some insights on the *Advaita* epistemology.

The fourth point of the *prasamkhyaanam vaadhi* is on how the *prasamkhyaanam* works. He says: "If you keep repeating the *mahaa vaakyam* in the manner suggested by me, at the appropriate time in the future, depending on several factors, including your *poorva janma punyam*, after days or weeks or months or even years of *aavrutthi*, the *abhayaasaa* will produce another type of knowledge. *Sravaana janya jnaanam* is ordinary knowledge; whereas, this *abhayaasaa janya jnaanam* is extraordinary knowledge, called *saakshaathkaara:* | This extra-ordinary knowledge alone will remove *samsaaraa*. The very fact that aspirants with

mere *sravana janya jnaanam* are never able to claim boldly that they are liberated, is the proof that *sravana janya jnaanam* is not sufficient. Such aspirants with mere *sravana janya jnaanam* never claim that they are *jnaani-s*; they continue to claim to be *saadhakaa-s*. The very fact that they always look upon themselves as *saadhakaa-s*, the very fact that they hesitate to claim to be *jnaani-s* and the very fact that they hesitate to claim 'liberation' are proofs, that mere *sravana janya jnaanam* is not enough for liberation. They have to, therefore, work for the extraordinary *jnaanam*, through *vaakya abhyaasaa*, which will be the liberating *jnaanam*."

These are the four points of the *poorva pakshin*, the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*. In fact, many of the *advaitic* students would tend to agree with him, feeling that they are themselves standing examples of such people, who have *sravana janya jnaanam*, but not 'liberated'.

There is a similar discussion in the *Brahmasoothraa-s*, in the context of the 4th *soothram*, where a *poorva paksha matham* called *vrutthikaara matham* is introduced. The famous statement of this *poorva pakshin* is: "*srutha brahmana: api yathaa poorvam samsaarithva dharsanaath*" meaning "because of the very fact that *Vedhantic* students continue to be *samsaari-s*".

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa has to refute this *prasamhkyana vaadhi*, which he does very elaborately. Before we go into the text, for discussions on the *Aachaaryaa's* elaborate refutations, his answers are presented briefly below.

The *Aachaaryaa's* answer to the first point of the *prasamhkyana vaadhi* was also discussed in the earlier session; but, is presented again, as follows: "You can never say that *mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam* contradicts *anubhavaa*. I will explain why. You complain that *mahaa vaakyam* says 'I am free from problems', while your *anubhava pramaanam* shows 'I am full of problems'. But, what you do not realize or what you overlook, is the fact that the *sravana janya jnaanam* is talking about 'I', the *aathmaa*, the *saakshi chaithanyam*, while, when you talk about *anubhava janya jnaanam*, you are talking about *anaathma anubahvaa*, *anubhavaa* at family level, *anubhavaa* at body level, *anubhavaa* at mind level etc., which family, body and mind etc. are all *anaathmaa*. Family, body and mind are all full of problems. That is not disputed. But, they are all part of *anaathmaa*. Therefore, your *anubhava janya jnaanam* is *anaathma vishayakam*, while *saasthram* is talking about *aathmaa*. Therefore, how can you even make a comparison between *mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam* and *anubhava janya jnaanam*, or talk about a contradiction between the two, when *mahaa vaakyam* and *anubhavam* are dealing with totally different topics? Can you ever talk about *pramaanaa* contradiction, when you talk of the knowledge born of eyes and the knowledge born of ears? Knowledge born of eyes deals with forms and colours and knowledge born of ears deals with sound. They can never even be compared, to talk of a contradiction. Therefore,

'*kshethra bedhaath*' i.e. because the very fields of operation are different, you cannot talk of a comparison of the two or about a contradiction. When *Vedhanthaa* says 'you are *aanandha svaroopaa*:', it does not mean 'your mind is *aanandha svaroopaa*:' | If you misunderstand it in that manner, it is only your fault". Thus, the answer to the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*'s first objection is "there cannot be *pramaanaa virodhaa*, between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *anubhava pramaanam*, since they are dealing with different fields".

The second point of the *poorva pakshin* / the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* is: "*mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam nishprayojanam*". Sureswaraachaaryaa's answer to this objection is as follows: "If you expect a transformation in *anaathmaa*, through *mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam*, you are again making a mistake. Your expectation is unfortunate, because *Vedhanthaa* never promises a transformation in *anaathmaa*. The aim of *Vedhanthaa* is not 'transforming' or 'improving' *anaathmaa*. The aim of *Vedhanthaa* is 'falsification' of *anaathmaa*. Any transformation of *anaathmaa* or improvement in *anaathmaa* requires action / effort / *karmaa*. How can you expect a *karmaprayojanam* as *jnaana prayojanam*? The *karmaprayojanam*, viz., *aapthi*, *uthpatthi*, *samskaaraa* and *vikaaraa* – the *chathurvidha karma prayojanam* at *anaathmaa* level, can never be expected to result through *jnaanam*. For any *karmaprayojanam*, you have to resort to *karma kaandaa*.

"Then, what *prayojanam* can you expect from the *jnaana kaandaa* and consequent *jnaanam*?
Ans: Only problems resulting from ignorance will be eliminated by *jnaanam* / knowledge. You cannot hope for any transformation of or improvement in *anaathmaa*, from knowledge. An example will make this clear: Assume that one of the rooms in your house is dirty. There is a lot of mud, oil etc. on the floor. There is a lot of cluttered furniture also in the room. In addition to the dirt and the disorderliness, imagine that the room is also pitch dark. Therefore, if you walk into the dark room, you will step on the dirt on the floor and you may bang yourself against the furniture also. Both these problems of stepping on the dirt and hitting a piece of furniture are caused by darkness. Now, you switch on the lights in the room. What will happen? The dirty room will continue to be dirty. The cluttered furniture will remain cluttered. Light does not promise cleanliness of the room or re-arrangement the furniture. It will help only in your not banging against the furniture or walking on the dirt. If the room has to be cleaned and the objects have to be organized, merely switching on the light is not enough. After switching on the light, you have to physically re-arrange the furniture and clean the floor. The moral: What can be gained through action, action alone can do. What can be gained by knowledge, knowledge alone can do.

"Similar to the light solving only the problems caused by the darkness, namely the unpleasant possibilities of walking on the dirt or banging against furniture and not 'cleaning' or 're-arranging the furniture', *Vedhanthaa* will solve only problems caused by ignorance. How?

When you give *sathyathvam* to the world because of ignorance, the world gets another dimension and creates a lot of problems. If I take *anaathmaa* - mind / body etc. - as 'myself', that is also ignorance and it will give me problems. Only the problems caused by this ignorance will be removed by the *maha vaakya janya jnaanam*, since it gives the knowledge that (1) 'I' am not my mind nor my body (2) 'I' am the *sathya, nithya aathmaa* (3) the world, my body and my mind are all *mithyaa* and (4) the *mithyaa* world, body and mind cannot give any problems to 'me', the *sathya aathmaa*. Therefore, when you look for a *prayojanam* from *Vedhaanthaa*, do not have wrong expectations. Transformation of *anaathmaa* and / or improvement of *anaathmaa* are **not** the *prayojanam*-s that you can expect from *maha vaakya sravana jnaanam*. 'Falsification' of *anaathmaa* and also the knowledge that *mithyaa anaathmaa* cannot make 'me' *samsaari* are the very valuable *prayojanam*-s of *maha vaakya janya jnaanam*. 'I **am muktha.**; **in spite of** *mithyaa anaathmaa* and its condition' is the knowledge that *Vedhanthaa* gives. It does not want to change the *mithyaa anaathmaa*. Its message is: "my' freedom is not by changing the condition of the *mithyaa anaathmaa*, but in spite of the condition of *mithyaa anaathmaa*' | Of course, if you enjoy transforming the *mithyaa anaathmaa*, you can certainly try to do so thereafter, without any mental pressure. But, for that purpose, you have to resort to *karmaa*. The dirt on the floor of the room (in the example) will not be removed by switching on the light; only action will help. Please understand, therefore, that, because of wrong expectations only, you complain that *Vedhaanthaa* does not benefit you. If you understand what *Vedhaanthaa* is really meant for, namely, to give you the conviction 'I, the *athmaa* is free; *anaathmaa* is *mithyaa*; it will have changing favorable and unfavorable conditions, which do not affect 'me' ', and also realize that, that knowledge itself is beneficial, you will agree that *maha vaakya sravana jnaanam saprayojanam eva* | In short, rightly expected *prayojanam* is there for *maha vaakya sravana jnaanam*; your wrongly expected *prayojanam* will not result from it".

The third point of the *poorva pakshin*: "Since *sravana janya jnaanam* is *nishprayojanam* (in his opinion) you have to go for *vaakya abhyaasaa*, i.e., 'meditative repetition' of the *maha vaakyam*. The *vaakya abhyaasaa* or *vaakya aavruthhi*, otherwise called *prasamkhyaanam*, will produce another type of knowledge, which is termed '*saakshaathkaara*:', an extraordinary knowledge, which extraordinary knowledge alone can 'liberate' you". Sureswaraachaaryaa commences his answer to this view of the *poorva pakshin*: "No; *vakya abhyaasaa* comes under a type of *karmaa*. Repetition of this particular thought - *maha vaakya vrutthi* - will come under *karmaa* alone, called *maanasa karmaa*. That is because you are deliberately withdrawing your mind from all the other thoughts; you are deliberately invoking a particular thought and deliberately repeating the thought. It is a deliberate wilful action done, by creating a situation. It is exactly like *likitha japam*, i.e. similar to repeatedly writing the slogan '*Sri Rama Jayam*' or some other slogan. Instead of using your hand for repeated writing, you repeat with the instrument called 'mind'. You are repeating another

action, *maanasa japam*; it is a *maanasa karma* | *Kaayika japam* is *likitha japam* and *vaachika japaa* is loud 'repetition' with the organ of speech, both coming under '*karmaa*'. In a similar manner, *maanasa abhyaasa*: is *maanasa japam* and it will also come under *karmaa* only".

The *poorva pakshin* or the student might wonder: "What if, it is a *karmaa*?" Sureswaraachaaryaa explains: "No *karmaa* – let it be of any type – can ever produce any *jnaanam*. Meditation, being a *karma*, cannot produce ordinary *jnaanam* itself. Where is the question of it producing extraordinary knowledge?"

(Swamiji gives an example in support of this statement: Imagine that a student of Mathematics is unable to understand a formula in the class. So next morning, he gets up early, takes his bath and seating himself at a clean spot - in keeping with '*suchau dese prathishtaapya*' - goes on repeating the formula. Will this repetition produce any knowledge / understanding of the formula? The answer is 'no').

Sureswaraachaaryaa continues: "Even if the 'repetition' is of a *veda manthraa*, it can produce only *punyam* – not *jnaanam*. Even '*Aham Brahma asmi*' *japaa* – a *karmaa* – will produce only *punyam*, and not knowledge, because *karmaa* is never included in the list of *pramaanam*-s. In the science of epistemology, a thorough analysis has been done as to what all can produce knowledge and what all cannot. *Advaita vedhaanthin*-s have arrived at six *pramaanam*-s, while the *Visishtaadvaita* philosophers have arrived at eight. Different philosophies have arrived at different *pramaanam*-s. But no philosophy has ever suggested or accepted *karmaa* – *kaayikam* or *vaachikam* or *maanasam* – as a *pramaanam*. *Karmaa* is never a *pramaanam* and can never produce *jnaanam*. Therefore, I vehemently refute *prasamkyaanam* – a *karmaa* - as *pramaanam*. It cannot produce the extraordinary *jnaanam* you are talking of. If you want *jnaanam*, what is required is not *vaakya abhyaasaa*; what is required is *vaakya sravanam* only, since, in *sravanam*, we are enquiring into *mahaa vaakyam*. The enquiry / *vicharaa* will be useful, not repetition"

Thus, the *poorva pakshin*'s statement is "*Prasamkyaanam* produces knowledge" and Sureswaraachaaryaa's answer is "No, it cannot; only *mahaa vaakyam* can"; and, his argument in support of his answer is "*Prasamkyaanam* is not a *pramaanam*; *mahaa vaakyam* is".

If any aspirant or the *prasamkyaana vaadin* says: "I will do *prasamkyaanam* i.e. the 'meditative repetition' of the *mahaa vaakyam*. Through that exercise, I will acquire *punyam*, because of which I will get *chittha suddhi*. Thereafter, I will again come to *sravanam* and acquire *jnaanam* – the *jnaanam* which I did not acquire through my earlier *sravanam*", that will be acceptable to Sureswaraachaaryaa. But, he will never accept that *prasamkyaanam* itself can produce knowledge. *Advaitin*-s do not accept meditation as a means of knowledge / *pramaanam*. The third point of the *prasamkyaana vaadhi* has been answered thus.

What is the 4th point of the *prasamkyaana vaadhin*? He says that only as a result of the extraordinary knowledge acquired through *vaakya abhyaasaa*, *samsaara nivrutthi* will take place. He argues that *vaakya sravana jnaanam* cannot remove *samsaaraa*. He cites himself as the proof. He says: “I did *mahaa vaakya sravanam*; my *samsaaraa* did not go; but, after *abhayaasaa*, my *samsaaraa* will go”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa responds: “You say that you continue to have *samsaaraa* after *sravana janya jnaanam*; and, you hope to be free from *samsaaraa*, **after** *abyassa janya jnaanam*. That means after *abhayaasaa janya jnaanam*, your *samsaaraa* will go away. That, in turn, means that you are presenting *samsaara nivrutthi* as a future event. If *samsaara nivrutthi* happens after *prasamkyaanam* that will be a ‘*janyaa*’ i.e. ‘a result born in time’. In your opinion, you get *mokshaa* at last, as a result of long meditation. But, *vaakya abhyaasaa* being a *kriyaa* – an action - that *mokshaa* which is ‘born out’ of *vaakya abhyaasaa* will be subject to an end also. That will mean, that, through *vaakya abhyaasaa*, you will get *anithya mokshaa* alone. The *guru* is telling you ‘you are already / even now free from *samsaaraa*’. You do not accept it. You want to meditate, complaining ‘*sravana janya jnaanam* has not produced liberation for me. I continue to be *samsaari*’; and, you are hoping to get *mokshaa* through practice of meditation. If at all you get *mokshaa* through this course, that will be *anithya mokshaa*, which cannot be called *mokshaa*, because, by definition, *mokshaa* is *nithyam*”. Thus, the fourth point of the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*, namely, that, the *samsaara nivrutthi*, which did not happen through *sravana janya jnaanam*, will happen through *vaakya abhyaasaa jnaanam*, is not acceptable to Sureswaraacharya, because that *samsaara nivrutthi* will be temporary. It is like *svargaa* and not *mokshaa*.

Therefore, according to Sureswaraachaaryaa, all the four points of the *prasamkyaana vaadhi* are wrong. Then, what is his contention? Ans: “*Sravana janya jnaanam* itself will give liberating knowledge. If *sravana janya jnaanam* does not give liberating knowledge to any aspirant, in his first *sravanam*, the aspirant may take to ‘meditation’ - not for *jnaanam*, but for *chittha suddhi*, after which he has to come back for *sravanam* and *sravana janya jnaanam*. Ultimately, liberation is by understanding ‘(i) ‘I’ am ever free (ii) *mithyaa anaathmaa* is never free and (iii) the non-freedom or bondage of *mithyaa anaathmaa* cannot affect ‘my’ freedom / ‘my’ freedom is in spite of the conditions of *mithyaa anaathmaa*’ ”.

In the rest of this chapter, Sureswaraachaaryaa will be elaborating on these four points of the *prasamkyaana vaadhin*, in different methods.

Entering the text and referring to the second sentence in the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 81:

ॐ यदा पुनः (एवं वदन्ति)- If a poorva pakshin says

ॐ "सर्वप्रकारेण अपि यतमानाः- "Though we have been striving in different ways,

In this second sentence, the part from the term 'sarvaprakaarena' to 'virodhatha eva', is the *poorva pakshin's* statement and therefore given (by us) within 'quotes'. 'yathamaanaa: means 'people who put forth efforts'; 'sarvaprakaarena' means 'in different ways'.

ॐ इमं वाक्यार्थं न एव संभावयामः - we are not able to concur with the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*,

The *poorva pakshin* says "I have been striving in different ways to gain *jnaanam* through *mahaa vaakya sravanam*; but, even after all my efforts, I am not able to accept or appreciate the message of the *mahaa vaakyam*". What is that message of the *mahaa vaakyam*? Ans: "'I am ever free from problems" is the message.

This is similar to a very common complaint even of many *Vedhaanthic* students: "For a number of years now, I have been studying *Vedhaantha*, text after text and *Upanishad* after *Upanishad*, hoping at the commencement of every text or *Upanishad*, that I will attain *mokshaa* on the completion of that text / *Upanishad*. But, even after years of study, on my own assessment, I do not seem to be anywhere near 'liberation', though I am not able to bluntly confide in my *guru* about this, because of my respect for him".

The *poorva pakshin* gives a reason also for his reluctance to accept the message:

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाणान्तर विरोधतः एव" - as I find that the statement contradicts all the other five *pramaanam*-s, starting with *prathyaksha pramaanam*",

Again, the student also may feel the same: "*Vedhaantha's* message is that I am free here and now. Because of my different *saadhanaa*-s, my *sanchithaa* might have gone and any *aagaami* might have been avoided. But, when my *praarabhdhaa* is still very active and is 'thrashing' me all the time, how can I say that life is entertainment or claim that I am *muktha*? I may make the claim at the time of my death; but, not 'here and now'. That is why I continue my prayer for *videha mukthi*". Majority of the *Vedhaanthic* students may thus agree with the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*, on this aspect.

Up to this is the *poorva pakshin's* statement. Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ तस्मिन् अपि पक्षे - in that event also

ॐ उच्यते - the answer is being given.

The *Aachaaryaa*'s answer is from verse 81 to verse 125 of this chapter. 45 verses deal with *prasmakyaana vaadhaa*, because the *vaadhaa* is very powerful and also because many *Vedhaanthic* students also are troubled by similar views.

Chapter III: Verse 81 –

प्रत्यक्षादिविरुद्धं चेद्वाक्यमर्थं वदेत्क्वचित् ।
स्यात् तद्दृष्टिविध्यर्थं योषाग्निवदसंशयम् ॥ ८१ ॥

In case the proposition says what is contradictory to perception etc., it has to be construed as inculcating a certain manner of looking at things as the statement “woman is fire”.

First, Sureswaraachaaryaa makes a statement to please the *prasmakyaana vaadhi*. He says “Hey! *Prasmakyaanaavadhi* ! You are an informed person. You know *meemaasaa saasthram* and you know the rules of interpretation. There are similar occasions which occur in other parts also of *Vedic* teaching and there is a certain *meemaamsaa* rule which will have to be applied in these ‘other’ occasions. I agree that the rule that you are referring to, does exist in *meemamsaa saasthraa* and that, that rule will have to be applied on certain occasions”.

Then, the *Aachaaryaa* protests: “But, unfortunately you are wrongly applying that rule in this context”.

What is that rule referred to and how and where is it applied? It is explained as follows: Sometimes *Vedaa* does make statements which contradict our knowledge gained through other means of knowledge. *Vedaa*, as a *pramaanam*, is meant to give new knowledge; but, *Vedaa*, as a *pramaanam*, cannot afford to contradict other *pramaanam*-s, because a rule of epistemology is “one *pramaanam* cannot contradict another *pramaanam*, since if it does so, one of them will become *apraamaanam*”. To repeat: A *pramaanam* should give a new knowledge, but should not contradict other *pramaanam*-s. Even *Vedaa*, even though it is *Bhagavaan*'s *saasthram*, even though it is *apourusheyam*, even though it is *nirdhushtam*, as a *pramaanam*, it does not have any right to contradict other *pramaanam*-s. And, if it contradicts other *pramaanam*-s, that particular contradictory *jnaanam* that it gives, will not be acceptable. That knowledge will not produce any benefit. An example is generally given: *Chaandoghya Upanishad* discusses a topic known as ‘*Panchaagni Vidhyaa*’. In this *panchaagni vidhyaa*, the *Upanishad* talks about five types of *agni* – *pancha agnaya*: | It enumerates ‘*svargaa*’ as the first *agni*, ‘*meghaa*’ as the second *agni*, ‘*prithvee*’ as the third, ‘*purushaa*’ as the fourth and ‘*yoshaa*’ (which means ‘*sthree*’) as the fifth *agni*. Sureswaraachaaryaa takes one statement occurring in the *Chaandogya Upanishad* (V.8.1) in this context of the ‘*panchaagni vidhyaa*’, running, “*yoshaa vaava Gauthama agni:*”. ‘*Yoshaa*’

means 'woman'; 'agni:' means 'fire'. That means the *Upanishad* makes the statement "woman is fire". *Vedaa* is *pramaanam* and a *vaidhikaa* is supposed to have *sraddhaa* in the *Vedaa*. But even with *sraddhaa* in the *Vedaa*, is this statement acceptable? No, it can never be accepted, because, this knowledge obtained from *Vedaa*, contradicts the knowledge gained from *prathyakshaa*. If someone takes this sentence literally, and with the intention to have boiled water, keeps a pot of water on a woman's head and waits for the water to boil, will it work? Obviously not. The statement, therefore, is *nishprayojanam*. It shows that *sravana janya jnaanam* which is *pramaanaanthara (anubhava pramaana) vrudham* – contradictory to 'experience' - cannot be true *jnanam*.

Meemaamsaa saasthram (science of interpretation) wonders: "In such cases, i.e. in cases similar to 'yoshaa vaava gauthama agni:' what should we do? We cannot reject the statement, because we have got *sraddhaa* in the *Vedaa*. Therefore, the *vaakyam* has been accepted and it should give some *prayojanam* also, since *pramaanam* is defined as 'anathigatha abaadhitha arthavath jnaana janakam' – 'produces a new, non-contradictory and beneficial knowledge'. And, *Vedaa* is *pramaanam*".

Thinking on these lines, the *meemaasakaa* comes to the conclusion that, what the *Upanishad* expects us to do, is, that, after listening to this statement, namely 'yoshaa vaava gauthama agni:', we have to do *upaasanaa*. He concludes that the *Panchaagni vidhyaa* - the teaching - of the *Upanishad* is nothing but 'meditating' upon these five things – *svargaa*, *meghaa*, *prithvee*, *purushaa* and *yoshaa* - as 'fire', similar to meditating upon a stone as *Vishnu*; i.e. similar to 'saaligrame Vishnu buddhi:' | *Saaligramaa* is a *jada vasthu*; *Vishnu Bhagavaan* is *chethanam*. Knowing that *saaligraamam* is really not *Vishnu*., the devotee **visualizes** *Vishnu* on the *saaligraamam* and meditate on Him. Thus he does *vaakya abhyaasaa* and as a result of that *abyaasaa*, he obtains *brahma loka palan*. "In a similar manner, even though there is a contradiction between the *Veda vaakyam* 'yoshaa vaava gauthama agni:' and my *anubhavaa*, the *vaakya abhyaasaa/ vaakya aavrutthi* will produce *prayojanam*" is the conclusion of the *meemaamsakaa*.

The *prasamkyaana vaadhi* says "you have to apply this law in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam* also. I am not *Brahman*; but, I should go on repeating 'aham Brahma asmi', though it is contrary to the fact. And, when I keep repeating, as a result of that repetition, *punyam* will come, *jnaanam* will come and, ultimately, *mokshaa* will come". This is what the *prasamkyaana vaadhi* avers. *Sureswaraachaaryaa* differs. He tells the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*: "That rule is applicable to *yoshaagni vaakyam*; but do not apply the *yoshaagni niyamaa* to *mahaa vaakyam*".

He wants to explain, as to why the law is applicable to *yoshaa agni* and why it is not applicable to *mahaa vaakyam*.

189. Chapter III, Verses 81 (17-07-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa has entered into a discussion with the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*, who argues that the *mahaa vaakyam* is meant for *upaasanaa* only. And, according to the *prasamkyaana vaadhi*, this *upaasana karmaa* will have to produce knowledge later and as a result of that knowledge, *mokshaa* has to come. Thus, his road map is (i) *eiykya upaasana karmaa anushteyam* (ii) *eiyka upaasanena jnaanam bhavathi* and (iii) *jnaanena moksha: bhavathi*. This is his contention.

Whereas, we (*Advaita Vedhaanthin-s*) say: “*Mahaa vaakyam* is not meant for *upaasanaa* at all; *mahaa vaakyam* is meant for ‘knowing’ or ‘understanding’. And, when *mahaa vaakyam* gives the understanding of *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eiykyam*, that knowledge itself removes *aathma ajnaanam*; and, other than removing *aathma ajnaanam*, nothing else is required for *mokshaa*”. *Sankara Bhagavadh Paadha*, in his *Kenopanishad Bhaashyam* makes a very important statement: “*Avidhyaa nivrutthi vyathirkhena anya saadhana nishpaadhya: moksha: na bhavathi*” meaning “No means other than elimination of *aathma ajnaanam*, can help achieve liberation”. “Other than ‘dropping Self-ignorance through knowledge’, nothing else need be done for *mokshaa*, which does not need not be generated” is the *Advaitin-s* contention.

The *prasamkyaana vaadhi*'s conclusion on the mode of employment of *mahaa vaakyam*, is based on a *meemaamsakaa* rule; i.e., he is applying a *meemaamsaa* rule to arrive at his interpretation of the utility of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa first analyzes that rule and admits that the *meemaasakaa* rule is certainly applicable in a number of contexts. But, what he is contending is, that, that rule cannot be applied to *mahaa vaakyam*. In other words, he is not against the rule *per se*; but he *is* against the application of that rule in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*.

To explain the rule and its application: If *Vedaa* gives any statement which contradicts our experience or reasoning - *prathyaksha pramaanaa* or *yukthi pramaanaa* - then, that *Vedic* statement cannot be taken as statement of a fact. Such a *Vedic* statement is called *pramaanaanthara viruddha vaakyam* – a statement which is opposed to other *pramaanam-s*, such as *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa* etc.

Sureswaraachaaryaa cites a particular *Vedic* statement as an example, “*yoshaa vaava Gauthama agni:*” | This statement is from the *Chaandhogy Upanishad* (V.viii.1), on what is known as ‘*panchaagni vidhyaa*’. The statement means “a woman is fire”. Obviously, this statement cannot be accepted on face value, because *prathyaksha pramaanaa* reveals that it is not true. But, as *vaidikaa-s*, we cannot reject any *Vedic* statement, because *Vedaa* is an

apourusheya pramaanaa | Therefore, what we should do? Ans: “We have to enter into an analysis, to properly interpret the statement and its object. On such an analysis of this statement, it has been concluded by the *Aachaaryaa*-s, that the purpose of this statement is ‘May you meditate upon *yoshaa* as *agni:*’ | The conclusion is: ‘*yoshaa agni:*’ *jnaanam*’ is not the aim of the *Vedaa*; it is ‘*Yoshaa agni*’ *upaasanam*’, which is prescribed by the *Vedaa*”.

But, what is the benefit of this *upaasanam*? Ans: “It will become a *vaidhika karmaa* and when this *panchaagni vidhyaa upaasana karmaa* is done, as result of this meditation, the *Upaasakaa* will go to *Brahma loka* through *sukla gathi*, and so on, as detailed in the *karma kaandaa* portions”. Those details are not very material in this context. But, the *vyaapthi* / the general rule that is arrived at, is material.

What is that general rule? Ans: “*Pramaanaanthara virodhe sathi upaasana vidhi: angeekaarya:*”- “When there is an obvious contradiction between a *Vedic* statement and other *pramaanam*-s, it should be understood that *Vedaa* intends that statement to be used for meditation. It is only by practicing that *vidhi*, you will get the benefit; you will not get the benefit by merely receiving that *vaakyam*; You have to go on mentally repeating that *vaakyam*, as a *japaa*”.

The *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* says that this general rule is applicable to the *mahaa vaakyam* also. He argues: “‘*thatthvamasi*’ is also exactly like the statement ‘*yoshaa vaava agni:*’ | ‘I am free from problems’ is a statement which is *pramaanaanthara viruddham*. My *anubhava pramaanaa* reveals that I am a *samsaari*; *saasthra pramaanaa* says I am *asamsaari*. Therefore, it is a typical *pramaanaanthara viruddha vaakyam yoshaa agni: vaakyavath* | *Yathra yathra pramaanaanthara viruddha vaakyam thathra thathra upasanaa vidhiparathvam*” |

According to the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*, *mahaa vaakyam* also is a *pramaanaanthara viruddha vaakyam*. And, therefore, he makes an *anumaanam*, “*thatthvamasyaadhi vaakyam pramaanaanthara viruddhathvaath, upaasana vidhi param, yoshaa agni: vaakyavath*” – “Since the *mahaa vaakyam* ‘*thatthvamasi*’ contradicts other *pramaanam*-s, the statement is meant for meditation and not for ‘understanding’, similar to *yoshaa agni: vaakyam*”. This is his approach.

Sureswaraachaaryaa differs. He answers the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhin:* “Your conclusion on the ‘*yoshaa agni*’ *vaakyam* is fine; it is *pramaanaanthara viruddham*; therefore, it is *upaasanaa vidhi param*, as per the *vyaapthi* / the general rule. But, ‘*thatthvamasi*’ *vaakyam* will not come under that rule. No meditation - *upaasanaa* or *karmaa* - is involved in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*. It is a matter for ‘understanding’ and not a matter for ‘doing’. Unfortunately, in our spiritual journey, our general tendency is to always ask ‘What is the

next step to be taken?'. We want to go on doing *saadhanaa*-s | Performance of a *sadhaanaa* has become a rut in our minds. Because of this general tendency only, you show the anxiety of 'doing' something in the case of the *mahaa vaakyam* also. But, please listen to me. Get out of the *vibareetha bhaavanaa* of getting *mokshaa* later, through a *saadhanaa*. It is the most unfortunate wrong notion, which we have built up over the years”.

Reverting to the text (verse 81):

ॐ क्वचित्- In any context in the *Vedaa*-s,

ॐ वाक्यं अर्थं प्रत्यक्षादिविरुद्धं चेत्- if the idea conveyed by a *Vedic* statement reveals something contradictory to other *pramaanam*-s, such as *prathyakshaa*, (in that case),

ॐ तद्- that statement

ॐ दृष्टिविध्यर्थं स्यात्- should be taken as instruction for *upaasanaa*,

- ‘*vaakyam artham*’ means ‘meaning / sense / idea / message of the statement’.
- ‘*prathyakshaadhi viruddham*’ means ‘contradictory to other *pramaanam*-s such as *prathyakshaa*’.
- ‘*Cheth*’, of course, means ‘if’ / ‘on the supposition’.
- ‘*dhrushti vidhi*’ means ‘*upaasanaa vidhi*’ / ‘instruction for meditation’, the word ‘meditation’ always implying ‘meditation with a future result in view’ / ‘meditation looking for a result to be generated in time’.

What is the example of such a *Vedic* statement? The *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ योषा अग्निवत्- like the statement ‘woman is fire’,

ॐ असम्शयम्- without any doubt / doubtlessly.

What Sureswaraachaaryaa says is: “Suppose a *Vedic* statement reveals an idea which is contradictory to other accepted *pramaanam*-s, such as *prathyakshaa*, in that case, you have to apply the *meemaamsaa* rule ‘the statement is an instruction for meditation only’. I agree with that rule”.

“Woman is fire” is only one example of such statements. In the *Panchagni Vidhyaa* portion itself (of the *Chaandoghya Upanishad*) five ‘fires’ are mentioned, including ‘woman’. Heaven, cloud, earth and man are the other four ‘fires’. All of them are *pramaanaanthara viruddham* i.e. contradictory to other *pramaanam*-s. Therefore, they are all for the purpose of ‘*upaasanaa*’ only.

Thus, Sureswaraachaaryaa is conceding here, that, with regard to most of the *pramaanaanthara Veda vaakyaani*, this general rule is applicable. But, whether *mahaa vaakyam* comes under this rule or not is the question to be studied. Sureswaraachaaryaa is doing that in the following verses.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 82:

यदा तु तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यं सर्वप्रकारेणापि विचार्यमाणं न क्रियां कटाक्षेणापि
वीक्षते तदा प्रसंख्यानादिव्यापारो दुस्संभाव्य इति । तदुच्यते ।

But, when a proposition like ‘That Thou art’, however variously considered, does not connect itself with action in any way, it is impossible to construe it as inculcating endeavours like meditation. This is explained now:

When we analyze the *mahaa vaakyam* to see whether it is a *pramaanaanthara viruddha vaakyam* like *yoshaa agni: vaakyam*, we find that *thathvamsyaadhi mahaa vaakyam-s* do not come under this category at all. Therefore, no action can come anywhere near *mahaa vaakyam* – either physical action or verbal action or mental action. No action of any kind is involved; it is an idea to be ‘understood’ and ‘absorbed’. ‘Understanding’ is also not any action we do, because there is no will involved in that. When you listen to a statement made in a language that is known to you, then the ‘understanding’ is not something you ‘do’; it is something that ‘happens’ automatically. In other words, since your will is not involved, nothing is being done including the ‘understanding’; the ‘understanding’ happens, if you submit yourself to the teaching properly. Where is the question of ‘doing’ anything? Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ यदा तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यं - When any *mahaa vaakyam* like ‘*thaththvam asi*’,

Because of the use of the word ‘*aadhi*’, all other *mahaa vaakyam-s* such as *pragjnaanam Brahma, ayam aathmaa Brahma, aham Brahma asmi, sayaschaayam purushe* etc., also get included.

ॐ सर्वप्रकारेण अपि विचार्यमाणं- even when analyzed from different angles,

Many advanced *Vedhaanthic granthaa-s* have analyzed this topic, very thoroughly. One instance is when Sankaraachaarya, in his *Brahma Soothraa Bhashyam*, comments on *soothraa* I. i. 4, ‘*thath thu samanvayaath*’. In that context, he takes enormous pains to analyze whether *mahaa vaakyam* prescribes any *saadhanaa*. ‘Does *mahaa vaakya* prescribe any *saadhanaa*?’ is the question. Sankaraachaarya firmly concludes that *mahaa vaakyam* does not prescribe any *saadhaana*; he holds, that, the *vaakyam* only reveals a fact which has to be

‘understood’ and absorbed and, also that, even that ‘understanding’ is not a *karmaa*, but is something that ‘happens’. A serious and diligent *Vedhaanthic* student should, therefore, keep revising the *samanvaya bhaashyam*. Another instance is in the *Sruthi saara samuddharanam* of Thotakaachaaryaa, where also, Thotakaachaaryaa analyzes this in detail. Several points are discussed by him. To highlight only one of them, he points out, that wherever any *Upaasanaa* is prescribed by any *Upanishad*, the *Upanishad* itself gives the clear instruction ‘*ithi Upaaseetha*’. *Upanishad*-s are never vague or ambiguous on this aspect. An example is ‘*mano Brahma ithi upaaseetha*’ (*Chaandoghya Upanishad* – III.18. 1)| In all *upaasanaa* cases, *Vedaa* itself makes the *upaasana vidhi* very clear with the injunction “May you practice this *upaasanaa*”, after enunciating the statement to be meditated upon. Whereas, in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*, after stating ‘*thath thvam asi*’, *Chandoghya Upanishad* does not instruct ‘may you meditate’. On the other hand, in that context, the *Upanishad* only says ‘*Svethakethu understood and walked away (with the knowledge)*’. There was no ‘doing’ involved.

ॐ क्रियां कटाक्षेण अपि न वीक्षते- does not look at any action even through a corner of its eyes,

Sureswaraachaaryaa expresses his view in a poetic manner. He imagines *mahaa vaakyam* as a person and says, that, this *mahaa vaakyam* is so much averse to action, that ‘he’ does not want to look at the action even through a corner of ‘his’ eye. Then, where is the question of any *karmaa* or any *upasanaa*? ‘Understanding’ is an end in itself. In his *Kena Bhaashyam*, Sankaraachaaryaa mentions one more powerful and irresistible argument which can also be cited here. He points out: “*Mahaa vaakyam* tells the student ‘you are *akartha*’; suppose the student responds ‘Oh yes. I have understood I am *akartha*’; but, ironically, follows it up with the statement ‘Hereafter, I want to practice *Karmaa*’, in effect saying ‘I, the *akartha*, want to start *upaasana karma*’, is this not a jarring statement / a great contradiction? How can it ever happen?”

On the other hand, after absorbing *mahaa vaakyam*, the thought pattern that should be in the aspirant’s mind is ‘*naiva kinchith karomi pasyan srnvan sprusan jigraan api*’ (*Bhagavadh Githa* – Ch. V- verse 8) - ‘I do not do anything at all, even while seeing, hearing, touching, smelling etc.’”

Sureswaraachaaryaa asks “‘*Akarthruthva nischaya:*’ is the *mahaa vaakya palan* | That being the case, how can you do any action?” To emphasize this forcefully, he uses the term ‘*kataakshena api na veekshathe*’ |

Though only a few instances have been cited here, hundreds of such arguments establishing that there is no *upaasanaa vidhi* in the *Vedaa*-s, in the context of the *mahaa vaakyam* or

establishing that “‘I am *akartha*’ is the knowledge given by the *mahaa vaakyam*”, can be quoted. Sankaraacharya and a number of other *aachaaryaa*-s give many arguments to convince the aspirant, that, after absorbing *mahaa vaakyam*, he cannot afford to be a *saadhakaa*, because, ‘to be a *saadhakaa*’ means ‘to be a *kartha*’, whereas *mahaa vaakyam* says “‘I am *akartha*’”.

ॐ तदा- that being so,

ॐ प्रसंख्यानदिव्यापारः - any action, such as meditation etc.

ॐ दुस्सम्भाव्यः- is not at all possible.

ॐ इति- This is my stand.

The student may get a doubt: “What is *nidhidhyaasanam*, if not the mental action of ‘meditation’?” The answer is: *Nidhidhyaasanam* is **not** an action that is done by the aspirant. *Nidhidhyaasanam* is “claiming the fact that ‘I have nothing to do’, because ‘I was, ‘I am and ‘I ever will be *siddha aathmaa* and not a *saadhaka anaathmaa*”. *Nidhidhyaasanam* is “disowning *saadhaka anaathmaa* and claiming *siddha aathmaa*”. *Nidhidhyaasanam* is **not** ‘working for *mokshaa* as a *saadhakaa*’. The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* presents *prasamkhyaanam* as ‘working for *mokshaa* as a *saadhaka*’. *Advaitin*-s talk about *nidhidhyaasanam* as ‘disowning the *saadhaka anaathmaa* and claiming *siddha aathmaa*’ and not ‘working for *mokhsaa*’. Therefore, there can be no comparison or equation between *nidhidhyaasnam* and *prasamkyaanam*. The *prasamkyaana-kaari* is a *saadhakaa*. The aspirant in *nidhidhyaasanam* is not a *saadhakaa*; he is a *muktha*: and *siddha*: claiming his *mokshaa* as a fact”.

This statement may give rise to another doubt: “But, then, why do I have to take this special effort – *nidhidhyaasanam* – to claim what is a fact?” The answer to that doubt is: “Because every aspirant, unfortunately, has an orientation of ‘looking for’ *mokshaa*. *Nidhidhyaasnam* is for getting rid of that misconceived orientation. That ‘de-conditioning’ is *nidhidhyaasanam*. It is not at all ‘working for *mokshaa*’.

To revert to the text:

ॐ तदुच्यते- That is being analyzed.

As already pointed out, this analysis is done by Sureswaraacharya in a very elaborate manner, up to verse 125. He takes enormous pains to do so, because this is a very crucial topic, since almost all *Vedhaanthic* students have the wrong concept of ‘looking for’ *mokshaa*. This is a very serious problem in the course of *Vedhaanthic* education. In fact, all of us are hidden *prasamkhyana vaadhin*-s. The *Aachaaryaa* is, therefore, anxious to ‘knock off’ that feeling.

Chapter III: Verse 82 –

वस्त्वेकनिष्ठं वाक्यं चेन्न तस्य स्यात्क्रियार्थता ।
वस्तुनो ह्येकरूपत्वाद्विकल्पस्याप्यसंभवः ॥ ८२ ॥

If a proposition signifies only actual reality, it is not for inculcating action. Reality is determinately of one nature and so does not permit alternative possibilities as required in relation to the import of injunctions.

All these are technical, important, epistemological topics, dealing with *pramaanam*, *jnaanam*, *karmaa* etc., and have to be carefully understood. This topic has been discussed earlier and has to be recollected here.

A statement which reveals a fact is called a '*siddha bodhaka vaakyam*' or '*vasthu bodhaka vaakyam*', termed '*bodhaka vaakyam*' for short. A statement which gives a commandment to the aspirant to do some action is called a '*kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*' or '*karma janaka vaakyam*', termed '*kaaraka vaakyam*', for short. Thus, we have two types of sentences: (1) *siddha bodhaka vaakyam* or *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* or *bodhaka vaakyam* (which three names are synonymous) and (2) *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* or *karma janaka vaakyam* or *kaaraka vaakyam* (which three are, again, synonymous).

Vasthu bodhaka vaakyam is *jnaana janaka vaakyam* i.e. it generates *jnaanam*; *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* is *karma janaka vaakyam* i.e. it generates *karmaa*. Sureswaraacharya says: "These two statements are totally different. One can never become the other. They are mutually exclusive like light and darkness. May you meditate upon this idea". This topic is very elaborately analyzed in the *Brahma Soothraa*-s also, in the *Purasharthadhikaranam*, the first *adhikaranam* of Section 4, Chapter III, the biggest *adhikaranam* in the *Brahma Soothraa*-s. This *adhikaranam* is a discussion on the mutually contradictory teachings of *Jaimini* and *Vyaasaacharya*. In that discussion, it is said that *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* and *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* are like light and darkness, with many contradictory or opposite features. Here, Sureswaraacharya refers to one of those many features.

That particular feature is detailed as follows: When a statement reveals a fact, the individual who receives that statement understands that fact without any choice or option involved. An example as cited by Swamiji: "Suppose in a particular football tournament, you do not know the result of the tournament, i.e. as to who lifted the trophy and I tell you that Spain lifted the trophy. When I make this statement, whether you like the statement or not, it gives you 'knowledge' which you helplessly understand, of course, assuming that you know the language. But, why do I say 'helplessly'? *Sabda pramaanam* is only for the one who knows the language of that *pramaanam*. At the same time, for that listener, the *sabda pramaanam*

does not give any choice also. Reverting to my example, you understand from my statement, that Spain won the match; in that 'understanding' you have no choice and after understanding, you do not have any choice also on any 'thinking' you might want to do. Assuming that you happen to love Netherlands, the opponent country better, you cannot choose to think that Netherlands won. It is therefore a situation totally without a choice”.

Swamiji continues: “Now, imagine another situation. I tell you ‘do *sandhyaavandanam*’. This is a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*, inducing you to do an action; you understand the *vaakyam*. What is that ‘understanding’ meant for? Obviously for doing *sandhyaa vandanam*. But, on whether the *karmaa* actually takes place or not, in response to my *vaakyam*, there is a choice. You may choose to do *sandhyavandhanam* or not. You can choose to do it three times a day or twice a day or once a day. You may choose to do it only for a particular special event, such as just for a week, before your son’s *upanayanam*. Not only that. There are some people who say ‘I do not do full *sandhyaavandhanam*. I do only *Gaayathri japam*’. Therefore, there is a choice for *karthum* (doing), *akarathum* (not doing) and *anyathaa karthum* (doing with modifications) etc. available.

“Similarly, when *Panchaagni Upaasanaa* is prescribed, you may choose to do it or not. The *upaasanaa* is prescribed for *Brahma loka praapthi*; if you are not interested in *Brahma lokaa*, why should you do it? Thus, the reactions to a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* can be varied. In short, in *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam*, there are no choices available; but, in *karthru bodhaka vaakyam*, choices are available”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa points out that *mahaa vaakyam* is a *vasthu / jnaana bodhaka vaakyam*, where no *vikalpaa-s* is available. He asks: “Where, then, is the question of any *karmaa*?”

Reverting to the text:

ॐ वाक्यं वस्तु एकनिष्ठं चेत्- If a statement is merely committed to the revelation of a fact / if a statement is a *vasthubodhaka vaakyam*,

‘*eka*’ (in this context) means ‘merely’; ‘*nishtam*’ means ‘committed to’; ‘*vasthu*’ means ‘revelation of a fact’.

ॐ तस्य- for that statement,

ॐ क्रियार्थता न स्यात्- there cannot be any meaning inducing action.

‘*kriyaarthathaa*’ means ‘*kaarya bodhakathvam*’. This sentence can be expressed in simple Sanskrit as “*vasthu bodhaka vaakyam cheth kaarya bodhakathvam naasthi*”.

Swamiji reverts to his example and says: “In my example of the football tournament, I am just saying that this particular team, viz., Spain, won the match. I am merely revealing a fact to you, whether you are interested in sports or not. You may be a lover of the game of football or you may be averse to it. But, your *raagha-dveshaa* cannot stop the ‘knowledge’, which my statement gives. Whether you love or hate football or you are neutral to football, your emotional conditions - likes or dislikes or indifferences - cannot stop my statement from functioning. Irrespective of your mental state, if you listen to the statement ‘Spain won the match’, you have got the knowledge of the match. That is how powerful a *pramaanam* is. At the same time, my statement, being merely an information, does not require you to take any action, on the statement”. This is what is being said here:

ॐ वस्तुनः हि एक रूपत्वात्- Since ‘fact’ is only one and is not subject to your choice, विकल्पस्य अपि असंभवः- there is no possibility of introducing any optional action like ‘*upaasanaa*’ etc.

A ‘fact’ is an ever accomplished thing and can never be associated with any particular tense also, like *varthamaana*, *bootha* or *bhaavi*, because ‘fact’ is eternal. ‘Fact’ is not associated with *kaalaa*, while ‘action’ is associated with *kaalaa*.

An example: The sun rises in the morning. The action of ‘rising’ is in the morning; i.e. it is associated with the *kaalam*. But, what about the fact ‘the sun rises in the morning’? Is the fact valid only in the mornings? Is it not valid in the nights also? ‘Fact’ is *kaala adheetham*; *kriyaa* is within *kaalaa*. Thus, there is no choice of time also with respect to a fact.

A *Vedhaanthic* student obviously cannot say “I have been taught the *mahaa vaakyam* in my *Brahmacharya Aasramaa*. But, let me practice it in *Sanyaasa aasramaa*”. You are not ‘liberated’ only in *sanyaasa aasramaa*. ‘Fact’ is *kaala adheethaa* | The term ‘*vasthuna: eka roopathvaath*’ implies this also.

The legend goes, that some *Aachaaryaa* said: “I have postponed my liberation. I do not want to get liberated alone; I want to carry all my disciples to ‘liberation’ with me”. But, this is a statement made by the *Aachaaryaa*, only because of love for his disciples, which he wants to express by saying “I alone do not want to get liberated and go away; I would like to get liberated along with you all”. But, this *Aachaaryaa* cannot ‘enforce’ his statement. He cannot postpone ‘liberation’, for the disciples to come along with him. Therefore, one cannot take his statement seriously. Similarly, a wife, totally devoted to her husband – a *pathivrathaa* - also cannot say “I cannot go to ‘liberation’ without my husband. I will go only with him”. Whether one likes it or not, ‘liberation’ is a fact. Therefore, there is no choice of postponing ‘liberation’.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 83:

भिन्नविषयत्वाच्च न प्रमाणान्तरविरोधः । कथम् । उच्यते ।

As there is separation of spheres of application, there is no conflict between *sruthi* and other means of knowledge. This is explained.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* said, that, *upaasana* of the *mahaa vaakyam* is a necessity because there is *pramaanaanthara virodhaa* in the *vaakyam*, as in the example *vaakyam*, 'yoshaa agni:' | He says: "In *mahaa vaakyam* also, there is a contradiction, because *sruthi* says that I am liberated, while, I know I am not".

Unfortunately, this is the conclusion of a number of other people, including many *Vedhaanthic* students also. Very often, even a senior *Vedhaanthic* student, with years of study behind him, tends to consider himself as only 'working for liberation'. "I am not yet liberated; therefore, I am working for liberation" is the mindset of such a *Vedhaanthic* student. And, if asked, 'Why do you say that?', he would reply "I still suffer *kaama krodha lobha mohaa*: | I do not yet have *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi*". Having studied *Vedhaantha* for a number of years, he is knowledgeable enough to give this *saasthric* reason, unlike a layman, who may not be able to explain his situation. Such a senior student tends to think: "*Sruthi* says I am liberated. My experience is that I am not liberated"; and therefore, he thinks that the *mahaa vaakyam* is *prathyaksha pramaana viruddham*, and, therefore, concludes "I have to do *saadhanaa-s*". And, therefore, *prasamkhyanam*, as a *saadhanaa* may appeal to him.

Sureswaraachaaryaa responds to the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* and to such students: "All your arguments are unfortunate arguments. There is no *pramaanaanthara virodhaa* at all in the *mahaa vaakyam*. When you say 'I do not have *chathushtaya sampatthi*', you are talking of one particular 'I', while when *sruthi* talks of '*thath thvam asi*', it is talking of another 'I'. You are mixing up the two 'I'-s unknowingly. The 'I', that you are talking about, is the *ahamkaaraa* 'I', belonging to *anubhava pramaanaa*. *Anubhava pramaanaa* is dealing with the *saadhana chathushtaya rahitha ahamkaaraa* 'I', whereas, *veda pramaana* is talking about a different 'I', the *ahamkaaraa vilakshana saakshi* 'I'. Why are you mixing up the two? Why are you also refusing to shift your focus from the *ahamkaaraa* 'I' to the *saakshi* 'I' by *bhaagathyaagha lakshanaa*? Complaining of lack of *saadhana chathushtaya sampatthi* is acceptable, when you are in the initial stages of your spiritual journey, namely, *karma yogaa* and *upaasana yoga*. But, after listening to *mahaa vaakyam* for a number of years, how can you give that argument? *Ahamkaaraa* belongs to one *pramaanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* is a different *pramaanam*. Where, then, is the question of any contradiction?

“To repeat: your *anubhava / prathyaksha pramaanaa* is dealing with *ahamkaaraa*, which *ahamkaaraa* is a myth meant to be refuted. By talking of *saadhana chathushtaya sampaaathi* etc., you are holding on to *ahamkaaraa*. *Mahaa vaakyam*, on the other hand, is not talking about *ahamkaaraa*. It never says ‘mind is *aananda svaroopam*’. If it says ‘mind is *aananda svaroopam*’, your complaint that it contradicts *prathyakshaa*, is legitimate. *Mahaa vaakyam* does not. On the other hand, it says ‘mind is myth / *ajnaana adhyastham*’. When it says “‘I am *aanandha svaroopam*’, that ‘I’ refers to the *saakshi-aathmaa*. It says that *saakshi is aanadasvaroopam*. Where, then, is the contradiction requiring long *pramsamkyaanam*? If you love ‘meditation’, do meditate. But do not meditate for *mokshaa*. Since you love to meditate, continue to meditate; enjoy meditation as *muktha*: | But, the meditation should not be for liberation It is only for claiming ‘I do not require any *saadhanaa*, including meditation”

Therefore, he says:

- ॐ भिविषयत्वात् - Since the topic dealt with by *sruthi* is different from the topics dealt with other *pramaanam*-s,
ॐ न प्रमाणान्तर विरोधः- there can be no contradiction between *saasthra pramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam*.

This is only an introductory statement; Sureswaraachaaryaa will explain this later.

- ॐ कथम् -How do I say so?
ॐ उच्यते - I shall tell you. Listen carefully.

Verse 83 – Chapter III:

अपूर्वाधिगमं कुर्वत्प्रमाणं स्यान्न चेन्न तत् ।
न विरोधस्ततो युक्तो विबिन्नार्थावबोधिर्नो ॥ ८३ ॥

Knowledge is cognizing what is not known before. If the means of knowledge does not fulfill this condition, it is no means of knowledge at all. Therefore, no conflict is conceivable between *sruthi* and other sources of knowledge as they relate to mutually distinct spheres.

This particular portion is one of the most important portions of the entire *Naishkarmya Siddhi*, because several of our misconceptions are being knocked off in this portion. Here, Sureswaraachaaryaa says that *Vedhaanthaa* need not come and talk about *ahamkaaraa*. Why not? The answer: “We already know the *ahamkaaraa*; we are experiencing the *ahamkaaraa* all the time; all the miseries belong to *ahamkaaraa* only”.

To go to fundamentals, what is the definition of *ahamkaaraa*? Ans: “In *Vedhaanthic* language, *ahamkaaraa* does not mean pride / self conceit etc., as it does in common parlance. In *Vedhaanthic* language, it is ‘mind + *chidhaabhaasaa*’ ”.

Vedhaantha need not talk about that mind-*ahamkaaraa*, because mind-*ahamkaaraa* is already known.

That the mind has problems is also a fact, because mind has got *poorva janma vaasanaa*-s, *varthamaana janma vaasana*-s, unconscious issues like (as Swami Dayananda says) childhood problems etc. Since this is also a known fact, *Vedhantha* need not also say that mind has got problems. Just as body has problems, mind also has problems. Swami Vidyaaranyaa, in his *Panchadasee*, points out that just as the physical body goes with a set of *vyaadhi*-s, mind also has got some *vyaadhi*-s, in-built / intrinsic, caused by *gunaa* fluctuations, *poorva janma papaa* etc.

But, while *Vedhaantha* **need not** say ‘mind has problems’, *Vedhaantha* **cannot** also say ‘mind is free from all problems’. Why not? Ans: “Then it will become *pramaanaanthara viruddhaa*”. Therefore, *Vedhaantha* does not at all propose to talk about the problems of the mind. Of course, it wants to give an important information about the mind viz., that, ‘mind is *mithyaa*’. Other than that, no other information about the mind is given by the *mahaa vaakyam*. All the other information is well known. “May you assimilate the *Mithyaathvam* of the mind and may you assimilate that you are not the mind” is the new information derived from the *mahaa vaakyam*.

190. Chapter III, Verses 83 (24-07-2010)

Sureswaraacharyaa is refuting the powerful *prasamkhyaanavaadhi*, who argues: “Merely understanding *mahaa vaakyam* is not at all sufficient for liberation. After understanding *mahaa vaakyam*, we have a very big job to do and that job is ‘repetition of the *mahaa vaakyam*’, which is called *prasamkhyaanam*. As a result of this repetition, another type of *jnaanam* will be generated, which is called *saakshaathkaara roopa jnaanam* | Only thereafter *samsaara nivrutthi* will take place. His view is: “*Mahaa vaakyam* is not for mere understanding; the understanding should be followed by *prasamkhyaanam*, for the *vaakyam* to be effective”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa wants to refute the *prasamkhyaanavaadhi*'s argument. He points out that *prasamkhyaanam* is a type of *karmaa*; and that no *karmaa* can ever produce any knowledge and no *karmaa* can ever produce *mokshaa* also. He says: “Whether the *karmaa* is in the form of meditation - *maanasa aavrutthi*: - or whether it is physical *karmaa*, *karmaa* can never produce knowledge; nor can *karmaa* produce *mokshaa*. And, do not take *mahaa vaakyam* as a *karma bodhaka vaakyam*; it is only a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam*. It is revealing the fact of liberation. It is not giving us a method of getting liberation. *Mahaa vaakyam* is revealing the fact of liberation, which liberation is already obtained. I repeat: *mahaa vaakyam* is meant to reveal a fact; it does not give me a *saadhanaa* for liberation. It is simply revealing the fact that I happen to be liberated already”.

Thus, Sureswaraachaaryaa avers that the *mahaa vaakyam* is a fact-revealing statement and not an action-revealing statement; that, it is a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* and not a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*.

Vasthu bodhaka vaakyam and *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* are totally different. The main difference is this:

Vasthu bodhaka vaakyam, by definition, reveals a ‘fact’. Obviously, with regard to a ‘fact’, we cannot / need not do anything else, apart from accepting the ‘fact’. In other words, with regard to a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam*, we do not have any choice, other than ‘understanding’. Even ‘understanding’ the *vaakyam* is not based on our choice. Swamiji gives an example from common experience: “If in your neighbourhood, film music is played loudly, through a public address system, you will have to listen to the music helplessly, whether you like it or not. It may disturb your meditation or study. But, you will not be able avoid ‘hearing’. Not only will you ‘hear’ it; if the song, that is being blared, is in a language known to you, you will automatically understand the meaning of the song also helplessly, again without a choice.” In a similar manner, a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* does not give any choice or option to the listener. The listener *has* to ‘understand’ the message of the *vaakyam*.

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

In contrast to this, with regard to a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam*, there is always a choice. For example, after listening to a *vaakyam* prescribing an *upaasana vidhi*, it is up to the listener to choose to meditate or not to meditate or to meditate in different ways and in different postures also, which is expressed in Sanskrit as “*karthum akarthum anyathaa vaa karthum sakhyam*”.

To consolidate: *Kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* is *savikalpa vaakyam*; *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* is *nirvikalpa vaakyam*. (In this context, ‘*vikalpam*’ means ‘choice’).

These points are very important technically. If an aspirant does not appreciate the fact that *mahaa vaakyam* is a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* and not a *kaarya bodhaka vaakyam* and also this main difference between the two types of *vaakyam*-s, he will keep on meditating the *mahaa vaakyam*, expecting either a new knowledge to dawn or expecting ‘liberation’ to happen. That false approach to *mokshaa* has to be demolished, which Sureswaraacharya is doing vigorously. In verse 82, he says:

ॐ वस्तुनः एक रूपत्वात्- A fact being a fact,

A ‘fact’ does not depend on one’s *raagha dveshaa*. In response to the message of *jeeva-Isvara-eikyam* of the *mahaa vaakyam*, a *vishtaadvaitin* may say “I do not like to be *Brahman*; I like to be a worshipper of *Brahman*”. The *Advaitin* would reply: “But, ‘knowledge’ does not depend on *your* likes and dislikes. Like or dislike, a ‘fact’ is a ‘fact’”. An example: Some people would want India to be a Hindu *raashtraa* and not a secular country. But, what kind of country it is, whether secular or Hindu, does not depend on these people’s likes and dislikes. India *is* a secular country, according to the country’s Constitution. Without getting into the merits of whether it should be secular or Hindu and irrespective of individual likes or dislikes, the fact of its being secular, is a fact.

ॐ विकल्पस्य असंभवः- there is no alternative possibilities to the ‘fact’.

In the context of the *mahaa vaakyam*, there is no choice as to whether ‘I’ am liberated or not; or whether I should be liberated in this *janmaa* or in the next *janmaa* etc. Without a choice, ‘I’ happen to be liberated, here and now. It is a message from the *pramaana moordhanya sruthi*, which we have to merely understand and assimilate. The *Aaachaaryaa* tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*: “Where is the question of *doing* any action with regard to the *mahaa vaakyam*? In the names of *karma yoga*, *upaasana yoga*, *pancha mahaa yagnyam* etc., you have done enough. At least now, may you understand that *mahaa vaakyam* is **not** *prasamkhyana karma bodhaka vaakyam* but a *vasthu bodhaka vaakyam* only. In the case of the *yoshaa agni vaakyam*, I entirely agree with you, that, **that** *yoshaa agni vaakyam* indicates

an *upaasanaa vidhi*, following which, the interested individual has to enter into *panchaagni upaasanaa*. The *upaasanaa* has to be done, *punyam* has to be generated, and *Brahmalokaa* reached through *sukla gathi*. *Yoshaagni vaakyam* is intended for future *Brahma loka praapthi*: | But, *mahaa vaakyam* is different. It is intended for claiming instantaneously, the already attained *mokshaa*. Why are you mixing up the two and getting confused?"

The *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* justifies his stand as follows: "I prescribe *prasamkhyanaa*, because of a reason, which is this: What *mahaa vaakyam* tells me is that 'I' am already liberated. If I am able to accept this message, I will not attempt to do any meditation; but, I am not able to accept the message. I am not able to accept that I am *aananda svaroopaa*., since my experience / *prathyaksha anubhavaa* says I am *dhu:kha svaroopaa*.; *mahaa vaakyam* says I am *aanandha svaroopaa*: | There is, thus, a contradiction between my personal experience and *sruthi*'s revelation. That is why I am trying meditation of the *mahaa vaakyam*, so that, at least sometime in the future, I may be able to accept that 'I' am *aanandha svaroopaa*." |

(This is the thought pattern of not only the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhin*; many *Vedhaanthic* students also tend to think "I am full of sorrow; therefore, I have to take to meditation; and, as a result of the meditation, some day in the future, I will get the mental peace, which will cause the 'understanding'. Right now, I am looking for that future conducive mental peace, and doing *saadhanaa*-s to achieve that mental peace.")

Thus, the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*'s explanation of his view is: "*pramaana virodhaa* is forcing me to introduce meditation, in the context of *mahaa vaakyam* also, on the lines of *yoshaagni vaakyam*".

In the *sambhandha gadhyam* to Verse 83 (detailed in the earlier session) Sureswaraachaarya answers the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*: "No; there is no *pramaana virodhaa*, as you wrongly perceive. I will explain why. Your *anubhava pramaanaa* is talking about your mind which is *anaathmaa*. When you say 'I lack peace', you are talking about only your mind *anaathmaa*. Whereas, *sruthi pramaanaa* is not talking about the mind; it is talking about *aathmaa*. It does not say that the mind is *aanandha svaroopaa*., it is talking about the *aathmaa* as *aanandha svaroopaa*: | The information that it gives about the mind is, that, mind is not *sathyam*; but, is *mithyaa*. It is also saying that you are not the *mithyaa* mind. *Saasthra pramaanam* declares: 'You are not your mind and your *dhu:khee* mind is not *sathyam*'. That is the teaching of *Vedhaantha*, which never says mind is *aanandha* | *Vedhaantha* is also not prescribing any *saadhanaa* for converting *dhu:kee* mind into *sukhee* mind. The facts revealed by the *mahaa vaakyam* are (i) *Dhu:kee* mind is *mithyaa* (2) you are not the *dhu:kee* mind (3) you are the 'witness' of the mind and (iv) you, the 'witness' happen to be *aanandha svaroopaa*., all the time. Under the circumstances i.e. when *prathyaksha pramaanam* is talking about *anaathmaa*

and *sruthi pramaanam* is talking about *aathmaa*, two totally different fields, where is the question of any contradiction between the two *pramaanam*-s?"

Of course, by diligently doing the appropriate *karmaa* prescribed by the *karma kaandaa* / *Veda poorvaa*, a *saadhakaa* can convert the *dhu:khee* mind, into *sukhee* mind. It is possible, just as the physical body can be made to shed weight, by the appropriate physical exercises. Mind *can* be changed by *karma*; but, that change, caused by *karmaa*, will come under *karma palan*; and, unfortunately, that *karma palan* will be only *anithyam*. Mind is subject to constant transformations, as indicated by the Lord Himself, in the *Bhagavadh Githaa* (Verse 22- Chapter XIV), when He talked about the aspirant who has gone beyond the three *gunaa*-s – “*prakaasam cha pravrutthim cha mohameva cha Paandava na dveshti sampravrutthaani na nivrutthaani kaamkshathi*” - “Oh! Paandava! A *guna atheetha*: does not hate brightness, activity and delusion as they arise in the mind; nor does he desire them as they withdraw from the mind”. Whether you do *karmaa* or not, mental fluctuations are inevitable. ‘I’ am ever *sath-chith-aanandha svaroopaa*; and, when the mind is in a conducive condition, ‘my’ *aanandhaa* will be reflected in that mind; when, on the other hand, the mind is exposed to some terrible information and is disturbed, that disturbed mind will not reflect ‘my’ *aanandhaa*. Mind will have reflected *aanandhaa* at times; and, at other times, there will be no reflection of *aanandhaa*. Nobody including *Bhagavaan* can change this trait of the mind. In essence, mind is of fluctuating nature.

Mahaa vaakyam talks about *aathmaa*, saying “That fluctuating mind is *mithyaa*; ‘you’ are not that mind; ‘you’ are only the ‘witness’ of the mind; and, ‘you’ are ever free from any misery”. On the other hand, *anubhava pramaanam* is talking about the ‘miserable’ mind. When, thus, the very subjects of *saasthra* and *anubhava pramaanaa*-s are different, how can anyone even make a comparison of the two *pramaanaa*-s, much less see a contradiction between them?

Reverting to the text, the verse 83 (though covered in the earlier session):

ॐ अपूर्व अधिगमं कुर्वत् प्रमाणं स्यात्- What generates a newknowledge alone can be termed as *pramaanam*;

ॐ न चेत् तत् न (प्रमाणं भवति)- what does not generate a newknowledge cannot be considered a *pramaanam*.

‘*apoorvam*’ means ‘something new’; ‘*adhigamam*’ means ‘*jnaanam*’; ‘*kurvath*’ means ‘that which generates’.

The essence of this first line of the verse: “a *pramaanam* is a *pramaanam*, only when it reveals something new”. Therefore, if *mahaa vaakyam* says ‘mind is *dhu:kee*’, it cannot be considered a *pramaanam*, because, ‘mind is *dhu:khee*’ is already discerned from experience. If *mahaa vaakyam* also repeats it, it will not be a new knowledge. If, on the other hand,

mahaa vaakyam says 'mind is never miserable', in that case also, *mahaa vaakyam* cannot be considered to be a *pramaanam*, because it contradicts 'experience'. Such a statement is not a fact. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* should not say 'mind is miserable'; nor can it say 'mind is not miserable'. A *pramaanam* should give a new information, and that new information should be a fact also. *Mahaa vaakyam* fulfills all these conditions. It does not say 'mind is miserable'; it does not say 'mind is not miserable'. It does not talk about the condition of the mind at all. On the other hand, it gives two important new pieces of information about 'mind'. It says: "'Mind' is not 'me' and 'mind' is *mithyaa*"| These are the two important pieces of information that the *mahaa vaakyam* gives about the mind. You are allowed to say 'my mind is *dhu:khee*', based on *anubhavaa*; but, you are not allowed to say 'I am *dhu:khee*', since 'mind' is not 'you'. *Mahaa vaakyam* gives new knowledge, which is not contradicted by other *pramaanam*-s.. It says "mind is *mithyaa*"; this statement does not contradict *prathyaksha pramaanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* says "mind is not 'you'". This also does not contradict *prathyaksha pramaanam*. *Mahaa vaakyam* says "'you' are the 'witness' of the mind". This fact is also not available for *prathyaksha pramaanam*. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* is a *pramaanam*, in its own right.

ॐ ततः विरोधः न युक्तः - Therefore, no contradiction is conceivable विभिन्न अर्थ

अवबोधिनीः - between the two *pramaanam*-s which are revealing two different things.

'*thatha:*' conveys 'since *mahaa vaakyam* is a *pramaanam* revealing new information, not at all contradictory to available information' | '*vibhinna artha*' means 'two different things'; '*avabodhin*' means 'that which reveals' / '*pramaanam*'|

Prathyakshaa is dealing with *anaathmaa*; *mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with *aathmaa*. How can one talk of a contradiction between the two *pramaanam*-s, when the very subjects of the two are different?

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 83:

य एवमपि भिन्नविषयाणां विरोधं वक्ति सोऽत्रापि विरोधं ब्रूयात् ।

If one still speaks of conflict here, let him argue as follows:

Sureswaraacharyaa says: "If, in spite of all these explanations, you still hold on to the idea 'since *mahaa vaakyam* says I am *aanandha:* and I know I am *dhu:khee*, and therefore there is contradiction in *mahaa vaakyam*' and, therefore, refuse to accept "I am already free", then, I have to point out that your idea is absurd as in the following example."

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

The example is given in the *slokaa* that follows. In this *sambhandha gadhyam*, Sureswaraachaaryaa is introducing the example for absurdity:

- ॐ एवं अपि-Even in spite of my explanation,
- ॐ यः विरोधं वक्ति- if a person talks about a contradiction
- ॐ बिन्नविषयाणां (प्रमाणानां)- between two pramaanam-s dealing with totally different subject matters,
- ॐ सः विरोधं ब्रूयात्- that person will come to the conclusion of contradiction,
- ॐ अत्र अपि- with regard to the following also

‘*athra*’ refers to the example to be given in the verse that follows. This person who sees a contradiction between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam*, in spite of explanations proving the contrary, will come to the absurd conclusion of contradiction also in the instance to be given as example. And, what the absurdity is, is being explained in this beautiful and technical verse.

If the student understands these *slokaa*-s clearly, he will comfortably say “‘I’ am *nithyamuktha*.”. Understanding all these *slokaa*-s is very important, since, the more the clarity attained by the aspirant, more will be his comfort in accepting his ‘liberation’, without any reservation. He will proudly declare to himself - he need not declare to others - “‘I’ was, ‘I’ am and ‘I’ ever will be free, in spite of the conditions of my body and mind”. He can comfortably claim that *mokshaa*.

As mentioned earlier, legend has it, that, a *mahaathmaa* said to his disciples: “I have postponed my liberation. I do not want to go to *mokshaa* alone; I want to take all of you also with me; let us all attain *mokshaa* together, even if later”. But, the *mahaathmaa* must have said this to his *sishyaa*-s only to encourage them, since a person who understands and assimilates *vedhanthaa*, will conclude “I am ever free. Even if I want to be a *samsaari*, I cannot”. Of course, he may act as *samsaari* and even say “I am doing regular *saadhanaa*, hoping that I will get *mokshaa*”, just to set an example to others, ‘*lokasangrahaartham*’, as Lord Krishna mentioned in the *Bhagavadh Githa* (Verse 25 – Chapter III).

If the current verses of *Naishkarmya Siddhi* are understood by a student, he will never be able to think “I am a *samsaari*”. These verses are, therefore, technically important verses.

Chapter III: Verse 84 –

नायं शब्दः कुतो यस्माद्रूपं पश्यामि चक्षुषा ।
इति यद्वत्तथैवायं विरोधोऽक्षयवाक्ययोः ॥ ८४ ॥

‘This is no sound, since, with my eyes, I am seeing colour’. If this argument is sound, then possibly there is a conflict between perception and *Vedhaanthic* proposition.

Sureswaraacharyaa is quoting an absurd situation as an example to drive home to the *poorva pakshin*, the absurdity in his (the *poorva pakshin*'s) mixing up the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* with *prathyaksha pramaanam*. To elaborate on the example: Imagine that a baby is crying. A person close by is looking at the baby; he also hears the ‘crying’ of the baby. The eyes are revealing the form of the baby. The ‘crying’ of the baby is revealed by the ears, the *pramaanaa* dealing with sound. Suppose the person argues: “the ‘crying of the baby’ is not a fact, because, with my eyes, I am able to see the beautiful form of the baby”. What sort of reasoning is this? Would it not be considered as the height of absurdity?

ॐ अयं न शब्दः- This is no sound / there is no sound at all.

In the example, the person argues that the ‘crying’ of the baby (which his ears are hearing) is not there at all.

ॐ कुतः- How?

In the example, another person asks the first individual “But, you are hearing the ‘crying’ of the baby. How do you say that there is no sound?”

The first individual explains:

ॐ यस्मात् चक्षुषा रूपं पश्यामि - Because, with my eyes I am seeing the form.

His explanation is: “I say ‘there is no sound’, because, with my eyes, I am seeing the beautiful form of the baby. My eyes are revealing the form of the baby. Since the baby’s form is revealed and its form is a fact, its ‘crying’ is not a fact. ‘The ‘form’ of the baby is a fact revealed by the eyes; ‘sound’ and ‘form’ are contradictory; therefore, ‘the crying of the baby is not a fact’”. Is this not an absurd explanation?

Dayaananda Swami gives another example for absurd statements: “This is a clip that I am holding in my hand and from this, I conclude that an elephant is standing outside the hall”. When a sane individual listens to this statement, would he not wonder “what is the connection between holding a clip and the presence of an elephant outside the hall?” It is obvious, that, there can be absolutely no connection at all between the two. It is ‘absurdity’ to even try to connect the statements.

Sureswaraacharyaa says: “If you are seeing the absurdity in mixing up the knowledge given by the eyes, with the knowledge given by the ears, you should be able to realize that you are

committing a similar absurdity when you say ‘I am not liberated though *mahaa vaakyam* says so, because I suffer from a lot of mental and physical pains’, mixing up the knowledge given by *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* about *aathma*, with the knowledge given by *prathyakshaa* about *anaathmaa*’.

If and when a *Vedhaanthic* student similarly says: “Since I have varieties of pain, I cannot claim I am *aanandasvaroopa:*”, that student also does not realize the absurdity in his statement. His *guru* sees the absurdity. But, out of compassion for the student, the *guru* does not say so and discourage the student. He tells the *sishtyaa*: “It is because you have so far done only *sravanam* and *mananam*; take to *nidhidhyaasanam* now; you will get liberated shortly”. And, the student is relieved and wants to do *nidhidhyaasanam* to attain *mokshaa*. Even after *mahaa vaakya sravanam*, most students have hesitation in claiming “‘I am a *jnaani*; I am *muktha:*”| That hesitation should go away. The absurdity of ‘looking for’ *mokshaa* has to go away. Both will go away when these *slokaa*-s are understood clearly.

“*chakshushaa roopam pasyaami; thasmaath na ayam sabdha:*” – “I am seeing the form with my eyes; therefore, there is no sound” is an absurd statement.

ॐ इति यद्वत् - Just as this statement is absurd,

ॐ तथा इव अयं विरोध:- so is the contradiction (that is talked about by the *poorva pakshin*)

ॐ अक्षय वाक्ययो:- between *anubhava pramaanam* and *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*

‘*akshayaa*’ means ‘*prathyakshaa*’ and ‘*vaakyam*’ means ‘*mahaa vaakyam*’. ‘*virodha:*’ means ‘contradiction’. The perception of any contradiction between the two is absurd. There can be no contradiction at all.

Very often a *Vedhaanthic* student says “I have no *Brahma anubhavaa*” | This statement is made without the realization that the so-called *Brahma anubhavaa* does not exist. Why not? Ans: “‘I am that *Brahman*; *Brahman* is never an object of experience”. Such a student also thinks that when *Brahma anubhavaa* comes, his mind will become *asamassari*. This concept is also wrong. It should be remembered that mind will have to go through its own fluctuations, depending on umpteen factors, including biochemical changes. Quite often we perceive that ‘old age’ and ‘depression’ have a connection. It is because, in ‘old age’, certain biochemical changes take place, resulting in certain types of depressions, sometimes necessitating medication also. But, those fluctuations in the mind have nothing to do with the fact that “‘I am *muktha:*”, since ‘I am not the mind, but, am only the ‘witness’ of the fluctuating mind. “*manobuddhyahamkaarachitthaani naaham chidhaanandarooopa: sivoham sivoham*”, declares Sankaraacharya, in his *Nirvaanashatkam* | A diligent aspirant should be able to make this claim, without any reservation.

Sambhandha gadhyam (part) to Verse 85:

प्रमाणानां सतां न विरोधश्रोत्रादीनामिव भिन्नविषयत्वात् ।

Two valid sources of knowledge can never be contradictory to each other, as they relate to different spheres, like the senses.

This is one of the very important rules of epistemology. The *pramaanaa*-s, which are genuine *pramaanaa*-s, can never, never contradict one another. Two valid instruments or valid sources of knowledge cannot contradict each other.

Prathyaksha, *anumaana*, *upamaana*, *arthaapaththi*, *anupalabdhi* and *sabdhaa* are the six *pramaanaa*-s recognized by *Advaita* philosophy. Each one of them is genuine and valid in its own field. No one *pramaanaa* among them can contradict any one of the others. Therefore, *mahaa vaakyam* cannot contradict *prathyakshaa* and *vice versa*. *Mahaa vaakyam* does not contradict modern science also. A *Vedhaanthin* is, therefore, never afraid of the advancements in modern science. Science deals with *anaathmaa* and *mahaa vaakyam* is dealing with *aathmaa*, both dealing in two different fields, one material and the other spiritual. The *Vedhaanthin* is not afraid of the possibility of science ever dethroning *Vedhaanthaa*. He will never discourage the advancement in science, since, he has no fear at all that science can ever disturb / threaten the knowledge “‘I’ am ever free; ‘I’ am the eternal all-pervading Consciousness”. How is he so confident? Ans: “Because of the reason, that, *pramaanam*-s cannot contradict each other”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

सतां प्रमाणानां न विरोधः- There can be no contradiction between different valid *pramaanaa*-s,

‘*sath*’ means ‘valid’. Eyes are valid with regard to form and colours. Ears are valid with regard to sound. Eyes can never tell ears “I will replace you”. (In a lighter vein): There is no coup possible amidst the *pramaanaa*-s. What is the reason?

ॐ भिन्नविषयत्वात्- because, each *pramaanaa* has its own field of operation,

ॐ श्रोत्रादीनां इव - like the ears, eyes, nose etc.

Sambhandha gadhyam (further) to Verse 85:

ययोश्चाभिन्नाविषयत्वं तयोराखुनकुलयोरिव प्रतिनियत एव बाध्यबाधकभाव
स्यात् । अतस्तदुच्यते ।

If they relate to the same subject-matter and there is a conflict between them, only one of them can sublimate and thus be a source of valid knowledge and the other which is sublated, is no source of valid knowledge at all. This principle is stated now:

This is another important rule of epistemology. Imagine that you experience a contradiction between two *pramaanaa*-s. In that case, it is a violation of the first rule, mentioned earlier. But, that rule cannot be violated. Then, if you do experience such a contradiction, how do you solve this problem? The following example will show:

“When I look at the ocean water from a distance, what is the knowledge I get? I get the knowledge that the water is blue. How did I get the knowledge? With my own eyes. ‘Blue waters’ and ‘blue sea’ are proved by *prathyksha pramaanam*. Thereafter, I go to the beach, take some water from the ocean and pour it in a transparent glass. What do I see? I find that the water is colourless. For discerning this also, I used my eyes alone. ‘Water is blue’ is perception no. 1; ‘water is colourless’ is perception no.2. Perception no. 1 and perception no. 2 have contradicted each other. Naturally, you would question me ‘How do you say *pramaanaa*-s do not contradict? Here is a clear case of contradiction. My eyes first said, that, the water is blue. Now, they say that water is colourless’.

“To this, Sureswaraachaarya would answer: ‘You have to think properly. If there is contradiction between two perceptions with regard to the same waters, then you should know that, of these two perceptions only one is valid and the other invalid. Both cannot be true. One of them is an illusory perception. Therefore, one of them will be called *pramaana aabhaasaa*, which means pseudo *pramaanam*. *Pramaanam*-s cannot contradict; but, *pramaanam* and pseudo *pramaanam* can contradict. And, when *pramaanam* and pseudo *pramaanam* contradict, what will happen? Ans: The *pramaanam* will knock of the pseudo *pramaanam*.

“Now, with regard to blue water and colorless water - perception 1 and perception 2 - which is *pramaanam* and which is *pramaana aabhaasa*? Ans: It is the ‘Perception 1’ which is the *pramaana aabhaasaa* / pseudo *pramaanam* – an optical illusion, caused by ‘distance’. Eyes can be *pramaanam* only when the conditions are appropriate. When appropriate conditions are not there, the eyes cannot be *pramaanam*. They will function as *pramaana aabhaasaa*. When the viewer has got appropriate conditions, eyes will give right knowledge.

“Another example is the appearance of the distant stars. The stars, which, in reality, are ‘huge’, appear as ‘little’ stars. The ‘smallness’ is *aabhaasaa*, caused because the stars are a long distance away. Eyes can function effectively only when the distance is appropriate. Even while reading a book, if the book is held very close to your eyes, you cannot read. Under that

circumstance also, your eyes are not *pramaanam*. They are not *pramaanam* when the objects are too far away also.

“In *saamkhyaa* philosophy, eight conditions are mentioned for the eyes to be a *pramaanam*. Those conditions need not be discussed in detail here. Suffice it to know, that, if those conditions are not fulfilled, the eyes will not be valid *pramaanaa*. They will be *pramaana aabhaasa*. When the conditions are proper, eyes will be *pramaanam*.

“All these show, that, there will be / can be contradiction between *pramaanaa* and *pramaana aabhaasaa*; or, to put in another language *sath pramaanaa* and *asath pramaana can* contradict each other.

“Another instance: Suppose see some floating dust particles. From a distance, the particles appear like smoke. It is not smoke; but, it appears like smoke. When ice melts also, the water vapour looks like smoke. Based on such non-existent smoke, which ‘appear’ like smoke, I make an inference ‘there is fire’. *Anumaana pramaanam* gives me this knowledge. I go closer and investigate and find that there is no fire. Thus, there is a seeming contradiction between *anumaana*, which supported ‘*agni asthithvam*’ and *prathyakshaa*, which proves ‘*agni naasthithvam*’. What is the explanation in this instance? The answer will be: ‘*Anumaanaa* and *prathyakshaa* will never contradict; your *anumaanam* is actually *anumaana aabhaasaa*, because it was based on incomplete data’.

“At times, scientific results also suffer a similar fate. One scientist comes to a conclusion, based on *anumaana aabhaasaa* and a second scientist comes to a different conclusion based on correct *anumaanam*. The correct *anumaanam* knocks off the earlier *anumaana aabhaasa*. Of course, it is only our hope that the second scientific theory is based on correct *anumaanam*. After a few years, it may also be proved to be *anumaana aabhaasaa*. In fact, that is why, our knowledge is always inconclusive.

“Therefore, what is rule no. 2? Ans: “If there is contradiction, it is always between a *sath pramaanam* and an *asath pramaanam*, otherwise called *pramaana aabhaasaa*. *Sath pramaanam* will negate the *asath pramaanam*”.

191. Chapter III, Verses 85 (31-07-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is negating the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa*. This *poorva pakshin* (the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*) holds the views that (i) 'understanding' *mahaa vaakyam* is not an end in itself (ii) the 'understanding' has to be followed by a meditation and (iii) this meditation alone will lead to liberation later, through, (what he terms) *saakshaathkaara jnanam*. These are his contentions.

For prescribing this meditation for future liberation, the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* gives an argument, on the example of the *yoshaagni vaakyam* of the *Chaandogya Upanishad*. His argument is: "The message of the *yoshaagni vaakyam* is contradictory to *prathyakshaa*. It is an universally accepted conclusion, therefore, that the *Upanishad* only intends this *vaakyam* to be used for *upaasanaa*, by the *vaidhikaa*. This is true about any *sruthi vaakyam*, whose content is contradictory to the *prathyakshaa* or *anubhava pramaanam*. We cannot accept such a *vaakyam* as it is, but, should understand that *sruthi* intends such a *vaakyam* to be used only for *upaasanaa* by the *vaidhikaa*, leading him to the next step in his spiritual journey. In the same manner, in the case of *mahaa vaakyam* also, the *sabda pramaanam* and my *anubhava pramaanam* / *prathyaksha pramaanam* happen to be *viruddham* or contradictory to each other. Therefore, I should conclude that I am not liberated now *and* therefore should *work* for liberation, of course, making use of the *mahaa vaakyam*, since it has been provided by the *sruthi*. The question is how I can employ the *mahaa vaakyam* appropriately, to get liberation. On analysis, my further conclusion is that, the appropriate employment is 'meditation' of the *mahaa vaakyam*, in other words, *aavrutthi* of '*aham brahma asmi*'. This *prasamkhyanam* will result in *saakshaathkaara jnanam*, which alone will 'liberate' me".

Unfortunately, this is a very common belief even among *Vedhaanthic* aspirants, many of whom think that knowledge of *mahaa vaakyam* is not at all enough for 'liberation' and that they have to 'do' something, after understanding *Vedhaantha*. Since this is a powerful misconception, Sureswaraachaaryaa is taking pains to refute this view from different angles. In these verses, he first establishes that there is no contradiction at all, between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *anubhava pramaanam*, as feared by the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*.

He points out: "*Mahaa vaakyam* says 'I' am *aanandasvaroopa*: and when it uses the word 'I', that word means *aathmaa* and not the body-mind complex. On the other hand, 'experiences' / '*anubhava pramaanam*' are / is dealing only with the *anaathmaa* body-mind complex. Physical body is 'matter' and '*anaathmaa*'. 'Mind' is also only *anaathmaa*. It is an object of experience / *Saakshi prathyaksha vishaya*: | All one's experiences deal with the physical body, which is external *anaathmaa* or with the 'mind', which is internal *anaathmaa*. Sorrowful experiences also relate to *anaathmaa* alone. Therefore, you are free to conclude that *anaathmaa* is subject to misery. *Vedhaantha* will not challenge that conclusion. What

Vedhaanthaa says is, that, 'I', the *saakshi*, which is neither the external *anaathmaa* nor the internal *anaathmaa*, but, which is other than both, that 'I' alone, **am** *aanandha svaroopam*: | As for the mind, it reflects that *aanandhaa* now and then; and, may fail to reflect that *aanandhaa* at other times, because of various extraneous conditions. So, when, thus, *anubhavaa* says '*anaathmaa* is *dhu:kha svaroopam*' and *Vedhaanthaa* says '*aathmaa* is *aanandha svaroopam*', where is the contradiction?

If *prathyakshaa* says '*anaathmaa* is *dhu:kasvaroopam*' and *Vedhaanthaa* says '*anaathmaa* is *aanandha svaroopam*', there is contradiction; again, if *Vedhaanthaa* says '*aathmaa* is *aanandha svaroopam*' and *prathyakshaa* says '*aathmaa* is *dhu:kasvaroopam*', then also there is contradiction.

"*Prathyakshaa* says '*anaathmaa* is *dhu:ka svaroopam*' and *Vedhaanthaa* says '*aathmaa* is *aanandhasvaroopam*'. Therefore, there is no contradiction. An example will make this clear: When I hold a rose flower in my hand, my nose reveals to me, that the flower has fragrance and my eyes reveal to me, that the flower has got a rose colour. Now, you cannot see a contradiction between what my nose reveals and what my eyes reveal; you cannot say 'The 'fragrance' is invalid knowledge. Since I am experiencing the rose colour, the perception of fragrance must be wrong'. Would it not be absurd to say so? Where is the question of any contradiction between fragrance and colour, since they are two different fields accessed by two different means of knowledge?"

Thereafter, i.e. after thus showing that two *pramaanam*-s dealing with two different fields can never be faulted as 'contradicting each other', Sureswaraachaaryaa moves to a different possible situation. (This was in the process of being discussed, at the end of the last session).

To explain the situation: "Suppose there are two valid *pramaanam*-s functioning in the same field. Being valid *pramaanam*-s, they should not normally contradict each other. But, imagine a situation where two *pramaanam*-s are dealing with the same object, but are found to be contradictory to each other. An example was discussed in the earlier session; an individual perceived smoke and inferred that there was fire; but, on examining at close quarters, found there was no fire at all. 'Inference', otherwise called *anumaana pramaanam*, had revealed 'fire'. But, 'physical examination' or *prathyaksha pramaanam* proved there was no fire at all. Now, there is a contradiction between '*anumaanaa*', which revealed '*agni asthithvam*' and '*prathyakshaa*' revealing '*agni naasthithvam*'. How come there is a contradiction between *anumaanaa* and *prathyakshaa*, which are both valid *pramaanam*-s?"

Sureswaraachaarya answers this doubt. He insists: "Certainly two valid *pramaanam*-s cannot contradict each other. Therefore, if there is a contradiction, as in this case, it should be concluded that only one *pramaanam* is valid and the other one is a pseudo-*pramaanam* i.e.,

not a valid *pramaanam*. While two *sath pramaanam*-s cannot contradict each other, a valid *pramaanam* and a pseudo-*pramaanam* can be contradictory. A valid *pramaanam* is termed *sath pramaanam* and a pseudo-*pramaanam* is termed *asath pramaanam* or *pramaana aabhaasaa*. A *sath pramaanam* and an *asath pramaanam* / *pramaana aabhaasaa*, can contradict. In such cases, exercising judgment, the *asath pramaanam* should be identified and dismissed”.

In the case of the example, existence of fire must have been wrongly inferred, by seeing from a distance, some steam or dust particles floating in the air. The steam / dust particles must have been mistaken as ‘smoke’ and based on that wrong data, the wrong conclusion of ‘existence of fire’ must have been reached. Obviously, this wrong conclusion cannot be called ‘valid knowledge’ and that *anumaanam*, based on wrong data, cannot also be called *pramaanam*; it is *pramaana aabhaasaa*.

As mentioned earlier, two *sath-pramaanam*-s will never contradict each other. *Saasthraa* is valid *pramaanam*; it says “‘I’ am *aanandhasvaroopaa*.” | No *pramaanam* in the world can challenge that valid knowledge. Even modern science, however highly advanced, cannot contradict it, since science can deal only with *anaathmaa* – external or internal. “‘I’, the *aathmaa*, am *aanandha svaroopaa*: and *nithya muktha*.” is a fact. *Mokshaa* is ‘claiming’ this fact. ‘I’ do not have to become liberated; ‘I’ do not have to *get* happiness, because ‘I’ am ‘happiness’ itself.

If an aspirant says “But, I want to make my *mind* happy”, he can do various *saadhanaa*-s for that purpose, because of which the ‘mind’ will reflect ‘happiness’. That is called ‘experiential happiness’; but, unfortunately, no experiential happiness can be permanent. The *saadhakaa* has to accept the impermanence of experiential happiness. If he looks for ‘permanent experiential happiness’ through *saadhanaa*-s it is not possible. ‘Permanent experiential happiness’ is, similar to the proverbial ‘rabbit’s horn’, a non-existent entity. If anyone wants ‘permanent happiness’, it is ‘me’, which is non-experiential. To repeat: no one can aspire for ‘permanent experiential happiness’. It simply does not exist, even for *Bhagavaan*.

Here, Swamiji, in a lighter vein, cites a story popular in Kerala, as an example for such an illogical aspiration: “A subject of a small state, went to the king of the state and told him ‘I have a few minor wishes; you will have to fulfill them’. The king asked ‘what are those wishes?’ The subject said ‘I desire to mount the royal elephant, which you mount on special days’. The king did not take the request amiss and replied ‘I can fulfill that wish’. The subject continued ‘I should be given all your insignia like the royal umbrella etc., when I mount the elephant’. The king agreed to this also. The subject proceeded: ‘I should go on a procession through the busy bazaar area of the city, mounted on the elephant’, to which also the king gave his consent. Then, the subject made his final demand: ‘Nobody must see me (*aarum*

ennaik kaanaan paadillaa) while thus I go on procession through the crowded bazaar streets, mounted on the royal elephant with all the royal insignia'. To this, the king replied: 'But, how can *that* happen? You want to go on the royal elephant with the royal insignia, through the crowded bazaar area, without anybody seeing you! How is that possible? Your wish is an impossible and therefore, unfortunate wish''.

Similarly, the unfortunate misconception of many people is that *mokshaa* is 'permanent experiential *aanandhaa*', which 'permanent experiential *aanandhaa*' simply does not exist. 'Experiential *aanandhaa* is *vrutthi svaroopam* and no *vrutthi* is ever permanent. The *saasthraa*-s talk of three degrees / grades of *aanandhaa* – *priyaa*, *modhaa* and *pramodhaa*.

(Swami Chinmayaanandhaa explains these terms as below:

Priyaa, *modhaa* and *pramodhaa* are different degrees of happiness experienced when we come in different degrees of contact with the objects of our liking. When we are near an object of pleasure or contemplating upon it, we feel happy. A lover sitting in his home and thinking of his beloved feels happy. Though the beloved is far away, just to think of the beloved *is* happiness. This pleasurable emotion felt in the bosom at that time, is *Priyaa*, which, in English, we may call as 'Pleasure'.

When the beloved or the object of our liking is in front of us, the pleasure is intensified and that intensified pleasure is called *Modhaa*. In English, let us call it 'Joy'.

And, when we are actually indulging in or enjoying, when the object of our pleasure is in our possession, that pleasure is most intensified. This maximum intensity of joy is called *Pramodhaa*. In English, let us call it 'Ecstasy'.)

The interesting fact is that once you get *pramodhaa aanandhaa*, the greatest joy among the three, even *modhaa aanandhaa*, which is only slightly lesser than *pramodhaa aanandhaa*, will become *dhu:kham* for you. After experiencing the superlative *pramodhaa aanandhaa*, *modhaa aanandhaa* will not be enjoyable, even though it is only slightly inferior. (An example, in lighter vein: It is similar to the depressed feeling of a person, who normally travels in a Benz car, if and when he is made to travel by an Esteem. He will not feel happy about the seeming scaling down of his status. Even that minor seeming degradation causes *dhu:kham* in him.)

Unfortunately, most of us have misunderstood 'experiential *aanandhaa*' as the most desirable or the 'superlative' and toil for that 'experiential *aanandhaa*'. But, as already pointed out, one cannot have 'superlative experiential *aanandhaa*' **permanently**. That is why somebody wrote: "I experienced infinite *aanandhaa* in my *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*. But, when I dropped my *samaadhi avasthaa* and came back to *jaagrath avasthaa*, I found it as painful as a thousand scorpions stinging me simultaneously".

All these show that 'permanent experiential happiness' cannot be achieved. *Vedhaanthaa* says "You are that permanent *aanandhaa*, which is not an object to be possessed or owned. You are the very subject". Where is the contradiction?

Reverting to the text (second sentence of the *sambhandha gadhyam* to verse 85):

ॐ ययोः च अभिनविषयत्वं - if there are two *pramanaam*-s dealing with the same subject,

ॐ तयोः (and) between them

ॐ आखु नकुलयोः इव प्रतिनियतः - there is a conflict as between a rat and a mangoose,

Aaaku means 'a rat' and '*nakula:*' means a 'a mangoose'

ॐ तयोः बाद्यबाधकभावःस्यात् - one of the contradicting *pramaanam*-s should be negated as pseudo.

The example of '*anumaana agni asthithvam*' and '*prathyaksha agni abhaavam*' may be recalled, where *prathyakshaa* negated *anumaanaa*. In this instance, *prathyakshaa* is the *sath pramaanam* and *anumaanaa* is the the *pramaana aabhaasaa*. Just as the mangoose destroys the rat, both being inimical to each other, *sath pramaanam* will destroy the contradicting *pramaana aabhaasaa*.

अतः तद् उच्यते - Therefore, that is being said here.

Chapter III: Verse 85 –

प्रत्यक्षं चेन्न शाब्दं स्याच्छाब्दं चेदक्षजं कथम् ।

प्रत्यक्षाभासः प्रत्यक्षे ह्यागमाभास आगमे ॥ ८५ ॥

What is perceptual is not given by verbal testimony. How can that given by verbal testimony be perceptual? In case of definite conflict, what is supposed to be perception may be illusory perception and what is supposed to be verbal testimony may be false testimony.

ॐ प्रत्यक्षं चेत्- If a 'knowledge' is generated by *prathyakshaa*

ॐ शाब्दं (प्रमाणं) न स्यात्- *sabdhaa* is not a *pramaanam*, with regard to that particular knowledge.

The essence: An information known through personal experience need not be generated by *sabda pramaanam*. One does not have to know the fact that 'a crow is black' with the help of *saasthraa*-s, because it is knowable through *prathyakshaa*. Hence, even if *saasthraa* also says 'crow is black', *saasthraa* need not be looked upon as *pramaanam* for this knowledge, which has already been acquired by *prathyakshaa*.

ॐ शब्दं चेत् – (On the other hand) if the knowledge is generated by *sabdhaa*,

ॐ कथम् अक्षजं – how can that be contradicted by *prathyakshaa*?

In the context of this discussion, the *sabdhaa* is the *mahaa vaakyam*. The *vaakyam* deals with *aathmaa*, the 'observer'. *Prathyakshaa* and other *pramaanam*-s have no access to *aathmaa*. *Kenopanishad* (I.3) declares “*Na thathra chakshurgacchathi na vaaggacchathi no mana: na vidhmo na vijaaneema: yathaitadhdhanusishyaath*” – “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*”. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* questions: “*saabhdham cheth akshajam katham?*” – “if the knowledge is generated by *mahaa vaakyam*, how can that be confirmed or contradicted by *prathyakshaa*?” The implication is, that, it cannot.

If at all two *pramaanam*-s are dealing with the same object, but, contradicting each other, what will happen? That is answered in the second line of the verse..

ॐ प्रत्यक्षे (सिद्धे)- If a piece of knowledge is gained through *prathyaksha pramaanaa*

ॐ प्रत्यक्ष आभासः - any contradictory information by another *prathyakshaa* will make one of the two *prathyakshaa*-s 'pseudo' only.

What is the example for this? It was cited earlier. From a distance, the ocean waters appear blue in colour, i.e. *prathyakshaa* generates knowledge of *neela jalam*. But, when one approaches the ocean and collects some water of the ocean in a transparent bottle, the water is found to be colourless, again by *prathyakshaa*. Thus, *prathyakshaa* no. 1 gave '*neela jala jnaanam*' and *prathyakshaa* no. 2 is giving the knowledge of *varna rahitha jalam*. The two *prathyakshaa*-s dealing with the same *jalam* are contradicting each other. How does one resolve the contradiction? Ans: By understanding that *prathyakshaa* no. 1 is *prathyaksha aabhaasaa* or pseudo *prathyakshaa*, the misconception of the 'blue' colour caused by 'distance'.

Similarly, in *Vedaa* also, in several places, there *are* seeming contradictions. Naturally, the question 'how can two *veda pramaanam*-s contradict?' will arise.

An example for such contradictions in *Vedaa*-s can be cited. In one place (*Katopanishad* I. 2. 13), *Vedaa* says “*svarga lokaa: amruthathvam bhajanthe*” meaning “heavenly people enjoy immortality”, implying *svarga sukham* is immortal.

In another place (*Mundakopanishad* I.2.10), the very same *Vedaa* says ”*Ishtaapoortham manyamaanaa: varishtam naanyacchreyo vedayanthe pramoodaa: naakasya prushte the sukruthe anubhoothvaa imam lokam heenatharam vaa visanthi*” – “The indiscriminate, who consider *Vedic* rituals and social service to be superior, without knowing anything more superior (and, therefore engage themselves totally in rituals and social service) having enjoyed in the heights of heaven accomplished through the resulting *punyam*, return to this world or fall into even inferior *lokaa*-s, when they exhaust their *punyam*”.

Thus, *Ghata pramaanam* indicates that *svarga sukham* is *nithyam*, while *Mundaka pramaanam* avers the exact opposite, that *svarga vaasam* is *anithyam*. One *Veda pramaanam* says *svarga sukham* is *nithyam*; another says it is *anithyam*. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa says *pramaanam*-s will not contradict. How do you explain this? We resolve this by understanding that ‘*svarga sukham nithyam*’ is not *pramaana vaakyam*; it is *pramaana aabhaasa*: | The term ‘*nithyam*’, in this context, does not mean ‘absolutely permanent’, but, only indicates ‘a long duration’. It is, therefore, ‘*nithyathva aabhaasa*:’ only. A mundane example is the commonly used term ‘permanent job’. The person who holds the job is himself not permanent; the Organization, which has employed him is not permanent; the owners of the Organization are not permanent. How can the job be *really* ‘permanent’? A ‘long temporary job’ is figuratively called ‘permanent job’. ‘Living for a long duration’, is figuratively called ‘*amruthathvam*’ here. Therefore, there is no contradiction between the two *sabhdha pramaanam*-s, one of them being *pramaana aabhaasa*: | This is being indicated in the second half of the second line in the verse.

ॐ आगमे आगम आभासः हि - This is true with regard to *aagama pramaanam*(also), where there can be *aagama aabhaasa*: |

The seeming contradiction between the *Ghata vaakyam* and *Mundaka vaakyam*, quoted above, is an example. The *Ghata vaakyam* indicating ‘*svarga nithyathvam*’ should be understood as ‘*aabhaasa*:’ |

The student should, therefore, very clearly know that there can be no contradictions in *Vedhaanthaa*. “‘I’ am liberated” is a fact. The aspirant does not require meditation to become liberated. This also should be clear to the aspirant. “The message of the *saasthraa*, ‘‘I’ am liberated’, *is* valid; it can never be challenged” should be his conviction.

(To repeat, in order, to stress the point): What should an aspirant do, after *mahaa vaakyaa sravanam*, to get liberated? Ans: He does not require anything to be done. He does not

require any meditation. *Vaasanaa kshayaa* is not required. Many people think that you should do *vaasanaa kshaayaa* to get liberated; it is not true. Many people think that *mano naasaa* is required, to get liberated; that is also not true. The aspirant may suffer excruciating pain in some part of his physical body, say, in his knee. Even then, he should boldly and proudly say “I have no problem; it is my knee that has the problem”. He should practice that attitude; that is called *nidhidhyaasanam*.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 86:

न च प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तन्याय इह संभवति शब्दादीनां प्रत्येकं प्रमाणत्वादत आह ।

The sources of knowledge like verbal testimony are independent; and, hence, mutual supplementation of the different propositions of a syllogism cannot be required of the various sources of knowledge, in general.

Sureswaraachaaryaa foresees a possible objection, followed by a suggestion from the *poorva pakshin*. The *poorva pakshin* may say: “*Saasthram* is not an independent *pramaanaa*, capable of revealing my liberation. *Saasthram* becomes a *pramaanam* only in combination with some other *pramaanam*-s. In the context of *mahaa vaakyaa vichaaraa*, many *pramaanam*-s combined together, jointly become one *pramaanam*. You cannot go by *saasthram* only. You should include *tharka* and *anubhava pramaanam*-s also. *Sruthi*, *yukthi* and *anubhavaa* should all be combined for ‘understanding and assimilating’ *mahaa vaakyam*. *Saasthram* becomes *pramaanam*, jointly with *tharkaa* and *anubhavaa*. Why cannot we say so?”

This is not uncommon approach. Only based on such a misperception, many people say: “*saasthram* gives the knowledge ‘*aham Brahma asmi*’. Then, ‘meditation’ gives the *anubhavaa* of *Brahma aanandhaa*. Therefore, you **have to** combine *saaasthram* and *anubhavaa*. *Anubhava rahitha saasthra jnaanam* is incomplete. *Saasthram* is only ‘cold printed word’. What is the use of just making or printing the statement ‘sugar is sweet’? You have to taste the sugar. The printed words ‘sugar is sweet’ will not be complete knowledge. You have to experience the sweetness of sugar. Similarly, mere *saasthra pramaanaa* is incomplete. *Tharka pramaanaa* and *anubhava pramaanaa* should join *saasthra pramaanaa*. The joint *pramaanaa* alone will give *mokshaa*. So, do not stop with the mere study of *mahaa vaakyam*. You have to practice long meditation, for removing the *vaasanaas* and for *mano naasam*. After successfully achieving these, viz., *vaasanaa kshayam* and *mano naasam*, on one fine day, you will directly experience *Brahma aanandhaa*, which will make you ecstatic.”

Dayaanandha Swami points out that most of such so-called *Vedhaanthaa*, very much prevalent now, is actually *poorva pakshaa*. Unfortunately, to many students also, this argument may seem to be the right *Vedhaanthaa*.

The *poorva pakshin* says: “*Sruthi jnaanam* should be combined with *yukthi jnaanam* and *anubhava jnaanam*, all three of which *together* only, will give liberation or *Brahma aanandham*”. To establish this view, he gives an example, which is taken from *tharka saasthrraa*. To a student of *Vedhaanthaa*, the example may be found to be more difficult than *Vedhaanthaa*, because he is not familiar with *tharka saasthrraa*, which he has to learn, to understand the example given by the *poorva pakshin*.

In *tharka saasthrraa*, when you make an inference, you use several factors jointly. What are those factors? To explain this, a *tharka saasthrraa* example may be taken, the statement ‘*parvatha: vahnimaan dhoomavathvaath yathaa yaaga saalaayaam*’ meaning ‘The mountain has fire, since smoke, is perceived, as in the *yaaga saalaa*’.

In this statement, ‘*parvatha: vahnimaan*’ which means ‘mountain has fire’, is the ‘inference’, factor no. 1. ‘*dhoomavathvaath*’ meaning ‘because of (perceived) smoke’ is the ‘reason’, factor no. 2. ‘*yathaa yaaga saalaayaam*’ meaning ‘as in the case of *yaaga saalaa*’ is the ‘example’, factor no. 3.

In *tharka saasthrraa*, ‘*Parvatha: vahnimaan*’ is called ‘*prathignyaa*’ | ‘*Dhoomavathvaath*’ is called ‘*hethu*’ | ‘*Yathaa yaaga saalaayaam*’ is called ‘*dhrushtaantha:*’ | The *thaarkikaa*-s add two more factors ‘*upanaya*’ and ‘*nigamanam*’ | For the purpose of our discussion, the three factors, ‘*prathignyaa*’, ‘*hethu*’ and ‘*dhrushtaanthaa*’ will suffice.

Among the three, which one is *anumaana pramaanam*? One cannot say, that, *prathignyaa*, by itself, is *anumaana pramaanam*. Again, one cannot say, that, *hethu*, by itself, is *anumaana pramaanam*. One cannot also say, that, *dhrushtaanthaa*, by itself, is *anumaana pramaanam*. Then, what is *anumaanam*? Not any one of these three factors *singly*. All the three factors **put together** alone is *anumaanam*.

Based on this perspective, the *poorva pakshin* says: “In a similar manner, *Brahma-aathma-eiykya-jnaanam* can also be gained, only by combining *saasthrraa*, *tharkaa* and *anubhavaa*. Just as *prathignyaa*, *hethu* and *dhrushtaanthaa* jointly make one *pramaanam* for gaining knowledge of ‘fire’, *sruthi*, *yukthi* and *anubhavaa* (direct experience, which will come under *prathyaksha pramaanam*) joined together is the means for *Brahma-aathma-eiyka-jnaanam*. Why cannot we say so?”

If Sureswaraachaaryaa accepts this suggestion, the *poorva pakshin* will say “*Therefore*, you have to meditate. Because *saasthrraa* is not enough, you have to use *tharkaa* also and you have to do meditation also. Only when all of them join together, *jnaanam* can be generated”. But, Sureswaraachaaryaa does not accept this suggestion. He says “No, I cannot accept that”. That is the topic here.

- ॐ प्रतिज्ञा हेतु दृष्टान्त न्यायः - A rule similar to the rule that the three factors 'prathignyaa', 'hethu' and 'dhrushtaanthaa', put together only, become a 'source of knowledge' jointly
- ॐ इह न संभवति - cannot be applied in this context, i.e. with regard to *saasthra jnaanam*,

One cannot say *saasthra jnaanam* is incomplete for getting *mokshaa*. Why not?

- ॐ शब्दादीनां प्रत्येकं प्रमाणत्वात् because, *saasthram* and other *pramaanam*-s such as *prathyaksham* etc. are *pramaanam*-s, in their own rights, without having to depend on others.

'*Aaadhi*' refers to *prathyakshaa* etc. '*Prathyekam*' is an important word here, meaning 'without requiring the support of a separate experience'.

- ॐ अत आह - That is being said here (in the following verse)

Thus, the very powerful thesis of Sureswaraachaaryaa is: "For 'liberation', other than understanding *mahaa vaakyam* clearly, a separate special experience – ordinary or extraordinary or mystic - is not at all required. *Saasthram* is complete in itself. And, clear 'understanding' of the *saasthram* is capable of giving liberating knowledge. Therefore, you do not require *prasamkhyaanam* for liberation".

At this juncture, it should be clearly understood and remembered by the student, that the prescribed *nidhidhyaasanam* of *Vedhaanthaa*, after understanding *mahaa vaakyam*, is also not meant for 'liberation'. *Nidhidhyaasanam* is for dropping the orientation "I have to get liberation". That 'orientation-dropping' alone is the purpose of *nidhidhyaasanam*; not for getting knowledge or for getting liberation. *Saasthram* can give complete knowledge, because *saasthram* is a comprehensive, complete *pramaanam*. It is not only that *saasthram* does not require the support of *prathyakshaa* and *tharkaa*; *prathyakshaa* and *tharkaa* are incapable of supporting *saasthram*. Why are they incapable? Ans: They can deal with only *anaathmaa*, while *saasthram* is dealing with *aathmaa*. Every *anubhavaa* is dealing with *anaathmaa* only. How can any *anubhavaa* support '*aham Brahma asmi*' *jnaanam*, since any *anubhavaa* with open eyes or closed eyes (meditation) will deal only with external *anaathmaa* or internal *anaathmaa*. How can 'flashes of light', reportedly experienced in *samaadhi*, ever deal with *aathma jnaanam*? If a *saadhakaa* of meditation claims that *aanandhaa* arrived, descending from above or ascending from below and later disappeared, how can that *aagamaapaayee aanandhaa* be permanent *Brahma aanandhaa*? It is only *anaathma prathibhimbha aanandhaa*.

So, let it be clear to the student, that no *anubhavaa* can deal with *aathmaa*. Then, what can? Only *saasthra pramaanam* can. Reverting to the text:

Chapter III: Verse 86 –

स्वमहिम्ना प्रमाणानि कुर्वन्त्यर्थावबोधनम् ।
इतरेतरसाचित्ये प्रामाण्यं नेष्यते स्वतः ॥ ८६ ॥

Each source of knowledge reveals reality by its own inherent power. If the several sources are to be mutually dependent and supporting, the principle of intrinsic validity must be abandoned.

These are all very, very important epistemological *slokaa*-s. If their significance is clearly understood, the advantage is, that, the student can claim “I am liberated here and now”. Therefore, these *slokaa*-s are of practical use. The student should not think that all these advanced discussions are mere intellectual gymnastics, without any practical benefit. All these have the practical benefit of the aspirant's claiming his freedom instantaneously and without any reservation. Otherwise, the problem will be, that, he will be eternally waiting for some mystic experience or for another type of *mokshaa*, consisting of ‘escaping re-birth after death’. The student will be looking forward to that ‘escapist *mokshaa*’. The ‘escapist *mokshaa*’ is not the real *mokshaa*, according to *Advaitam*, though such an interpretation is presented initially, to attract students. The assurance “after death, you will not be re-born” certainly sounds attractive to many people, especially to elderly people who come to *Vedhaanthaa*, to whom the prospect of death is not totally scary and the concept of ‘freedom from re-birth, after death’ is even welcome. But, ‘freedom from re-birth’ is not the real *mokshaa*. *Mokshaa* should be claimed, here and now.

प्रमाणानि अर्थ अवबोधनम् कुर्वन्ति - Every instrument of knowledge will generate knowledge, in its field of operation,

Every instrument of knowledge will generate valid knowledge in its own particular field. Eyes will generate knowledge in their field of colours and form and that knowledge is valid. Even when some optical illusions are generated, we never destroy or reject the eyes. Just because they generated those few optical illusions, we do not conclude that the eyes are invalid and therefore, decide not to make use of the eyes. Eyes are valid even if certain optical illusions are created, not because of problems in the eyes, but some extraneous reasons. Similarly, for some people, the ears also hear or ‘hallucinate’ some non-existent noises, which malady may sometimes be lifelong, not helped even by medication. But, in spite of such illusions or hallucinations, the eyes and ears, as *pramaanam*-s, are valid. The illusions and hallucinations are not defects of the *pramaanam* itself; they are because of some extraneous factors. This theory, which says “every instrument of knowledge gives only valid

knowledge, without depending on any other *pramaanam*” is called *svatha: praamaanya vaadha:* | That is being said here.

ॐ स्वमहिम्ना - because of its own glory, viz., its independent capacity to generate valid knowledge, without depending on the support of other *pramaanam*-s.

ॐ इतर इतर साचिव्ये- If a *pramaanam* depends on another *pramaanam* for giving knowledge,

ॐ प्रामाण्यं न इष्यते स्वतः - that dependent *pramaanam* will become a *pramaanam*.

For instance, if ‘eyes’ depend upon ‘ears’ for giving knowledge, what will happen? Ans: In such a hypothetical situation, if the ears become deaf due to advanced age or some other reason, whatever is revealed by the eyes will also be only doubtful knowledge. But, does this happen? Even if other *pramaanam*-s are not there, what the eyes reveal is complete and valid knowledge. If the eyes require such support from the ears or other sense organs, they cannot be called *pramaanam*.

Dependent *pramaanam* will become non-*pramaanam*. If *pramaanam* no. 1 is *pramaanam* because of *pramaanam* no. 2, then, *pramaanam* no. 1 is *apraamaanam*. In short, *parathanthra praamaanyam = apraamaanyam*. This is what Sureswaraachaaryaa conveys by his statement “*ithare ithara saachivye praamaanyam na ishyathe svatha:*” |

These may give rise to another question or doubt from the *poorva pakshin* or the student. That question is: “If *sruthi* is an independent *pramaanam* and does not require *tharkaa* and *anubhavaa*, to give valid knowledge and liberation, then why do you (*Advaithin*-s) talk about *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanam*, in the context of *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*? *Sravanam* corresponds to *sruthi*, *mananam* corresponds to *yukthi* and *nidhidhyaasanam* corresponds to *anubhavaa*. And, therefore, *sravana-manana-nidhshyaasnam* corresponds to *sruthi-yukthi-anubhavaa*. Since you thus talk about *sruthi-yukthi-anubhavaa*, it is very clear that *sruthi* is incomplete and you require logic and experience. And, for *anubhavaa*, meditation is required. Then, how can *sravanam* be complete knowledge, without *Brahma anubhavaa*?” This question will be answered in subsequent sessions.

192. Chapter III, Verses 86 (07-08-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is elaborately refuting the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa* of a particular group of philosophers, who are also *Vedhaanthin-s* only. These philosophers are called *Vedhaantha eka desi-s*. While refuting them, the *Aachaaryaa* is giving us an important insight, viz., that, every *pramaanam* is valid by itself.

He points out, that, the validity of a *pramaanam* can never depend upon another *pramaanam*. Each *pramaanam* has to be valid independently in its field of knowledge, just as eyes are independently valid with regard to forms and colours. It goes without saying, that, 'ears' can never validate or invalidate 'eyes'. Similarly ears are valid in their own field of 'sound' and 'eyes' cannot validate or invalidate 'ears'. Thus, every *pramaanam* is self-valid without depending upon other *pramaanaam-s*. This theory is called '*svatha: praamaanya vaadha:*' and is accepted by both *Vedhaanthin-s* and *meemaamsakaa-s*; whereas, the *nyaaya* and *vaiseshikaa* philosophers are called *paratha: praamaanya vaadhin-s*, since they believe that a *pramaanam* has to be validated by some other method like reasoning etc.

We (the *Vedhaanthin-s*) hold the view, that, if we accept *paratha: praamaanya vaadha:*, there will be a serious problem. What is that problem? If one *pramaanam* has to be validated by another *pramaanam*, this second *pramaanam* being a *pramaanam*, has to be validated by a third *pramaanam*, according to this theory; the third *pramaanam*, in turn, will have to be validated by a fourth; thus, you will get into an 'infinite regress' problem. Thus, no *pramaanam* can be looked upon as valid. This 'infinite regress' problem, otherwise called '*anavastha dosha:*', will have to be solved. There is only one way to solve the problem, namely, accepting that every *pramaanam* is valid in its own field.

Therefore, *saasthra pramaanam* is valid in its own field and *prathyaksha pramaanam* is valid in its own field. Each *pramaanam* will work independently, in its own field. It will neither prove nor disprove other *pramaanam-s*.

But, why are we discussing the topic? Ans: "To establish that the *saasthra pramaana*, which states that 'I' am ever liberated and *prathyaksha pramaanaa*, which talks about the bondage of *anaathmaa*, cannot and do not contradict each other". *Saasthraa* talks of the liberation of 'me', the *aathmaa* and *prathyaksha pramaanaa* talks about the bondage of *anaathmaa*. There cannot be any contradiction at all between them. *Prathyaksha pramaanaa* is valid in its own field; but, it cannot challenge the *saasthra pramaanaa*.

Mahaa vaakyam can never be contradicted by any other *pramaanam*. And, Sureswaraachaaryaa holds that, since *mahaa vaakyam* cannot be contradicted by any other *pramaanam*, we do not require a *prasamkhyanam*, either to get *jnaanam* or to get liberation,

other than understanding the *mahaa vaakyam*. 'Grasping' the teaching of *mahaa vaakyam* is complete in itself; it does not require an extra assistance in the form of *prasamkhyanaa / vrutthi aavrutthi*.

Advaitin-s do talk about what is known as *nidhidhyaasanam*; but, that *nidhidhyaasnam* is neither for knowledge nor for liberation.

The purpose of resorting to *nidhidhyaasanam* is only to drop our wrong orientation of 'expecting' liberation. This is popularly expressed as "*vipareetha bhaavanaa nivrutthiyartham nidhidhyaasanam*".

If the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa* says that his *prasamkhyaanam* or 'meditation' is also intended only for *vipareetha bhaavanaa nivrutthi*, the *Advaitin* will gladly tell the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* "I am willing to accept this", since, in that case, *prasamkhyaanam* will be only another word for *nidhidhyaasanam*. But, the *prasamkhyanaa poorva pakshin* says that *prasamkhyaanam* is meant for 'future' knowledge and 'future' liberation. The *Advaitin* does not accept that part.

Based on this '*svatha: praamaanya vaadha:*', Sureswaraacharya says "*svamahimnaa pramaanaani artha avabodhanam kurvanthi*" averring "every *pramaanam* is valid by itself", to drive home the point, that *sruthi*, being an independently valid *pramaanam*, the *sruthi mahaa vaakyam* does not need the support of any other *pramaanam* to establish its teaching.

As discussed in the earlier session, this may give rise to a question from the *poorva pakshin*: "If *sruthi* is *pramaanam*, by itself capable of giving *jnaanam* and liberation independently, why do you (*Advaitin*-s) talk about *sravana-manana-nidhidhyaasanaani*, which correspond to *sruthi-yukthi-anubhavaa*, as a package? In that case, are you not also using *yukthi* and *anubhavaa* to produce knowledge?"

The *Advaitin*'s answer is: "We do **not** use *yukthi* to support the knowledge given by *sruthi*. *Yukthi* or *anumaanam* is never used either to support the knowledge given by the *sruthi* or to independently give the same knowledge given by *sruthi*, because *Upanishad* has clearly said '*naishaa tharkena mathir aapaneyaa*' (*Katopanishad* I.ii.9) – 'This knowledge cannot be attained by reasoning'. The *Upanishad* has very clearly stated that logic has no access to *aathma jnaanam*. Similarly, *anubhavaa* also cannot be used to know *aathmaa*, because all *anubhavaa*-s are generated by *pourusheya pramaanaa*-s only. Any *anubhavaa*, generated by any *pourusheya pramaanaa*, including meditation, can deal only with *anaathmaa*. Only *sruthi / saasthraa* can reveal *aathmaa*. *Kenopanishad* makes this point, by declaring, '*na thathra chakshurgacchathi na vaaggacchathi no mana:*' (I.3) – 'Eyes do not objectify that *Brahman*; the organ of speech does not; the mind also does not'. Therefore, *yukthi* and *anubhavaa* are **not** used by us to generate *jnaanam*. *Saasthraa* **is** capable of independently

producing knowledge. *Yukthi* and *anubhavaa* are utilized only to avoid misinterpretation of the *saasthraa*. For instance, when *saasthra* says 'svargaa is *nithyam*', we use logic, only to give a new meaning to the word *nithyam*. What is that new meaning to the word? Here, 'nithyam' cannot be taken literally as eternal; 'nithyam', in this context, should be understood as 'long lasting'. *Svargaa* being a *kaaryam*, a product in the creation, can never be eternal. In fact, we do not use logic even to reveal or prove *svargaa*; no logic can prove *svargaa*; *svargaa* is revealed only by *saasthraa*. Logic is used in only understanding that *svargaa*. Logic is used neither to corroborate *svargaa* nor to prove *svargaa*; it never can. Logic is used in understanding what *svargaa* is, by interpreting the *saasthraa* properly - that there is a *svargaa* other than *bhoolokaa*. *Saasthraa*, neither logic nor experience, *is* the *pramaanam* for the existence of *svargaa*, We also use logic to understand that *svargaa* cannot be eternal; that, it has to be time-bound only.

“In the same manner, neither *yukthi pramaanam* nor *anubhavaa* ever proves *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam* also. Only *saasthraa* does. *Yukthi* and *anubhavaa* are used only to avoid all misinterpretations of *saasthraa*. It is like using a funnel to pour a liquid into a bottle. If a quantity of liquid, say, milk, is to be transferred from a container to a narrow-necked bottle, a funnel is generally used for the purpose. The funnel does not give or produce the milk. The first container alone is the source of milk; the funnel is used only to facilitate transfer of the milk from the container into the bottle. *Sruthi* is like the first container; 'Brahmajnaanam' is like the milk; our intellect is like the narrow-necked bottle. The 'Brahmajnaanam' is there only in the *sruthi*. *Yukthi* and *anubhavaa* are not sources of 'Brahmajnaanam'. They serve only as funnels to help the *sruthi janya jnaanam* enter our intellect. To repeat: “*Yukthi* and *anubhavaa* can never be sources of 'Brahmajnaanam'. We are using *yukthi* and *anubhavaa* as funnels to understand the *sruthi*, which is the only source of 'Brahmajnaanam'”. And, there is no contradiction between *sruthi* and any other *pramaanam*, including *yukthi* and *anubhavaa*. Therefore, *prasamkhyaanam* is **not** required either for *jnaanam* or for *mokshaa*”. Moving into the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 87:

न च सुखदुःखादिसंबन्धोऽवगत्यात्मनः प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणैः गृह्यते येन विरोधः प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणैः उद्घाट्यते । कथम् । श्रुणु ।

That reason of contradiction between *prathyaksha pramaanaa* and *saasthra pramaanaa*, which is being raised by you, viz., that “through *anubhava pramaanaa*, we get the knowledge, that, pain and pleasure are associated with the Self (Consciousness)” is not correct. Listen to me as to how this is not correct.

Here, Sureswaraacharya tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* “I understand why you are talking about the requirement of *prasamkyaanam*. It is because you believe and argue that there is a contradiction between the knowledge that one gains through *mahaa vaakyasravanam* and one's personal ‘experience’. What is the knowledge given to me, by *mahaa vaakyam*? That I am *aanandhasvaroopa*: | On the other hand, what is my experience? That I am miserable. That is the contradiction you are talking about. And, because of this perceived contradiction, you say that meditation is required. But, your perception is wrong; there is no ‘contradiction’ at all”.

ॐ येन - That reason

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाणैः विरोधः - of contradiction between *prathyakshapramaana* (otherwise called *anubhava pramaanaa*) and *saasthra pramaanaa*

ॐ उद्घाटयते - which you are raising, (viz., that),

The *Aachaaryaa* tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhin* “You are raising the problem of contradiction to support your *prasamkhyana vaadhaa*”. What is the contradiction seen by the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*? That is given in the first line of the *gadhyam*:

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाणैः - “through *anubhava pramaanaa*,

ॐ गृह्यते - we get the knowledge of

ॐ सुखदुःखादि संबन्धः - association of pleasure and pain

ॐ अवगत्यात्मनः” - with the Self, which is of the nature of Consciousness”

ॐ न च - is not correct.

In fact, Sureswaraacharya is presenting here, only a common complaint of *Vedhaanthic* students, many of whom lament to the *guru*: “Hey! *guro!* You say I am *aanandha svarooopa*: | Only I know my problems. I am suffering from different types of pain – both mental and physical. But, I am told by *Vedhaantha*, that, I am *aanandha svarooopa*: | Thus, my experience, the *prathyaksha pramaanam*, tells me that I do have *sukha dhu:kha sambhandha*:, whereas *sruthi* avers that I have no misery at all. Therefore, there is contradiction between *saasthraa* and *anubhavaa*”. Based on this perception only, the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* prescribes ‘long meditation’ to resolve the so-called contradiction. But, Sureswaraacharya firmly refutes his approach, by saying ‘*na cha*’, emphasizing that ‘the very perception of a contradiction is not correct’.

Why is it not correct? The reason has been discussed in the earlier session and should be recollected here. It is this: “Whenever I get the knowledge from *saasthraa*, viz., ‘I am *aanandhasvaroopa*:’, the meaning of the term ‘I’ is ‘*aathmaa*’; but, whenever I say ‘I am miserable’, the meaning of the word ‘I’ changes. In that context, I am talking about my ‘mind’

as miserable. *Saasthraa* never says 'mind' is *aanandha svaroopaa*: | *Saasthraa* says, that, 'I', the *aathmaa*, am *aanandha svaroopaa*., even when my 'mind', which is an object of perception, is miserable. '**I**' am *aanandha svaroopaa*.; '**mind**' is miserable. Where is the contradiction? Instead of saying 'my 'mind' is miserable', it is *you* who are committing the mistake of saying 'I am miserable'. And, you are challenging *saasthraa*. You make the mistake and you are challenging the *saasthraa*. In the statement "I am *aanandha*.; mind is miserable', there is no contradiction at all, because 'I' am not the mind and mind is not 'me'".

Sureswaraachaaryaa tells the *prasamkhyaaana vaadhi* and the student: "Since, thus, there is no contradiction at all, the conclusion that the *Vedhaanthic* aspirant requires *peasamkhyaanam* is also wrong. *Prasamkhyaanam* is **not** at all required. You should only have the realization and conviction ' my mind may be miserable; but, 'I' **am** *aanandha*.:'| That alone is required. By *prasamkhyaanam*, the nature of the mind, viz., 'being subject to misery' cannot be changed. The nature of *aathmaa*, viz., 'never prone to misery' also cannot be changed. Mind will be mind, at times happy and at times miserable. *Aathmaa* will be *aathmaa*, never tainted by any emotion. Understand mind properly and understand *aathmaa* properly. Therefore, claim "'I' **am** *aanandhaa*", even when the mind is miserable. If this is not understood by you, you will be eternally looking for permanent mental happiness and you will be always striving for permanent mental happiness. But, 'permanent mental happiness' is, like the proverbial rabbit's or horse's horn, non-existent, since mind is a fluctuating instrument, subject to umpteen factors, unknown and uncontrollable. Instead, understand the *mithyaathvam* of the mind and use the mind only for the limited purpose of knowing that 'I' am not the *mithyaa* mind. Otherwise, you will be sitting in eternal *prasamkhyaanam* and there will be no solution at all."

By saying '*na cha*', the *Aachaaryaa* firmly avers "May you understand, there is no contradiction at all between *saasthraa* and *prathyakshaa*".

ॐ कथम् - (Sureswaraachaaryaa himself asks) How? Why do I say this?

ॐ श्रुणु- Listen to me carefully.

Chapter III: Verse 87 –

दुखिता अवगतेचेत्स्यान्न प्रमीयेत सात्मवत् ।
कर्मण्येव प्रमा न्याय्या न तु कर्तर्यपि क्वचित् ॥ ८७ ॥

If the fact of being miserable etc., were of the very nature of Self, it cannot be revealed by any mode of knowledge, similar to the Self itself, which is also not revealed by any

pramaanam, other than *saasthraa-s*. The modes of knowledge like perception are directed to revealing only the 'objects' and not the 'Subject'.

Here, Sureswaraacharyaa is mentioning how *anubhava pramaanam*, when it talks of 'misery', is dealing with the objective mind only. It does not deal with *aathmaa*. All the *dhu:kha anubhavaa-s* reveal the *dhu:kham* of *anaathmaa* only. He says, that, they do not indicate any *dhu:kham* of *aathmaa*, because, even if *aathma* had had any *dhu:kham*, that *dhu:kham* could never have been objectified by *anubhavaa*.

ॐ दुःखिता अवगतेः स्यात् चेत्- If misery had been there for *aathmaa*,

'*avagathe:*' means 'for the *aathmaa*, the Consciousness principle'; since '*aathmaa*' is '*avagathi svaroopam*' the word '*avagathi:*' is used here, to refer to *aathmaa*.

"*Avagathe: dhu:khithaa syaath cheth*" means "if misery had been there for 'I', the Consciousness" or "if sorrow had belonged to 'me'" or "if 'I' were sorrowful".

ॐ सा न प्रमीयेत - that sorrow of 'me', the *aathmaa*, would not have been experienced by me.

The essence: "If '*aathmaa*' *were* sorrowful / if sorrow *were* '*aathmaa*'s' property (the use of the verb '*were*', is intentional, to indicate conditional clause), I would not have experienced that sorrow at all, as an object – not even as a temporary object". Again, the adjective 'temporary' is also intentional, to stress on the 'arriving and departing nature' of emotions like misery. The very fact that emotions are experienced by me *temporarily*, indicates, that, sorrow belongs only to the mind, which is subject to varieties of emotions.

The reason is given by the *Aachaaryaa*, for his declaration '*na prameeyetha*':

ॐ आत्मवत् - like the '*aathmaa*' itself.

What the *Aachaaryaa* avers is: "Since *aathmaa* is not available for 'objectification', *aathmaa*'s misery also could not have been objectified, *if aathmaa* had misery as *its* property".

In *sruthi saara samuddaranam*, there is an elaborate discussion on this subtle topic.

To repeat the important sentence: "*If aathmaa* had sorrow as *its* property, *aathmaa*'s sorrow would not have been available for objectification i.e. for experience, since *aathmaa* itself is not available for objectification / experience". But, the sorrow *is* experienced; therefore, it is not *aathmaa*'s property; it is the property of the mind only. What is the current enquiry into?

“Is sorrow ‘my’ property or not?” is the discussion here. Therefore, we can boldly say “*I* am never sorrowful at any time”.

In this context, it is appropriate to remember another relevant fact. Suppose a student says: “All right. I agree with *Vedhaanthaa* on this aspect. I concede that it is the mind which has got the problem of ‘misery’ and not the Self. But, I do want to handle the ‘sorrow’ of the mind *anaathmaa*. It is my desire to improve it”. If such is his desire, he has to go from the *jnaana kaandam* of *sruthi* to the *karma kaandam* of *sruthi*. If the student’s intention is not ‘dealing with *aathmaa*’, but, to deal with *anaathmaa* and improve *anaathmaa*, he will have to resort to the *karma kaandaa* of the *sruthi*, for guidance.

But, *Vedhaanthaa* warns that, while through *karma kaandaa*, *anaathmaa* **can** be improved, it can never be perfected. There is no permanent cure for mundane problems; physical body **can** be improved; but, in due course, problems in the body will arise again; the mind **can** be improved; but, problems to the mind will recur again, sometime later.

Because of this fact, if improvement to *anaathmaa* is one’s aim, one can follow *karmakaandaa*; but, **has** to come to *Vedhaanthaa*, when tired of attempting to improve the body-mind complex. *Vedhaanthaa*’s value will be understood only when the individual realizes the futility of trying to perfect the body and the mind; when he realizes that *anaathmaa* can never attain permanent perfection. *Mundakopanishad* (I.ii.12) expresses this very eloquently: “*Pareekshya lokaan karmachithaan braahmana: nirvedam aayaath*” - “Having examined the worlds, which are achieved through *Karmaa*, a *Brahmin* should / would come to dispassion”. It is only when the individual gets tired of his unsuccessful efforts to achieve a perfect body and mind, *Vedhaanthaa* appeals to him. And, *Vedhaantha* advises him: “Enough of your attempts to reform the body or mind; instead, use the body and mind for the limited purpose of knowing ‘I’ am not the *mithyaa* body; nor the *mithyaa* mind”.

Reverting to the text, the *Aachaaryaa* had said “*saa dhu:khithaa aathmavath na prameeyetha*” – “(If there were ‘misery’ in *aathmaa*) that misery would never have been experienced, just as *aathmaa* itself cannot be experienced”. What is the reason for the non-experience of *aathmaa*? The second line of the verse gives the reason:

ॐ न्याय्या- By mere logic / reasoning, it can be deduced that

ॐ प्रमा - the ‘knowledge’ generated by *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa*-s

ॐ कर्मणि एव - can be with regard to an object only.

The term ‘generated by *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa*-s’ has to be supplied by us. The word ‘*karmani*’ should also be carefully understood here; ‘*karmaa*’, in this context, does not mean ‘action’. It means ‘an *anaathmaa* object’.

ॐ न तु कर्तरि अपि क्वचित् - That 'knowledge' can never be with regard to aathmaa.

'Karthari' means 'with regard to the Subject, 'I', the *aathmaa*'.

Essence: *Prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa*-s deal with *anaathmaa* only. They can never generate any knowledge with regard to *aathmaa*.

(At this point, Swamiji makes the following few general comments:

“That is why the ultimate aims of life, according to *Vedhaanthaa*, are: (i) from the standpoint of 'my' real nature, claiming 'my' perfection and (ii) from *anaathmaa* standpoint, maintaining *anaathmaa* in a reasonably good functioning condition and enjoying its reasonably good functioning condition as it is.

“Ideally, one should enjoy 'functioning in the *anaathmaa*', without expecting perfection in the *anaathmaa*. In spite of its imperfection, *anaathmaa* **can** do a lot of wonderful things, just as, the physical body, with all its defects, serves reasonably satisfactorily for engaging in different activities. So, one should enjoy what *anaathmaa* can do, without expecting perfection.

“But, apart from this temporary enjoyment, there **is** a wonderful benefit derived from *anaathmaa*. In fact, the best benefit from *anaathmaa* is that, it helps us claim “I am the *athmaa*”. 'Aathmaa', however 'great' it may be, requires the 'miserable' / 'imperfect' *anaathmaa* mind, to claim “*maayeva sakalam jaatham, mayi sarvam prathishtitham, mayi sarvama layam yaathi thadh brahma adhvayam asmi aham*” (*Kaivalyopanishad - Manthraa* 19) – “Everything is born in me alone; everything is based on me alone; everything resolved into me alone. I am that non-dual *Brahman*” |

“So, let me with the help of the dilapidated, dying, old body / making the best use of the dilapidated, dying, old body, claim that I am the *adhishtaanam Brahman*, untouched by the dilapidated, dying, old body. This is the *aathma jnaanam*”).

Reverting to the text:

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 88 (chapter III):

अभ्युगमेऽपि च प्रसंख्यानशतेनापि नैव त्वं संभावितदोषान्मुच्यते । अत आह ।

For argument's sake, let the suggestion that 'it is the Self which is subject to misery' be accepted. In that case also, even a hundred meditations cannot bring about emancipation from that misery. Therefore, it follows:

Hereafter, Sureswaraacharya is changing the direction of the discussion.

Until now, he pointed out that (i) no *pramaanam* can contradict the fact that 'I' am free (ii) since no *pramaanam* can contradict this fact, *prasamkhyaanam* is not required, either for improving the knowledge or for giving a new knowledge and (iii) *Prasamkhyaanam* is not at all capable of giving any new knowledge also.

To repeat for emphasis: No improvement of knowledge is required through *prasamkhyaanam*; no new knowledge is possible through *prasamkhyaanam*; no *mokshaa* is required or possible through *prasamkhyaanam*.

One can boldly say: "I **am** free; no experience of mine can contradict this claim" without any *prasamkhyaanam*.

This was the direction of the argument till now.

Now, the *Aacharya* takes another direction. He enters into what is called a 'suppositional argument' or '*abhyupedhya vaadhaa*' | In these types of argument, the *siddhaanthin* temporarily agrees with the *poorva pakshin*, purely for the sake of argument. He does not really accept the views of the *poorva pakshin*; but, temporarily 'accepts' it, only to ultimately prove that the *poorva pakshin* is wrong.

Sureswaraacharya says: "It is my firm opinion, that, *anubhava pramaanaa* cannot deal with *aathmaa*; that, all experiences deal with *anaathmaa* only. But, let me concede your view temporarily. Let us assume that *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa*-s deal with the *aathma* - 'I'. Therefore, let us also assume that experience of *samsaaraa*, misery etc. belong to *aathmaa*. And, therefore, let us further assume that *prathyakshadhi pramaanaa*-s reveal the fact that 'I am miserable'".

This is the stand of the *prasamkhyaanam vaadhin*. Now, as *assumed* by the *Aacharya* also, *prathyaksha pramaanaa* / *anubhavaa* is revealing the fact that 'I', the Self, am miserable. Earlier, the *Aacharya* had maintained, that, it was the *anaathmaa* mind which was miserable. Now, after this assumption, what is 'my' present condition? Ans: "'I am *samsaari*". So, what is the new knowledge? Ans: "That *aathmaa* is miserable, proved by *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaa*-s".

Now, Sureswaraacharya questions the *prasamkhyaanam vaadhi*: "If the experience or the *prathyaksha pramaanaa* has proved that 'my' nature is *samsaaraa* or misery, can you permanently cure this problem, by *prasamkhyaanam*? Assuming, that 'I', the *aathmaa*, which is different from 'body', which is different from 'mind' and which is different from 'sense organs', is also a *samsaari* / a miserable entity, a fact proved by experience and *prathyaksha*

pramaanaa according to you, will 'I' get *mokshaa* through *prasamkhyaanam*? Even if, through *prasamkhyaanam*, I get an extraordinary knowledge, that extraordinary knowledge cannot reveal that 'I' am not a *samsaari*. Therefore, tell me, how can *prasamkhyaanam* change this *samsaaraa* situation. You are providing *prasamkhyaanam* as a means of *jnaanam* and *mokshaa*. But, how can *prasamkhyaanam* change the 'fact' that I am *samsaari*?"

In the following *slokaas*, Sureswaraachaaryaa argues on the following lines: "If 'I' am *samsaari*' is a fact, I need not work for *mokshaa*. I can involve myself in some other activities, without wasting my time on *Vedhaanthaa*, since, if 'I' am *samsaari*' is a fact, whatever I do, cannot negate that fact of 'my' *samsaaraa*.

"If 'I' am *samsaari*' is a fact, by *saadhanaa*-s, 'I' may get some temporary pleasure. But, the fact that 'I' am *samsaari* / miserable will persist. The miserable *samsaari* can get some pleasure now and then; and for that purpose why should anyone resort to *Vedhaanthaa*? There are several sources of temporary pleasure".

This is, in fact, the materialistic philosophy. The *chaarvaakaa* philosopher says: "After all, life is ephemeral / fleeting; therefore, when we have got a few healthy years, before getting old, let us eat, drink and be merry".

It should be understood from the above gist of Sureswaraachaaryaa's arguments, that if *prathyaksha pramaanam* reveals "'I' (*aathmaa*) am *samsaari*" as a fact, any amount of meditation cannot solve the problem. This is the *Advaitin*'s argument against *visishta advaitam* also. If "'I' am *samsaari*" is a fact, even going to *Vaikuntam* cannot solve the problem, since a 'fact' cannot be changed, just by a change of place. Dayanandha Swamiji presents this in his uniquely humorous manner: "When you go to *Vaikuntam*, you will find it crowded, since many people would have gone there before you. They would all be occupying the front rows and you will be somewhere in the rear rows, feeling jealous of the people who have got to *Vaikuntaa* ahead of you and sitting closer to the Lord"

If 'I' am finite and miserable by nature, any type or amount of *saadhanaa* cannot change it. What *Vedhaanthaa* says is: "'I' am **not** miserable; 'I' am ever *aanandha svaroopaa*:', which '*aanandhaa*' gets reflected in the mind, now and then; 'enjoying' that 'reflected *aanandhaa*' is, of course, not prohibited. But, do not get attached to it; any attachment or obsession with the reflected *aanandhaa* is undesirable. Instead of getting attached to the reflected *aanandhaa*, learn to claim the original *aanandhaa*. And, do not ask the question 'How to experience the original *aanandhaa*?' Original *aanandhaa* is not something to be experienced; but, a matter to be claimed as '*aham asmi sathyam jnaanam aanandham Brahma.*' "

Thus, the following *sloka*-s are based on the argument: “Suppose ‘I’ (the Self) am *samsaari*’ is a fact, *prasamkhyaanam* will not help to get rid of the *samsaaraa* and to get *mokshaa*”. Reverting to the text:

ॐ अभ्युगमे अपि च -. Even if it is accepted a fact,

What is accepted as a fact? The *Aachaaryaa* does not mention it explicitly here; but, by context, the student should know that what is accepted is the *poorva pakshin*’s view, that “‘I’ (the *aathmaa*) am *samsaari*”.

ॐ प्रसंख्यान शतेन अपि - even through hundreds of meditations,

ॐ त्वं न मुच्यसे एव - you will never be freed

ॐ संभावितदोषात्- from the *dhoshaa* of *samsaaraa* attributed to the Self.

Any amount of increase in the number of times or duration of “meditation’ will not help to free the Self from bondage, if “‘I’ am *samsaari*” is a fact.

What these discussions amount to is, that, either you are ever free or you are never free. These are the only two possibilities. If you are never free, do not work for freedom, because you will never get it. So also when you are ever free. In that instance also, never work for freedom, since that will be meaningless.

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: “Of these two possibilities, viz., ‘I am ever free’ or ‘I am never free’, *Vedhaantha* tells you, that, you come under the ‘ever-free’ category. Claim it; do not work for it by meditation. It would not help. If understanding the *mahaa vaakyam* cannot help your claiming your ‘freedom’, even hundreds of hours of *prasamkhyaanam* will not help you get liberation. If my ‘*jnaanam*’ cannot give ‘liberation’, your *prasamkhyaanam* also cannot”.

ॐ अतः आह - Therefore, the author says:

Chapter III: Verse 88 –

प्रमाणबद्धमूलत्वात् दुःकित्त्वं केन वार्यते।

अग्न्युष्णवत् निवृत्तिश्चेत् नैरात्म्यं ह्येति सौगतम् ॥ ८८ ॥

If the subjection to misery etc., are taken as belonging to the Self and are, as supposed, established firmly by means of valid knowledge, how can they be ever removed? If they

can be somehow removed, that would amount to an extinction of the Self, as in the philosophy of the Buddhists.

All these are very important *sloka*-s, because many of the *Vedhaanthic* students who are practicing *nidhidhyaasanam*, are approaching *nidhidhyaasanam* as *prasamkhyaanam* only. They are not able to differentiate between *prasamkhyaanam* and *nidhidhyaasnam*.

What is the primary difference? If the aspirant is doing *nidhidhyaasanam*, **expecting** *mokshaa* or knowledge, in either case, the *nidhidhyaasanam* becomes *prasamkhyaanam* and that *prasamkhyaanam* will create more problems only. On the other hand, *nidhidhyaasnam* **is** *nidhdhyaasnam*, once the aspirant approaches it with the awareness that he is not expecting any new knowledge other than the knowledge “‘I’ am free right now”. He does not expect a new knowledge or a new event making him free. He does not expect a new event in the mind, hoping that, that mental event would make him free. There is no such event making ‘me’ free. An *anaathmaa* event can never make ‘me’, the *aathmaa*, free, if ‘I’ am really bound.

Unfortunately, many students are not able to differentiate between *prasamkhyaanam* and *nidhidhyaasanam*; and, most of the students who practice *nidhidhyaasanam* are doing it as *prasamkhyaanam*, **expecting** some change. Any change that happens, will happen only in *anaathmaa* and any *anaathmaa* change cannot be defined as ‘liberation’, because it will only be a temporary modification in *anaathmaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa will be elaborating all these points in the following portions in this chapter. This verse is only an introduction. All these are to be analyzed thread bare by him, since he is anxious to remove all false expectations of the aspirants. Many students have fantastic expectations, such as mystic experiences etc., without the realization, that even if a mystic event happens, it will be an event happening only in *anaathmaa*. Mystic experiences can produce neither *jnaanam* nor liberation.

Then, what *is* ‘liberation’? Ans: “It is the understanding which we already have through the *mahaa vaakyam*, viz., that ‘I’ was, ‘I’ am and ‘I’ ever will be free”. And, it should be carefully noted that when the word ‘I’ is used in this sentence, the word is referring to neither the physical body nor the mind, but to ‘I’, the *aathmaa*.

All these are going to be analyzed very, very thoroughly / thread bare, because the *nidhidhyaasnam-pramsamkhyaanam* confusion is a very commonly prevalent confusion. That is the reason why Sankaraachaaryaa deals with this topic elaborately in chapter XVIII of his *Upadesa Saahasree* and Sureswaraachaaryaa deals with it, in this chapter of *Naishkarmya Siddhi*.

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

The aspirant will have to thoroughly understand this; otherwise, he will be permanently looking for a *saadhya mokshaa*. There is no *saadhya mokshaa*; there is only *siddha mokshaa*. *Saadhya mokshaa* does not exist.

193. Chapter III, Verses 88 (14-08-2010)

Sureswaraachaaryaa is elaborately negating the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa*, which holds that the knowledge gained through *mahaa vaakya vicharam* is not sufficient to give liberation. The *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* maintains “the *mahaa vaakya sravana janya jnaanam* is not at all sufficient to give liberation; therefore, after *sravanam*, the aspirant has to keep chanting the *mahaa vaakyam* mentally and repeatedly; this *aavrutthi* is called *prasamkhyaanam*; this repetitive meditation will generate another type of knowledge of a higher quality, which can be called *sakshaathkaara*; it is *this* higher knowledge, which is capable of giving liberation”.

To justify this view, the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi* gives an argument also. That argument is: “Why I hold that the knowledge gained through mere *sravanam* is not capable of giving liberation, is because, that knowledge contradicts our *prathyaksha anubhavaa*. There is *prathyaksha pramaana virodha:*, in the *sravana janya jnaanam*. In other words, the *sravana janya jnaanam* and *prathyaksha anubhavaa* are contradictory. *Vedhaantha* says ‘I am *aanandha svaroop:*’; my experience is ‘I am *dhu:kha svaroop:*’ | Because of this contradiction, *prasamkhyaanam* is needed. The new knowledge obtained after *prasamkhyaanam*, will resolve this contradiction and give liberation”.

Sureswaraachaaryaa gives his answer to this argument, in two stages. In the first stage, he established that there can be no contradiction at all, requiring a *prasamkhyaanam*. He said: “*Saasthra pramaanam* is talking about ‘I’, the *aathmaa*, whereas *prathyaksha* or *anubhavaa* is dealing with either the closer *anaathmaa* or the farther *anaathmaa*. *Saakshi prathyaksham* deals with mind, the closer *anaathmaa*. *Indriya prathyaksham* deals with the body and the external world. *Prathyaksha pramaanaa*, if it is *saakshi prathyaksham*, deals with mind, the closer *anaathmaa*; if it is *indriya prathyaksham*, it is dealing with remote *anaathmaa*. But, whether it is *saakshi prathyaksham* or *indriya prathyaksham*, *prathyaksha pramaanaa* deals with *anaathmaa* alone. Whereas, *saasthra pramaanam* is talking about *aathmaa*. When the very subject matters of the two *pramaanaa*-s are thus different, where is the question of one *pramaanaa* contradicting the other? There is absolutely no scope. Therefore, the necessity of *prasamkhyaanam* is not logically established by you, since your argument is based on this non-existing contradiction”. This is stage 1.

Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa has entered the second stage of argument. This argument is called suppositional or hypothetical argument, ‘*abhyupedhya vaadhaa*’ in Sanskrit. He says “All right; let us assume that *prathyaksha anubhavaa* is also dealing with *aathmaa*, as you presume; in reality, it does not deal with *aathmaa*; it cannot also; but, suppose, for argument’s sake, that it is dealing with *aathmaa*. Let us assume that the *prathyaksha anubhavaa* is revealing the *dhu:kithvam* of *aathmaa*, that it is ‘I’, who am miserable. *Under this assumption*, I agree, that, there will be a contradiction. I also agree, that, if there is a

contradiction, *sravana janya jnaanam* cannot give liberation, because the *sravanam* gives a knowledge which is contradicting *prathyakshaa pramaanam*. To consolidate: Under the assumption, that *prathyaksha pramaanam* declares that it is the *aathmaa* which is subject to *dhu:kithvam*, *sravana janya jnaanam* cannot give liberation, because *prathyaksha pramaanam* has revealed '*dhu:kham* is '**my**' *svaroopam*'".

"But" Sureswaraachaaryaa continues "Under this condition, it is not only that *sravana janya jnaanam* cannot 'liberate' me instantaneously, but, it cannot liberate me, in the future also, even if I do *prasamkhyaanam* for a billion *janmaa*-s. Because, how can *prasamkhyaanam* negate the 'fact', that I am *dhu:kha svaroopam*? *Dhu:kha svaroopam* is revealed by *prathyaksha pramaanam* and what is revealed by a *pramaanam* is 'fact' and by definition, 'fact' is 'that which can never be negated by any method'. Therefore, even if I do *prasamkhyaanam*, there is no hope of getting liberation, anytime in the future also. So, if I am wrong, you are also equally wrong".

Reverting to the text (verse 88 – Chapter III):

ॐ दुःखित्वं प्रमाण बद्ध मूलत्वात् - Since the *dhu:khithvam* of the Self is established by *prathyaksha paramaanam*,

It should be carefully remembered that this (viz., '*dhu:kithvam* of the Self, being revealed by *prathyaksha pramaanam*') is only a supposition.

'*Pramaana baddha moolam*' means '*pramaana siddha svaroopam*'. '*dhu:kithvam pramaana baddha moolathvaath*' means 'since, according to you, sorrow is the intrinsic nature of 'me', the *aathmaa*, proved by my own *anubhavaa*'.

Then, what will be the problem?

ॐ केन वार्यते - by what method, can (that essential nature of sorrow) be negated?

'*Kena*' means '*kena maargena*' or '*kena prakaarena*' – 'by what method'; '*Vaaryathe*' means 'can be eliminated'. '*Kena vaaryathe*' means 'By what means can (it) be eliminated / negated'.

This "By what method, can we negate the 'intrinsic' sorrow of the *aathmaa*?" is a not only a question. It implicitly contains the answer also viz., "By no means, can we negate the 'intrinsic' sorrow of the *aathmaa*". Even *Bhagavaan* cannot remove the 'intrinsic' nature of any object. Gowdapaadhaachaaryaa refers to this fact, in his *Maandookya Kaarika*: "*prakruthi: anyathaa bhaavaa na kathamchith bhavishyathi*" (Verse 7 – *Alaathasaanthiprakaranam*) – "Transformation of the intrinsic nature will not take place on

any account". Therefore, if *dhu:kithvam* or bondage is the intrinsic nature of *aathmaa*, no *mokshaa* is ever possible, which means, that, even by *prasamkhyaanam*, liberation cannot come.

What will happen if at all the 'intrinsic *dhu:kithvam* nature' of the *aathmaa* is eliminated? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers this question, with an example:

ॐ अग्नि उष्णवत् निवृत्तिः चेत्- Similar to when and if the intrinsic nature of heat is eliminated from fire,

ॐ नैरात्म्यं हि येति - extinction of the Self itself will result (if, *dhu:kithvam*, the presumed intrinsic nature of *aathmaa* is eliminated)

ॐ सौगतम् - as in the philosophy of the Buddhists.

Heat being the essential and intrinsic nature of fire, it can never be eliminated by anyone, including God. Similarly, 'sorrow', if and when supposed to be the essential nature of *jeevathmaa*, will never go away by any amount of meditation.

Of course, the heat of the fire *can* 'go away' under one condition, namely, when the fire itself goes out. Once the fire itself is extinguished, the heat also will go away. There is no possibility at all of the fire alone being there without the heat. In short, there are only two alternatives: (1) both fire and heat will be there or (2) both of them go away. There is no third option.

It is the *poorva pakshin* only, who says that 'sorrow' is the essential nature of the Self, proved by *prathyaksha pramaanam* and, that, by *prasamkhyaanam*, 'sorrow' will go away. If his views are conceded and it is assumed that 'sorrow', 'intrinsic' to *athmaa*, goes away by *prasamkhyaanam*, what will happen? Sureswaraachaaryaa argues: "Similar to the fire having to be extinguished for the heat to go away, if 'intrinsic' sorrow has to go away by *prasamkhyaanam*, the *jeevaathmaa* also will have disappear. There will be neither 'bound *jeevaathmaa*' nor 'liberated *jeevathmaa*'. There will be no *jeevathmaa* at all. In other words, *prasamkhyaanam* will lead to the very destruction of *jeevathmaa*".

The aspirant wanted to get liberation; with that purpose in mind, he meditated; what happened? He disappeared! There is a popular saying in Tamil: "Would anyone agree to have his head removed, to get rid of his headache?" 'Removing one's head to cure a headache' is no solution at all.

Sureswaraachaaryaa calls this 'state of absence of *aathmaa*' as '*nairaathmyam*'. '*Nairaathmyam*' means '*niraathma bhaava:*' or '*aathma abhaava:*' | And, once you accept '*aathma abhaavaa*', you are moving away from the *Vedhaantha dharsanam* to the *Bouddha*

dharsanam of 'nihilism'. The *Aachaaryaa* points out, that, the *poorva pakshin's prasamkhyana vaadhaa*, thus, ends up as *soonya vaadhaa*.

But, what is *soonya vaadhaa*? Ans: "It is a theory which belongs to one branch of Buddhism, which believes, that, ultimately, nothing really exists – not even *aathmaa*".

'Sugatha:' is one of the several names of Buddha. '*Sougatham*' (in the verse) means 'of the *bhuddha matham*'. It is adjective to '*nairaathmyam*'. '*Saugatham nairathmyam ethi*' means 'you will end up with the *soonya vaadhaa* of Buddha'.

This will be considered inappropriate by the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* also, since, he is also an *aasthikaa* philosopher, who will not like to become a *naasthika bouddha*. "Therefore" Sureswaraachaaryaa concludes "*prasamkhyana vaadhaa* is not acceptable".

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 89 & Verse 89 – Chapter III:

अथ मतम् ।

निराकुर्यात्प्रसंख्यानं दुःकित्वं चेत्वनुष्ठितम् ।

प्रत्यक्षादिविरुद्धत्वात् कथम् उत्पादयेत् प्रमाम् ॥ ८९ ॥

Or, consider the other alternative: If meditation, well-performed, is taken as putting an end to misery, we ask how can it generate valid cognition, while it is opposed to other sources of valid knowledge, like perception?

ॐ अथ मतम् - (The *Aachaaryaa* continues to address the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*):

Suppose the following idea is your contention.

The suppositional argument continues. What is that supposition? Ans: "*dhu:kham* is 'our' *svaroopam* i.e. 'sorrow' is 'our' intrinsic nature" (is the supposition).

Sureswaraachaaryaa says: "Let us continue with that unfortunate supposition. I have already established that, *mokshaa* cannot be attained by *prasamkhyaanam* and, that, you will end up with *soonya vaadhaa* i.e., the very disappearance of *aathmaa*. But, suppose you still maintain that after long *prasamkhyaanam*, a person will be able to generate joy / produce happiness, as a result of that long and intense meditation. Now, what is the situation? Ans: '**I**' am **essentially** sorrowful. As a result of *prasamkhyaanam* 'I' am now cheerful and happy'. But, can you call this liberation? What will be the condition of the now cheerful person who is **essentially** miserable, but smiling at the moment? Is this not only a temporary covering of the essential nature of sorrow by some superficial projection of happiness? Is it not like smearing perfume over one's body, without having a bath? Can you say, that, because of the perfume

applied superficially, the body has become *sugandha svaroopam*? *Pramaana virodhaa* will continue even if you manage to cover up the 'intrinsic sorrow' by 'temporary happiness'. If *prathyaksha pramaana* reveals that *dhu:kham* is '**my**' **intrinsic** nature and *saasthraa* reveals that '**I**' am *aanandha*., that contradiction will still be there. That *pramaana virodhaa* cannot be removed by the temporary joy superimposed on the *dhu:khee aathmaa*, by the mere practice of *prasamkhyaanam*".

(At this point Swamiji comments: It is an unfortunate fact that most people are working only on solutions for achieving temporary, superficial happiness, by visits to clubs, movies and other similar activities).

Reverting to the text:

ॐ सु अनुष्ठितं प्रसंख्यानं दुःखित्वं निराकुर्यात् चेत् - Even if it is assumed that practice of intense meditation suppresses the misery of the Self,

'*su anishtitham*' means 'intensely performed' or 'well performed'. It is adjective to *prasamkhyaanam*, which is the 'subject' of the sentence. '*dhu:kithvam*' is the 'object' of the sentence and '*niraakuryaath*' is the verb. '*Niraakuryaath*' should be taken to mean 'suppresses' and not 'removes', since, in the previous verse, it had been established that the intrinsic 'sorrow' cannot be removed without the inevitable consequence of *aathma abhaavam* / the very disappearance of *aathmaa*.

For argument's sake, let it be assumed that by resorting to *prasamkhyaanam*, the aspirant suppresses sorrow and generates an artificial and superficial happiness. Sureswaraacharya says, that, even in that case, the problem of '*prathyaksha virodhaa*' or 'contradiction with *prathyaksha pramaanaa*' will continue.

How or why? The *Aachaaryaa* does not explain the reason. Presumably he thinks that it is quite obvious. The reason can be explained as follows: According to the *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* and as temporarily conceded by Sureswaraacharya, the revelation of *prathyaksha pramaanaa* is that sorrow is '**my**' original or intrinsic nature. And, it has been established that the intrinsic sorrow cannot be 'removed' by *prasamkhyaanam*. At its best, *prasamkhyaanam* can only suppress that sorrow. Obviously, 'mere suppression of the misery of the Self' is not 'changing the very nature of the Self'. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that the *pramaanaa virodhaa* has been terminated; it will continue. Therefore, the *Aachaaryaa* says:

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि विरुद्धत्वात् - because of the (still persisting), *pramaana virodhaa* (the contradiction between *pramaanaa*-s)

Just as perfume used without a regular bath only manages to cover up body odour, the *prasamkhyaanam* also manages only to cover up the intrinsic nature of sorrow and does not remove it totally.

ॐ (प्रसंख्यानं) कथम् प्रमाम् उत्पादयेत्- how can *prasamkhyaanam* generate a new 'liberating' knowledge?

It is a very intelligent question, because, earlier, the *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* had said that *mahaa vaakya sravanam* will not generate real / liberating knowledge because of *prathyaksha virodhaa*. Now, Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "If *sravanam* cannot produce liberating knowledge because of *prathyaksha virodhaa*, how can *prasamkhyaanam* generate that knowledge, since the *prathyaksha virodhaa* continues to be there?" This is again not a question; it is a statement viz. '*prasamkhyaanam* also will not solve the problem, if sorrow is '*my*' essential or intrinsic nature'.

The superficial happiness has only suppressed or covered up the *dhu:kithvam*. It is similar to the common experience of the *Vedhaanthic* students forgetting their worries, at least during the class hours.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verses 90 and 91 (Chapter III)

ननु प्रसंख्यानं नाम तत्त्वमस्यादिशब्दार्थान्वयव्यतिरेकयुक्तिविषयबुद्ध्यामेडनं
अभिधीयते । तच्चानुष्ठीयमानं प्रमितिवर्धनया परिपूर्णां प्रमितिं जनयति न पुनः
ऐकाग्र्यवर्धनया इति । यथाशेषाशुचिनीडे स्त्रीकुणपे कामिनीति निर्वस्तुकः
पुरुषायासमात्रजनितः प्रत्यय इति । तन्न । यतः ।

The following may be said by way of objection: “*Prasamkhyaanam*’ means repeatedly dwelling in thought, on what is proclaimed by texts like ‘That thou art’ and is settled intellectually by rational discrimination. When practiced, this ‘*prasamkhyaanam*’ generates complete knowledge by progressively increasing the measure of right knowledge and not by simply increasing concentration of mind. It is unlike the spurious confidence born merely of masculine imagination in the beauty of a woman’s body, which, in reality, is a corpse full of filth”. But, we deny this also:

The *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* does not give up or withdraw. He presents further arguments in support of his *vaadhaa*. He says: “‘Meditation’, of course, means ‘repeated thinking’ or ‘*vrutthi aavrutthi*’. But, meditation is of two types. You have not understood that there are two types of meditation and, also that, the two types give two different types of results or consequences. The *prasamkhyaanam* which I am talking about, is different from the popular

dhyaanam or meditation. You have not understood that important fact and that is the reason you are arguing against it”.

What are the two types of meditation, according to the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*?

One is the popular ‘*vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:*’ meaning ‘meditating upon an object or a person repeatedly’. This is one type of ‘*vrutthi aavrutthi*’ – ‘repeatedly thinking of a particular object or a person’.

The other type is ‘*pramaana vrutthi abhyaasa:*’, which is of a different category. This type of meditation is not repetition of the thinking of an object or a person; but, is ‘meditation on the *sabda pramaana vaakyam*’, in this case, on the ‘*mahaa vaakya pramaana vaakyam*’.

Thus, the two types are (i) *vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:* and (ii) *pramaana vrutthi abhyaasa:* |

Vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa: has a particular result and *pramaana vrutthi abhyaasa:* has a different result. ‘*Vishayaa*’, in this context, means an ‘object’ or ‘person’; ‘*vrutthi*’ means ‘thought’; ‘*abhyaasa:*’ means ‘repetition’. ‘*Vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:*’, therefore, means ‘repeatedly thinking of a particular object or a person’. When an individual resorts to ‘*vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:*’ or when ‘*vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:*’ takes place helplessly (as it happens more often), the individual will gradually get more and more focus and concentration on the ‘object of meditation’; the concentration intensifies because of repeated thinking; and, that will lead to attachment towards that object. Lord Krishna refers to this phenomenon, in the *Bhagavad Githa* (Ch. II - verse 62) – “*dhyaayatho vishayaan pumsa: sanghastheshu upajaayathe sangaath samjaayathe kaama:*” – “When a man thinks of objects, attachment for them arises. From attachment arises desire”. This individual, who meditates on the given ‘object’, gets more and more intensified concentration; initially, he has to think of that object deliberately; thereafter, he is able to think of that object very easily or spontaneously; and, thereafter, that object ‘occupies’ his mind; and, finally, that object refuses to vacate the individual’s mind, and that is what is called obsession. And, because of this attachment and the constant mental association with the object, the objective perception will become gradually subjective. *Isvara srushti*, the object of meditation, will give way to *jeeva srushti*, ‘imagined’ virtues of the object of meditation. *Saasthraa*-s use the term ‘*sobhanaa adhyaasa:*’ for this phenomenon, which term means that the individual begins to see some virtues in the object of meditation, which virtues may not be actually existent. Thus, *adhyasaa* / *jeeva srushti* happens because of the conditioning of the mind. In other words, the ‘conditioning of the mind’ or ‘brain washing’ leads to mental projections. This is the consequence of ‘*vishaya aavrutthi abhyaasa:*’ – ‘meditation on an object or a person’.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* says that the second type of meditation is ‘*pramaana vrutthi abhyaasaa:*’, where, you are not meditating upon an object; but, you are analyzing that object;

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

in other words, thinking of that object *through* a relevant *pramaanam*. The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* argues: “When *pramaana vrutthi* is repeated, it will initially give you a knowledge of a particular grade or quality; and, once you go on repeating that *aavrutthi*, that knowledge will get more and more intensified. That knowledge will attain higher or better quality and will get converted into what is termed *saakshaathkaaraa*, a *jnaanam* of a superior quality. In short, inferior quality knowledge, through *pramaana vrutthi* will get converted into superior quality knowledge”.

Swamiji's comments at this point: “This approach means, that, in the class, when you study ‘*aham brahma asmi*’, you will have ordinary book knowledge and if you go on repeating to yourself, that book knowledge ‘*aham brahma asmi; mano buddyahamkaara chitthaani na aham*’ etc., that knowledge will get a higher fineness or quality. ‘The initial knowledge cannot liberate. That higher knowledge will liberate’ is the approach”.

To continue the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*'s argument: “My *prasamkhyaanam* is not ‘*vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa*’, leading to ‘conditioning’ or ‘brainwashing’; but, it is ‘*pramaana vrutthi abhyaasaa*’, which will lead to extraordinary knowledge. *Pramaana vrutthi abhyaasaa* **will** take a person from ordinary knowledge to extraordinary knowledge, which ‘extraordinary knowledge’ you do not get through *sravanam* alone, though, through *sravanam*, you do understand ‘*aham brahma asmi*’. That ‘extraordinary knowledge’ acquired by *prasamkhyaanam* alone is looked upon by some people as ‘mystic experience’. But, no mystic events are happening; in meditation, when you do that *ekaagra vrutthi*, in that silent mind / in that *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, an extraordinary knowledge, which gives a mystic appearance, takes place. It is different from ‘brainwashing’ or ‘conditioning of the mind’. ‘Brainwashing’ or ‘conditioning of the mind’, is, of course, a common problem in mundane existence. Any normal individual is attached to his children, spouse, possessions etc. and even to a gift given to him by someone loved by him. That gift from someone beloved, gets a ‘notional’ increase in value, resulting from *abhimaanaa*. This is a type of ‘brainwashing’ or ‘conditioning of mind’, which scriptures call *sobhanaa adhyaasaa*. My *prasamkhyaanam* does not lead to such ‘conditioning of the mind’. It leads to an extraordinary knowledge, *saakshathkaaraa*, which will produce liberation. Before the rise of that extraordinary knowledge, I am essentially sorrowful; but after the rise of that extraordinary knowledge, I am liberated. Thereafter, I can call myself *muktha*.” | This is the argument of the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not agree. Dayananda Swami also does not.

Reverting to the text (*sambhandha gadhyam* to verses 90 and 91):

The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* says:

ॐ ननु - I am raising an objection to your argument:

ॐ प्रसंख्यानं नाम अभिधीयते - Let me first give the definition of prasamkhyaanam.

What is that definition?

ॐ बुद्धि आम्रेडनं - "Repeated thinking of

'*aamredanam*' means 'repetition' / *aavrutthi* / *abhyaasa*: | '*buddhi aamredanam*' means 'thought repetition'

What is the 'thought' repeated?

ॐ तत्त्वमस्यादि शब्द अर्थ- the meaning of mahaa vaakyam-s such as 'thath thvam asi',

'*sabdha*' means '*mahaa vaakyam*'; '*artha*' means 'meaning'.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* says: "I am not repeating the words; but I am repeating the meanings of the words, that '*jeevathmaa is Paramaathmaa*'".

What type of *jeevaathmaa*? Ans: 'Essentially sorrowful' *jeevaathmaa*.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* continues: "While thinking of the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam* I am also remembering the *anvaya vyathirekhaa* reasoning, which is supporting the *mahaa vaakyam*" |

ॐ अन्वय व्यतिरेक युक्ति विषय- which meaning is arrived at, with the reasoning of *anvaya* and *vyathirekhaa*".

The mode of application of the logic of '*anvaya vyathirekhaa*' in the context of *mahaa vaakya vicharaa*, has been discussed earlier.

This portion of the *sambhandha gadhyam* can be a separate sentence, completed with the verb '*abhideeyathe*' | The essence of this first portion of the *sambhandha gadhyam* is: "The process of repetition of the thought of *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam*, which is the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam*, supported logically by *anvaya-vyathirkha-yukthi* is called *prasamkhyaanam*".

The *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*'s assertion is thus: "By *prasamkhyaanam*, I am remembering *jeevaathma-Paramaathma-eikyam*, which is the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam*, along with the supporting logic of *anvaya-vyathirekhaa*. Of course, during *sravanam*, I understood the meaning of the *mahaa vaakyam*. During *sravanam*, you do collect that knowledge; but, that

knowledge, however much you study and understand it, does not liberate; it is only book knowledge / intellectual knowledge. It will not give you liberation. What you should do thereafter, is that, you should go on repeating to yourself, the revelation which you have received or understood during *sravanam*. That repetition is called *prasamkhyaanam*".

What will that *prasamkhyaanam* do (according to the *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi*)?

ॐ तद् च - And, this meditation

The *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi*, as already mentioned, holds that this 'meditation' is different from what is commonly understood as *dhyaanam*. His 'meditation' is *maaha vaakya aavrutthi* |

ॐ अनुष्ठीयमानं - when practiced for a length of time,

ॐ परिपूर्णा प्रमितिं जनयति - produces complete knowledge

ॐ प्रमितिवर्धनया - by gradual qualitative improvement in the nature of the knowledge.

According to the *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi*, when *prasamkhyaanam* is practiced with more and more intensity, for a length of time, if necessary, extending even to a few years, it gradually increase the quality of the initial knowledge attained through *sravanam*. There is a gradual qualitative improvement in the nature of that knowledge through the years. It becomes superior and superior / better and better.

In contrast, Sureswaraacharya's contention is that the very understanding achieved through *maha vaakya sravanam* gives instantaneous liberation, without the need for any further *saadhanaa*. Unfortunately, even for many sincere *Vedhaanthic* students this statement of the *Aacharya* is not convincing. They doubt whether 'mere understanding' would help achieve liberation.

The *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* also says: "No; the simple understanding would not do" and proceeds: "That 'simple understanding' should be repeated in meditation. Gradually it will increase in quality. That 'simple understanding' or 'knowledge' will acquire an additional coat of fineness with every *nirvikalpaka samaadhi*, just as gold acquires more and more shine by repeated polishing. The 'simple understanding' becomes finer and finer by consistent *prasamkhyaanam* and will ultimately turn into an extraordinary realization / an extraordinary enlightenment / extraordinary *saakshaathkaaraa*. The knowledge will become complete knowledge. *Prasamkhyaanam* will help the aspirant reach the acme of realization / the zenith of realization. That is the type of meditation that I am talking about".

Having made this clear, the *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* takes further care to emphasize that *prasamkhyaanam* is not the same as '*vishaya vrutthi abhyaasa:*', which is a conditioning or a

brain washing process, leading to subjective projections. He says: “I am not talking about that type of meditation, when I talk of *prasamkhyaanam*”:

ॐ पुनः ऐकाग्र्य वर्धनया न - and, not by merely intensifying the concentration (and thereby ‘conditioning’ the mind),

Eikaagriyam’ means concentration / focus / conditioning / brainwashing. ‘*vardhanayaa*’ means ‘by increase’ or ‘by intensification’.

“*Prasamkhyaanam* does not give liberation by merely conditioning the mind or brainwashing. It is not the same as the ‘*vishaya dhyaanam*’, about which Lord Krishna warned in the *Baghavat Githa* (chapter II – verse 62)” is the *prasamkhyaanam vaadhin*’s stand.

The *prasamkhyaanam vaadhi* gives an example for ‘brainwashing’, which, in his firm opinion, *prasamkhyaanam* is **not**.

ॐ यथा - as the conditioning that happens in the following example.

What is that example? It should be noted that the example is not ‘similar’ to the *prasamkhyaanam*. On the other hand, it is dissimilar to *prasamkhyaanam* or ‘unlike *prasamkhyaanam*’, what is called a ‘counter example’.

The example follows.

ॐ स्त्री कुणपे - “In the body of a woman

The literal meaning of the word ‘*kunapa:*’ is ‘a dead body’ or ‘a corpse’. In this context, it may be taken to mean ‘*sthoola sareeram*’ or ‘physical body’, representing any sense object or ‘*indriya vishaya:*’ | That *sthree sareeram*, for that matter, the *sareeram* of any living being is a repository of all forms of *malam* or impurity. So, an adjective is used for the ‘*sthree sareere:*’:

ॐ अशेष अशुचि नीडे- which is an embodiment of filth and foul smell,

In the earlier chapter (verse 52 – chapter II) itself, Sureswaraacharya made a similar comment: “*subhroo: sunaasaa sumukhi sunethraa chaaruhaasinee kalpanaa maathra sammohaath raametyalingathe asuchim*” – “(One whose vision is blocked by the non-apprehension of Reality) embraces a thing impure, calling it a woman with beautiful eyebrows, nose and face and charming smiles, under the delusion born of a mere fancy”. In the *Viveka Choodaamani* also (verse 87) the detestable nature of the gross body is brought out as “*thvang maamsa rudhira snaayu medho majja asthi samkulam poornam moothra*

pureeshaabhyam sthoolam nindhyam idham vapu:” - “This body, which is made up of skin, flesh, blood, arteries, veins, fat, marrow and bones, is full of waste matter and filth. It deserves or contempt”.

ॐ निर्वस्तुकः- the non-factual

ॐ पुरुष आयासमात्र जनितः प्रत्ययः- mental projection born merely of masculine imagination

ॐ कामिनि इति- viz. ‘an attractive woman’ (is created)”.

‘*nirvasthuka:*’ means ‘non-factual’ or ‘false’. ‘*purusha aayaasaa*’ means ‘masculine imagination’; ‘*maathra*’ means ‘merely’; ‘*janitha:*’ means ‘born out of’ and ‘*prathyaya:*’ means ‘notion’ or ‘mental projection’. ‘*kaamini*’ means ‘an attractive woman’ / ‘an endearing woman’.

This ‘mental projection’ of an ‘attractive woman’ in a mere physical, gross body full of filth is ‘*sobhanaa adhyaasa:*’, a superimposition caused by constant association or attachment. The *slokaa* in the *Bhagavadh Githa*, quoted earlier, viz. “*dhyaayatho vishayaan pumsa:*” truly reflects this situation.

In mundane experience, we see this happening to youngsters. By constant association with a colleague or a classmate of the opposite sex, ‘infatuation’ results very often and a very ordinary girl becomes a ‘*devathaa*’ in the eyes of the infatuated boy. This is ‘*gunape kaaminee dhrushti:*’ referred to, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*. This is called ‘conditioning’ or ‘brainwashing’, resulting from constant association or meditation.

And, the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* says “Our *prasamkhyanam* is not such an affair. Do not think our type of meditation is ‘brainwashing’ or ‘conditioning’; our meditation is *pramaana vrutthi abhyaasa:*, which will generate the (so-called) ‘mystic’ liberating knowledge”.

Sureswaraacharya says:

ॐ इति चेत् - If you argue like that,

ॐ तद् न - I cannot accept that argument also.

Thus, Sureswaraacharya's contentions, as firmly expressed to the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* are: “Meditation cannot produce knowledge; meditation cannot improve knowledge; meditation cannot refine knowledge. What we call *nidhidhyaasanam* is different from your *prasamkhyanam*. In *nidhidhyaasanam*, the aspirants are **not** trying to improve the ‘knowledge’ gained from *mahaa vaakya sravanam*; no improvement to that knowledge is needed. By *nidhidhyaasanam*, they are only attempting to get out of their natural orientation towards the triangular format of *jeeva-jagath-Isvara*. And, as they get out of that orientation,

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

the understanding remaining the same, the impact of the 'knowledge' is more, because of the receding of the orientation. No improvement of 'knowledge' (as envisaged by you, through your *prasamkhyaanam*) takes place through our *nidhidhyaasanam*; nor is it attempted".

This is going to be further established by Sureswaraachaaryaa.

194. Chapter III, Verses 90 (21-08-2010)

Chapter III: Verse 90 –

अभ्यासोपचयाद्बुद्धेर्यत्स्यादैकाग्र्यमेव तत् ।
न हि प्रमाणान्यभ्यासात्कुर्वन्त्यर्थावबोधनम् ॥ ९० ॥

By cumulative repetition of thought, only concentration comes about. The modes of knowledge like perception do not reveal their objects as result of such repetition.

Sureswaraachaaryaa is refuting the *prasamkyaanaa vaadhaa* in these verses.

The first basic principle of *prasamkhyana vaadhaa* is that there is a contradiction between *sravana janya jnaanam* and *prathyaksha anubhava jnaanam*. The *Aachaaryaa* does not agree with the *prasamkhyana vaadhi* on this very first principle. He gives a valid reason also for this, as follows: “*Sravana janya jnaanam* deals with *aathmaa* and *prathyaksha anubhavaa* deals only with *anaathmaa*; since, thus, the subject matter is itself different, there cannot be any contradiction between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *prathyaksha / anubhava pramaanam*”.

Thereafter, he moves to another argument, ‘*abhyupedyaa vaadha:*’ or ‘suppositional argument’, temporarily accepting the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*’s view, merely for the sake of argument. On this basis, he questions the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*: “Even supposing that there is a contradiction between *sravana janya jnaanam* and *prathyaksha jnaanam*, how can ‘*prasamkhyanaa*’, which is only ‘mere repetition of *mahaa vaakyam*’, solve the problem?” His contention is: “The presumed contradiction will continue, even if meditation on *mahaa vaakya* is done. Mere repetition of *mahaa vaakyam* cannot remove the contradiction”.

In reply to this, the *poorva pakshin* presents *his* views as follows: “*Mahaa vaakya abhyaasaa* is capable of producing another extraordinary knowledge. This is because the *prasamkhyana* meditation is different from the conventional form of meditation. ‘Meditation’ is of two types; one is *vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa*, which is the conventional meditation; the other is *pramaana vrutthi abhyaasaa*. In *vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa*, one goes on dwelling upon an object or a person, because of which, one gradually develops an attachment to that object or person and because of the attachment, one begins to see virtues in that object / person which virtues may not be there at all. This is what Lord Krishna warned about, in the *Bhagavadh Githaa*, as ‘*Dhyaayatho vishayaan pumsa: sanghastheshu upajaayathe*’ (Chapter II – verse 62) – ‘For a person who dwells on sense-objects, a fancy towards them arises’. *Vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa* will lead to ‘brain-washing’, ‘conditioning of the mind’ etc., which, in turn,

will lead to mental projections and hallucinations. It is *kalpanaa* that is taking place. You are not going closer to the fact by *vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa*; in fact, you are going farther away from the fact. My *prasamkhyanaa* is different. By prescribing *prasamkhyanaa*, I am not suggesting such a misleading *vishaya vrutthi abhyaasaa*; by the term *prasamkhyanaa*, I am talking about '*mahaa vaakya pramaana vrutthi abhyaasaa*' / '*aham brahma asmi abhyaasaa*'. **This** *abhyaasaa* will improve the power of the *mahaa vaakyam*, and, in due course, the ordinary knowledge will be converted into an extraordinary knowledge called '*saakshaathkaaraa*' and this extraordinary knowledge will solve the problem".

Sureswaraachaaryaa has two objections to this argument. The first objection he raised was: "No. Even that 'extraordinary knowledge' cannot remove the contradiction you are talking about. If there is a contradiction between *prathyaksha janya jnaanam* and *sravana janya jnaanam*, as you claim, the extraordinary knowledge cannot remove that contradiction, because, according to your own statement, the contradiction is established through valid *pramaanam*-s and what is established by a valid *pramaanam* can never be altered. Therefore, even if an extraordinary knowledge is produced, as envisaged by you, that extraordinary knowledge also cannot remove the contradiction". This was his first objection.

Now, in this verse no. 90, the *Aachaaryaa* raises his second objection, questioning the very 'rise' of the extraordinary knowledge. He avers: "'Repetition' cannot produce any extraordinary knowledge. You cannot prove that 'repetition of thought' can produce extraordinary knowledge". Swamiji establishes this with an example: "For instance, when I am looking at a white flower, naturally, I see the flower as white in colour. Suppose I keep on looking at the whiteness of the colour. Would that continuous perception either increase or decrease the whiteness of the flower? Certainly not. Because of the continuous perception, the whiteness of the flower will neither increase or decrease; there will not be any refinement in the colour or any other nature of the flower, because of the repeated observation. Alternately, assume that I had a cataract problem in my eyes, when I viewed the flower the first time. Later, I have the cataract removed and then view the flower again. In that case, any wrong perception that might have been made with the cataract in the eyes, will be corrected after removal of the cataract. But, when there is no defect in the *pramaanam* and the *pramaanam* is operated properly, whatever knowledge I get in the first observation, need not be and cannot be changed. In the example of the white flower, 'repetition of perception' or '*prathyaksha abhyaasaa*' can never change the nature of the flower. This fact cannot be questioned or doubted by anyone. Similarly, when '*aham brahma asmi*' *sravanam* helps me know that 'I' am liberated, you cannot say, that, at the time of *sravanam*, I get only partially liberated and I as go on doing either *nidhidhyaasnam* or *prasamkhyanam*, the quantum of liberation will gradually increase. Or, that *raagadveshaa* will gradually become lesser and lesser. Such things are not possible. In short, *pramaana abhyaasaa* can neither produce

knowledge not can it refine knowledge nor can it produce an extraordinary experience; even if an experience gets generated, it will have nothing at all to do with *jnaanam*". Reverting to the text:

ॐ बुद्धेः यत् स्यात् तत् - Whatever consequence that happens in the mind

ॐ अभ्यास उपचयात्- because of the intensity of repetition of thought,

ॐ एकाग्र्यं एव- can be only more and more focus / concentration.

Essence: "Even intensive mental repetition of any thought can result only in more concentration". That 'it cannot produce knowledge' is stated in the second line. In the context of our current discussion, '*abhyaasaa*' can be taken to mean 'repeated mental practice of the *mahaa vaakyam, aham brahma asmi*'; '*upachayaa*' means 'increase in intensity, both qualitatively and quantitatively'. '*abhyaasa upachayaath*', therefore, will mean 'by qualitative and quantitative improvement in *aham brahma asmi vrutthi*'; '*thath*' refers to 'the consequence of the *aham brahma asmi vrutthi*'; '*eikaagriyam*' means 'increased focus' or 'increased concentration'.

In the *yoga soothraa*-s, three terms, *dharanaa, dhyaanaa* and *samaadhi* are used. When the *yogic* practitioner meditates on a particular object, withdrawing his mind from all other objects, all his thoughts will converge on that one object of meditation. 'Convergence' of thoughts can, of course, be there. But, that 'convergence' cannot improve or produce knowledge. It cannot produce a knowledge which has not been produced earlier; nor can it increase any knowledge acquired earlier. *Jnaana uthpatthi* cannot take place; *jnaana vrutthi* also cannot take place. What takes place is only '*eikaagriyam*' which means 'concentration' / 'focus' / 'convergence'.

In the second line of the verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives the conclusion, a general rule: "*pramaanaani abhyaasaath artha avabodhanam na kurvanthi*"- "Sources of knowledge do not / cannot produce knowledge by repetition". This is a very, very important statement, demystifying meditation.

ॐ प्रमाणानि - Any pramaanam,

ॐ अभ्यासात्- by its mere repetition,

ॐ अर्थ अवबोधनम् न कुर्वन्ति- cannot produce knowledge.

'*Pramaanani*' is intentionally interpreted as '*any pramaanam*', since *no pramaanam*, whether it is *prathyakshaa* or *anumaanaa* or *upamaanaa* or *arthaapatthi*, can produce new knowledge or improve knowledge, by mere repetition. For instance, if you make an inference '*parvatha: vahnimaan dhoomavathvaath*'- 'there must be fire in the hill, since smoke is

perceived', and keep repeating that inferential statement, that 'vahni jnaanam' cannot improve, just because you repeat the *pramaanam*.

In this context, Swamiji chooses to discuss a relevant subject, though not discussed by Sureswaraacharya. It is the question "Can a *pramaanam* convert *paroksha jnaanam* into *aparoksha jnaanam*, by 'repetition' of that *paroksha jnaanam*?" and also the answer to that question. As indicated, Sureswaraacharya does not discuss the topic.

Swamiji says: "We can discuss this as an aside note. Suppose I learn that *Gangothri* is a beautiful place, from what I read in a book. I get various descriptions of *Gangothri*, about its glaziers, its height from the mean sea level, its scenic beauty etc., by reading the book. In other words, I get *paroksha jnaanam* of *Gangothri*. Imagine that I repeat to myself mentally, the thoughts about the knowledge which I have collected from the book. Then, will that *paroksha jnaanam* of *Gangothri* get converted into *aparoksha jnaanam*, when I am sitting in Chennai and merely meditating on *Gangothri*? The answer is obvious, viz., 'No. The *paroksha jnaanam* cannot get converted into *aparoksha jnaanam*, by mere repetitions – mental or verbal. If there is to be a conversion, the *pramaanam* itself must change. If the book on *Gangothri* gave me *paroksha jnaanam* and I want *aparoksha jnaanam*, mere repetition of the contents of the book will not give me that *aparoksha jnaanam*. *Sabda pramaanam* gave me *paroksha jnaanam* of *Gangothri*. I have to go to *Gangothri* and through *prathyaksha pramanam*, I have to get *aparoksha jnaanam*'. If *sabda pramaanam* can give only *paroksha jnaanam*, by repetition of or meditation on that *jnaanam*, *sabda pramaanam* can never convert *paroksha* into *aparoksha*. In short, meditation cannot produce knowledge, meditation cannot improve knowledge and meditation cannot convert one type of knowledge into another type, *paroksha* into *aparoksha*'".

Swamiji continues: "This reasoning leads us to the conclusion 'If you gain knowledge in *sravanam*, during the *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa*, that alone is **the** knowledge; no other knowledge is possible by any other method'. At least in the case of *Gangothri*, I can get the *paroksha jnaanam* through *sabda pramaanam* and later, I can acquire *aparoksha jnaanam* through *prathyaksha pramaanam*. But, in the case of *aathma jnaanam*, *aathmaa* is not available to any *pramaanam*, other than *sabda pramaanam*. Then, how can anyone do anything to convert *paroksha* to *aparoksha*? Therefore, the conclusion '*sravana janya jnaanam* must be the *aparoksha jnaanam* – the liberating knowledge'. If I do not get that *aparoksha* liberating knowledge in *sravanam*, meditation can never, never help in the field of 'knowledge'. Meditation can be done for some other purpose, such as '*vipareetha bhaavanaa nivrutthi*', i.e., for 'removal of the habitual triangular format mindset'. We can achieve *that* through mediation. But meditation for acquisition of knowledge or improvement of knowledge is futile. This is what Sureswaraacharya points out in the second line of the verse by saying '*pramaanaani abhyaasaath artha avabodhanam na kurvanthi*'. By making

this a general statement, the *Aachaaryaa* conveys that this maxim is applicable not only in the context of the *mahaa vaakya pramaanam*, but to all other *pramaanam*-s also”.

Chapter III: Verse 91 –

अभ्यासोपचिता कृत्स्नं भावना चेन्निवर्तयेत् ।
नैकान्तिकी निवृत्तिस्स्याद्भावनाजं हि तत्फलम् ॥ ९१ ॥

If the imagination induced by repetition does remove all error, the removal cannot be final. After all it is a result of mere imagination.

In this verse, Sureswaraachaaryaa pre-empts a possible argument from the *poorva pakshin*. That argument is given in the first line of the verse and the *Aachaaryaa*'s answer in the second line.

What can be the *poorva pakshin*'s say? He may argue: “All right. Let me accept that the *mahaa vaakya abhyaasaa* does not directly improve the knowledge or produce any extraordinary knowledge. But, it can certainly improve the mind. The *pramaanam abhyaasaa*, the repetition of the *vrutthi*, will refine the mind; and, because of refinement of the mind, various problems in the mind, which cause emotional disturbances at the sub conscious level and are responsible for varieties of mental trouble will gradually disappear; and, consequently the mental trouble will gradually come down. All these will be results of *mahaa vaakya abhyaasaa*. Even if the *abhyaasaa* does not directly produce knowledge or improve knowledge, the meditation will refine the mind. Therefore, mental problems will go down, just as physical exercises result in improvement in the health of the body. Because of physical exercises, the resisting power of the physical body improves and varieties of physical health problems go away. In the same manner, meditation serves as a mental exercise, removing all the problems of the mind. The mind will get better health and therefore better joy and therefore will be able to appreciate ‘*aham aanandha svaroopam*.’ | The miserable mind will be converted into happy mind; gloomy mind will be converted into bloomy mind and the aspirant practicing *prasaadhaanam* will discover ‘*aham aanandha*.’” | Obviously, the *poorva pakshin* does not want to give up. To some, his argument may even sound reasonable.

Reverting to the text (verse 91):

ॐ अभ्यास उपचिता भावना - The impression created by intensified ‘repetition’ of mahaa vaakyam

‘*abhyaasaa*’, in this context (as already discussed), means ‘repeated mental practice of the *mahaa vaakyam*, *aham brahma asmi*’; ‘*upachithaa*’ means ‘intensified’ and is used as

adjective to 'abhyaasaa'; 'bhavanaa' means 'samskaaraa' or 'vaasanaa' or 'mental impression'. 'abhyaasaa upachithaa bhavanaa' therefore means 'the mental impression created by intense and repeated mental practice of the *mahaa vaakyam*, *aham brahma asmi*'

According to the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*, the *mahaa vaakyaa* impression gets stronger and stronger because of intense repetition, like any impression getting stronger if you go on rubbing it in. There is a saying in Tami 'எறும்பு ஊறக் கல்லும் தேயும்' meaning 'even a rock will get eroded / polished, when hordes of ants run continuously over it'. In the same manner, according to the *poorva pakshin*, 'aham brahma asmi', by intense repetition, will create a deep impression. That 'aham brahma asmi vaasanaa / samskaaraa' is called 'bhavanaa' here.

We have already established, that, the impression caused by increased, intensified 'mahaa vaakya puna: puna: aavrutthi:' cannot produce or improve *jnaanam*. The *prasamkhyana vaadhi* now concedes this and says: "All right; I concede that it does not produce knowledge and that it does not improve knowledge; but it can remove sorrows from the mind; it will eliminate pains from the mind. Pains in the subconscious mind will be flushed out by *prasamkhyaanam*".

ॐ कृत्स्नं (दुःखम्) निवर्तयेत्- will remove all the sorrows of the mind completely.

'kruthsnam' means 'completely'; 'dhu: kham' or 'samsaarithvam' has to be supplied; 'nivarthayeth' means 'will eliminate'.

Therefore, at the end of the *prasamkhyaanam*, the aspirant can claim "I am happiness personified", because he is happy.

Sureswaraachaaryaa does not agree on this also. He says: "I can see that you are coming one step down. You now accept that the *prasamkhyaanam*, which you are suggesting, is neither for acquisition of knowledge nor for improvement of knowledge, but only for refining of mind, But, there is a problem in that also. Mind comes under *anaathmaa*; refining of mind comes under *samskaaraa*. As it is universally known, there are four types of *karmapalan* – *aapthi:*, *uthpatthi:*, *samskaaraa* and *vikhaara*. Now you are talking about *samskaaraa* of the mind / refinement of the mind, by rubbing the mind, using the *mahaa vaakyam* as a polishing instrument. Instead of using *mahaa vaakyam* as *pramaanam*, you propose using it as sandpaper to refine the mind. This is similar to using precious *Gangaajalam* for washing a bathroom. *Mahaa vaakyam* is meant to falsify the mind and to throw away the mind. Instead, you want to use *mahaa vaakyam* as a washing powder to refine and improve the *mithyaa* mind. It is unfortunate. All right; so be it. But, in that case, *prasamkhyanaa* will come under

karmaa or *samskaaraa* and the removal of the *vaasanaa* becomes *samskaara palam* or *karma palam*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa concedes: "It is possible". *Gangaajalam can* be used for washing the bathroom also; the bathroom will certainly become clean. But what is the problem? The bathroom will become clean when you wash; but, that being *karmapalan*, that cleanliness is not going to last for long or forever. In his spiritual journey, the aspirant has resorted to *Vedhaanthaa*, only after understanding that all *karmapalan*-s are ephemeral. *Karmaa* or *upaasanaa* can never directly give eternal *mokshaa*. In his *Maandookya Kaarika*, Gowdapaadhaachaaryaa declares (verse 1 - *Advaitaprakaranam*) "*upaasana aasritha: dharm: jaathe brahmani varthathe praag uthpatthe: ajam sarvam thena asau krupana: smrutha:*" – essentially indicating "One who expects *mokshaa* through *upaasanaa* is an unfortunate person".

So, Sureswaraachaaryaa tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*: "Even after understanding that *upaasanaa palam* is *anithyam*, you are using *mahaa vaakyam* for *upaasanaa*, trying to refine the *mithyaa* mind and, expecting to get some kind of happiness in the future and also expecting that happiness to be eternal. What an unfortunate approach? You should understand that *mahaa vaakyam* should never be used to refine the mind; *mahaa vaakyam* should be used only to see the falsity of the mind and to remove the habit of looking at the mind as real. Removal of the false notions that (i) the mind is real and (ii) the conditions of the mind are 'my' conditions, are the aims of using *mahaa vaakyam*. Instead of that, you are using *mahaa vaakyam* to refine the mind. If you say 'I do not understand *mahaa vaakyam*, because I lack *chittha suddhi*', then, we will say 'in that case, you would do better, to go back to *karma yogaa* and *upaasana yogaa*'. But, unfortunately, you are using *mahaa vaakyam* to produce the results of *karmaa* and *upaasanaa*; and, having thus used *mahaavaakyam* wrongly, in the place of *karmaa* and *upasanaa*, you are looking for something else for acquiring *jnaanam*. You propose to sit in *samaadhi*, for some mystic knowledge, after throwing away *mahaa vaakyam*. How unfortunate that you use *mahaa vaakyam* for *chittha suddhi*, set aside *mahaa vaakyam*, sit in meditation, remove all thoughts and wait for knowledge to come, but, without any *pramaanam*?"

Reverting to the text (second line of verse 91):

ॐ तत् फलम्- That refinement of the mind / the mental happiness

ॐ भावना अजं- is born out of *samskaara karmaa*.

That mental happiness which results from the refinement of mind in meditation, can be only '*prathibhimbha aanandhaa*' or '*aanandha maya kosa aanandhaa*'. To quote Gowdapaadhaachaaryaa again, he discusses four types of obstacles in meditation - (1) *layaa*

(2) *vikshepaa* (3) *kashaayaa* and (4) *rasaasvaadhaa* | Why is '*Rasaasvaadhaa*' considered an obstacle? '*Rasaasvaadhaa*' is the joy that comes in meditation; in meditation, all problems are forgotten and the mind is made quiet. When the mind is quiet, because of the *satthva vrutthi*, it produces joy during meditation. But, that joy is '*janya aanandhaa*' and cannot be called '*aathma aanandhaa*'. It is only temporary, disappearing even as the practitioner comes out of meditation or *samaadhi*. So, Sureswaraachaaryaa says:

ॐ निवृत्तिः- That freedom from sorrow attained through meditation

ॐ न एकान्तिकी (स्यात्)- cannot be permanent

'*nivrutthi*:' means '*dhu:kha nivrutthi*:' | It refers to the temporary joy attained through meditation, the *samskaara roopa karma palan* | '*ekaanthikee*' means 'permanent' or '*nithyaa*' |

That *dhu:kha nivrutthi* is not permanent. It is only a palliative medicine; it is not curative.

What *is* the curative medicine? Ans: '*Mano mithyaathva nischaya*:' **alone** is the permanent cure.

"Instead" the *Aachaaryaa* tells the *poorva pakshin* "you take the mind as real and keep on 'washing' the mind with *mahaa vaakyam*. That is the worst form of abuse of *mahaa vaakyam*".

What is the logic behind the conclusion '*nivrutthi: ekaanthikee na syaath*' – 'the freedom from misery cannot be permanent'? Ans: Since it is only a *karma palan*. In Sanskrit, the 'logic' can be expressed as "*dhukha nivrutthi: anithyaa karma palathvaath*". What is the *karmaa* done here? Ans: '*Prasamkhyaanam*'.

The *prasamkhyaanaa vaadhi* wants permanent joy to come at the end of meditation. He does not understand that even if joy results from meditation, it cannot be permanent joy.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 92 & Verse 92:

अपि चाह ।

दुःख्यस्मीत्यपि चेद्ध्वस्ता कल्पकोट्युपबृंहिता ।

स्वल्पीत्योऽभ्यासजा स्थाण्वी भावनेत्यत्र का प्रमा ॥ ९२ ॥

Further: If the impression that one is miserable, which is produced by the experiences of countless lives can be removed, what evidence is there for holding that an imagination born of meditation of such a short duration will be everlasting?

Here, Sureswaraacharya is elaborating upon the conclusion of the previous *sloka*. In the previous *sloka*, he had told the *poorva pakshin* “Even if, as you claim, meditation removes sorrow because of the intensification of the repeated *samskaara*, ‘I am *aanandhaa*’, ‘I am *aanandhaa*’, ‘I am *aanandhaa*’, that *dhu:kha nivrutthi* will be only temporary”. That conclusion is further explained here, even though the explanation is not really required. But, the *Aachaaryaa* wants to dwell on it, so that *Vedhaanthic* spirants will receive it fully and properly, since, most aspirants have the mistaken notion that, by meditating, some permanent result will be achieved. That orientation is so powerful, that, Sureswaraacharya does not spare any effort to remove that notion.

The *Aachaaryaa* tells the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhi*: “‘I am a *dhu:khee / samsaari*’ is a thought formed by *bhaavanaa*. From time immemorial, the individual has entertained the notion ‘I am *dhu:khee*’, because of ‘ignorance’. ‘*Anaadhi avidhyaa vaasanayaa*’ / i.e. because of ‘beginning-less’ *avidhyaa samskaara*, he has been entertaining the thought ‘I am a *jeeva:/ a samsaari* and therefore, I am *dhu:khee*’.

“Since this ‘I am *dhu:khee*’ *samskaara* / *vaasanaa* originated from *anaadhi kaalaa* and had been practiced over millions of *janmaa*-s, that *vaasanaa* must be infinitely powerful. Now, you are telling me that the aspirant has to do *prasamkhyanam*, in other words, practice the meditation ‘I am *sukhee*’, which will eliminate this ‘I am *dhu:kee*’ *vaasanaa*. All right. But, for what duration can he practice this meditation in this *janmaa*? Assume that an aspirant practices this meditation without a break, for a number of years and, as you envisage, manages to generate ‘I am *sukhee / aanandhee*’ *samskaara*. You claim that because of this new-born *samskaara*, the old *dhu:khee samskaara* will go away. If the *dhu:khee samskaara*, which has been intensified through millions of *janmaa*-s can be eliminated by ‘meditation’ for only part of a single *janmaa*, how long can this new *samskaara*, which is not even one entire *janmaa* old, remain? ‘I am *dhu:khee*’ *samskaara*, which is so powerful, went away by a few years of *dhyaanam*. If that powerful *samskaara* can go away, how can ‘I am *sukhee*’ *samskaara*, which is much feebler, last long?”

Swamiji comments: “Sureswaraacharya’s question is very valid. Even our students tend to use the *Vedhaantha* classes for only generating some *Vedhaantha samskaara*-s; and rely more upon those *samskaara*-s of the mind than upon the falsification of the mind. That is not going to be of much use. If you use *Vedhaantha* classes only to ‘condition’ the mind, you will feel good in the class; but, afterwards, it will be of no use”.

Sureswaraacharya appeals: “Kindly do not convert my discourses into exercises for generation of *samskaara* or as attempts to improve the mind. Do not look for *videha mukthi* etc. Abolish such thoughts. Neither improvement of the mind nor the *future* removal of the mind is the aim of *Vedhaantha*. Let the mind be falsified here and now; and, may you claim

'I have nothing to do with the blessed mind'. Thereafter, use the mind as a blessing from *Bhagavaan*. As long as it is there, keep it as healthy as possible. Resolve: 'I will never use my mental condition to judge 'my' status'. That is *Vedhaanthaa*. But, unluckily we tend to use *Vedhaanthaa* as an instrument for improving or polishing the mind".

In short, Sureswaraachaaryaa considers *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa* as an abuse or misuse of *mahaa vaakyam*, when it is used to improve the mind, instead of understanding its real message. Therefore he says (vers 92):

ॐ दुःखी अस्मि इति (वासना) - The *vaasanaa* "I am *dhu:kee* / *samsaari*".

The word '*vaasanaa*' had to be supplied; alternately the word '*bhavanaa*' can be used.

ॐ कल्पकोटि उपबृंहिता - has been intensified over millions of *kalpa*-s;

Two thousands *chatur-yugaa*-s make one day of *Brahmaaji*. 365 such days make one year of *Brahmaaji*. One hundred such years is the life-time of *Brahmaaji*, and that one life-time of *Brahmaaji* is called '*kalpaa*'. The *Aachaaryaa* says that the *jeevaa* has lived through such a long period with this thought "I am *dhu:khee*". '*upabrumhithaa*' means 'made powerful'.

ॐ ध्वस्ता चेत् - (if that *vaasanaa*) can get eliminated / destroyed,

ॐ का प्रमा अत्र - what is the assurance here

'*kaa pramaa*' means '*ka: viswaasa:*' / 'what is the assurance'

ॐ स्वल्पीया अभ्यासजा भावाना स्थाण्वी इति - that the attitude '*aham Brahm asmi*' or '*aham sukhee*', generated by *prasamkhyanam* of a much shorter duration is permanent?

Suppose the *bhavanaa* '*aham dhu:kee*' can be eliminated by a new *bhavanaa* '*aham sukhee*'; the *dhu:kee vaasanaa*, which had been in existence for a long duration and is therefore very strong. If that can go away by development of *sukhee vaasanaa*, how can that *sukhee vaasanaa*, developed by meditation for a much shorter duration, remain permanent? That also will go away. Expressed in Sanskrit: '*sukhee vaasanaa anithyaa vaasanathvaath dhu:kee vaasanaavath*'. Replacement of one *vaasanaa* by another *vaasanaa* will not solve the problem. Since every *vaasanaa* is *karma janyaa*, it is perishable. How can one believe that '*aham Brahma asmi*' *vaasanaa* alone will be permanent? That *vaasanaa* also cannot be permanent.

(Swamiji concludes the class with the comments: A student told me "I have developed the *vaasanaa* '*aham Brahma asmi*', by attending your classes, But, as we grow old, there are many problems with our brains, like dementia etc. I am already having the problem of

forgetting many things. Therefore, perhaps after some time, I may forget this '*aham Brahma asmi*' also, because it is only a *vaasanaa*, which I have developed by attending 30 years of your class. But, if with one 'stroke', that *vaasanaa* goes away, will I get *videha mukthi*? *Saasthraa*-s say that '*antha:kaala smaranam*' / 'the thought prevailing at the moment of death' decides the nature of the *punar janmaa*. Lord Krishna also has declared in the *Bhagavadh Githa* '*anthakaale cha maameva smaran mukthvaa kalevaram ya: prayaathi sa: madhbhaavam yaathi*' (Verse 5 – Chapter VIII) – 'Dropping the body, at the time of death, the one who departs remembering Me alone, attains My nature'. But, at the moment of death, I may not remember *Bhagavaan* and I may not remember '*aham Brahma asmi*' also, because, that is a *vaasanaa* developed in the mind only. When I, thus forget both, will I get *videha mukthi*?' You will have hundreds of such questions if you are aiming at *jeevan muthi* / *videha mukthi* etc. But, remember, the concepts of *jeevan mukthi* and *videha mukthi* etc. are all from the standpoint of *ahamkaaraa* only, which you talk about, before you come to *Vedhaanthaa*. After you come to *Vedhaanthaa*, *jeevan mukthi* and *videha mukthi* are only *arthavaadhaa*. We, as *Vedhaanthin*-s, are talking about '*aham Brahma asmi*', which is true **always**, which has nothing to do with the dementia of the *mithyaa* mind or other such problems. Our *mokshaa* has nothing to do with *antha: kaala smaranam*, with the manner we die (in coma) or with the condition of the subconscious mind during that coma. 'I' am *muktha:* always – in the past, in the present and in the future. Your concerns about *jeevan mukthi*, *videha mukthi*, *antha: kaala smaranam* etc., are all because you are stuck with *ahamkaaraa* and refuse to drop *ahamkaaraa*.)

195. Chapter III, Verses 92 (28-08-2010)

The refutation of *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa* is being done by Sureswaraachaaryaa, in these verses. The *prasamkhyana vaadhin*'s basic assumption is: “*Prathyaksha anubhavaa* reveals that I am *dhu:khee*. On the other hand, at the time of *sravanam*, *saasthraa* tells me, that I am *sukhee / sukaahasvaroopa*: | So, as even as I receive this message, I perceive a contradiction between *saasthra pramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam*. In my view, therefore, that *saasthra sravana janya jnaanam*, which contradicts *prathyaksha pramaanam* cannot be ‘liberating knowledge’ and therefore that knowledge is not at all sufficient for ‘liberation’. But, there is a *saadhanaa* for the aspirant to overcome this problem, which is, that, the aspirant has to resort to ‘*mahaa vaakya japaa*’ and that ‘repetition’, in due course, will produce a different type of *jnaanam*, known as *saakshaathkaaraa*, through which *jnaanam*, the aspirant will attain *mokshaa*”. Thus, the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhin*'s contention is, that, knowledge received in *sravanam* is not the ultimate knowledge and that, it has to be improved upon. In contrast, Sureswaraachaaryaa's firm view is that, knowledge received in *sravanam* through proper study, is **the** *jnaanam*, resulting in instantaneous claiming of *mokshaa*. That is what he is establishing now, by various arguments.

In the first stage, the *Aachaaryaa* refuted the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*'s basic assumption of a contradiction between *mahaa vaakya pramaanam* and *anubhava pramaanam*, by pointing out that, since, the subject matters of the two *pramaanam*-s are totally different, *mahaa vaakya* talking about *aathmaa*, and *anubhavaa* dealing **only** with *anaathmaa*, it is illogical to make a comparison between their revelations.

Now, in this verse (*slokaa* 92), Sureswaraachaaryaa argues: “For the purpose of argument, let me temporarily concede that there is a contradiction between *saasthra pramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam*. And, also, that, the *prathyaksha pramaanam* reveals that ‘**I**’ am essentially *dhu:khee* / that, *dhu:khaa* or sorrow is ‘**my**’ essential nature. In that case also, how can that essential nature be ever changed by any amount of *prasamkhyanam*? What is revealed by a *pramaanam* is a ‘fact’ and a ‘fact’ is something that cannot be changed. That being an universally accepted maxim, if *prathyakshaa* reveals that *dhu:kham* is ‘**my**’ essential nature, how can any amount of the mere repetition or *japaa* of the slogan ‘**I** am *aanandha*:; ‘**I** am *aanandha*:’ ever change ‘**my**’ *dhu:kha svaroopaa*?”

He proceeds: “But, let us further suppose / grant that meditation does produce a *samskaaraa*; i.e., because of repeated *vrutthi avrutthi* that ‘**I** am *aanandha*:; ‘**I** am *aanandha*:’, some kind of *aanandha samskaaraa* is generated. Let me call this *samskaaraa* by the term *bhavanaa*. And, also suppose, that this *bhavanaa roopa samskaaraa*, born out of ‘repetition’, is capable of generating an *aanandhaa* experience. Even in that case, that *aanandhaa*

experience, generated by the *chittha samskaara* cannot change my essential nature of *dhu:kham*; at best, the *aanandha samskaara* can only temporarily cover the *dhu:kham* “.

(Swamiji explains this with a mundane example: “This is similar to our trying to forget our family or professional problems by going to an entertaining movie / drama/ dance etc. One can temporarily enjoy the movie / drama / dance and at that time, one’s sorrow is temporarily forgotten / covered”)

To continue with Sureswaraachaaryaa’s argument: “*Prasamkhyaanam may* generate *aanandha samskaara*, which *may* superficially cover the essential *dhu:kham*. But, even if that happens, that cannot be considered as ‘liberation’, nor can it lead to ‘liberation’, because, this *aanandha samskaara* which covers the essential *dhu:kham*, is born in time and that *samskaara*, like *any samskaara*, cannot last long. Every *samskaara* is subject to failing.”

And, then, Sureswaraachaaryaa uses the *kaimudhika nyaayaa* in this *slokaa*. In what manner? He tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*: “That I am *dhu:khee / samsaari* is a *samskaara*, which I have generated over millions of *janmaa*-s. You claim that this ‘I am *dhu:khee*’ *samskaara*, which I have imbibed because of countless *janmaa*-s, can be replaced by a few weeks’ or months’ mediation on another *samskaara*, viz., ‘I am *sukhee*’. Then, how long can this new *samskaara* last? To repeat: Million-*janmaa* old *samskaara* is ‘I am *dhu:khee*’; according to you, by *prasamkhyana* of a very short duration – not even one entire *janmaa* - the *samskaara* ‘I am *sukhee*’ is created, in the place of ‘I am *dhu:khee*’ *samskaara*. A million *janmaa* old *samskaara* itself is replaced by a six month (say) old *samskaara*. Tell me, then, how long can that six month old *samskaara* stay”.

Similar to the nice impressions created by a brief visit to the scenic *Kailash Manasarovar*, which impressions subside after an initial euphoria, all those nice feelings that you get in meditation also cannot last long. Therefore, *prasamkhyana may* produce *aanandha samskaara*; but, that cannot be *moksha*.

Mahaa vaakyam is not meant for creating *samskaara*-s and should never be used for creating any *samskaara* by ‘repetition’, because, when we do so, the ‘repetition’ becomes a *karma* and the resultant *samskaara* will only be a *karmapalan*. If at all *aanandha samskaara* is generated through *aavrutthi*, that will be a *karma palan* and all *karma palaani* are *anithyaa*. This can be expressed as: ‘*Aanandha samskaara anithya: palathvaath, ghataavath*’.

Vedhaanthaa is not meant to create a particular ‘conditioning of the mind’. *Mahaa vaakyam* does not intend to bring about a change in the mind; it wants to tell me that ‘I’ am not the mind. Any modification of the mind will be only temporary. The aspirant should not look to modify the mind to a temporary happy state, through *mahaa vaakya vichaara*. He is to get

the conviction ‘I am the ‘permanent happiness’ itself, not subject to any modification – ‘*poorna aathma aham asmi*’. It is this knowledge, which the *mahaa vaakyam* wants to give to the aspirant. But, even after this knowledge, the mind may have happiness ‘arriving and departing’. The *aanandha maya kosaa* will have arriving-departing happiness even after *jnaanam*. The mind may fluctuate; even if there is no sorrow, happiness of varying grades may be there in the mind. That is because, *aanandha maya kosaa* happiness is based on *priya-modha-pramoda-vrutthi* and nobody can have **permanent** *priya-modha- pramodha-vrutthi*. *Vedhaantha* wants to say that, that *priya-modha-pramoda-vrutthi* happiness is only a reflection, which will come and go in the mirror called mind. But, who am ‘I’? ‘I’ am the source of that *aanandhaa*. And, even when the reflected happiness goes away, ‘I’ continue to be the original *aanandhaa*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa contends, that, without taking all these into account, the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhin* wants to ‘meditate’ and condition the mind. The *prasamkhyanaa vaadhin* wants to create an *aanandha samskaaraa* in the mind. *Aanandha samskaaraa* may get created; but it will not be long lasting. On receipt of the first and least unpleasant news, mind can get disturbed, causing the *aanandha samskaaraa* to disappear. That will be the situation at the *anaathmaa* level.

This is the essence of the *slokaa* (verse 92), which was completed in the earlier session, which *slokaa*, the *Aachaaryaa* concluded with the question, “*svalpeeyobhyaasajaa bhavaanaa sthaasnvee (syaath) athra kaa pramaa?*”

The term ‘*svalpeeya abhyaasa jaa bhaavanaa*’ refers to ‘the *samskaara roopa aanandhaa*, which is born out of repetition / *aavrutthi* of a limited duration’. ‘*abhyaasaa*’ means ‘*aavrutthi*’; ‘*svalpeeya*’ indicates ‘a limited duration’; ‘*Svalpeeyaan*’ is the comparative degree of ‘*svalpaa*’, which means ‘short’. ‘*svalpeeyaan*’ means ‘shorter’. ‘*Svalpeeyaan*’ is adjective to ‘*abhyaasa:*’ | ‘*svalpeeyaan abhyaasa:*’ becomes ‘*svalpeeyobhyaasa:*’ | ‘*jaa*’ means ‘born out of’. ‘*svalpeeyobhyaasajaa*’ is adjective to ‘*bhaavanaa*’. It is a compound word and means ‘born out of *aavrutthi* done for a limited duration’. ‘*sthaasnvee*’ means ‘*nithyaa*’ or ‘permanent’. ‘*pramaa*’ means ‘belief’.

The *Aachaaryaa*’s question is: “How can you believe that a *samskaaraa*, born out of a short meditation, will be permanent?”

That is the reason, why we, the *Advaita Vedhaanthin-s*, do not attach any value to the *aanandhaa* experience in *samaadhi* also, because even that *samaadhi aanandhaa* is only *kosa aanandhaa* and not *aathma aanandhaa*. The very fact that it is experienced only during the *samaadhi*, neither before nor after, proves that, that *aanandhaa* is nothing but *aanandha maya kosa aanandhaa*, born out of *priya vrutthi* or *modha vrutthi* or *pramodha vrutthi*. There

is no difference between that *aanandhaa* and any other sense pleasure. Sense pleasure is *kosa aanandhaa*; and, *samaadhi sukham* is also *kosa aanandhaa*. In fact, we can get an *aanandhaa*, similar to *samaadhi aanandhaa*, without even going to *samaadhi*, and also much more easily, in *sushupthi*. *Kosa aanandhaa* is always *anithya*: | Therefore, the conclusion: “*Samaadhi aanandha: anithya: samaadhi janyathvaath*”.

An important message of *Vedhaantha*: “Understand that original *aanandhaa*, behind all experiential *aanandhaa*. Do not attach value to experiential *aanandhaa*. It is the understanding ‘*aanandha svaroopam: aham asmi*’, which is valuable.”

Without realizing all these, the *prasamkhyana vaadhin* is looking for ‘experiential pleasure’. Of course, seeking *dhaarmic* experiential pleasure is not frowned upon, by *Vedhaantha*. Even a *jnaani* enjoys wonderful music. He is not to be faulted. What is wrong or absurd, is, looking for ‘*permanence*’ in experiential pleasure, since such ‘*permanent* experiential pleasure’ simply does not exist. The term ‘permanent experiential pleasure’ is an oxymoron. Any experience has a beginning and therefore, an end also. To use a modern parlance, whatever has got a ‘manufacturing date’ has an ‘expiry date’ also. Therefore, any exercise for ‘permanent experiential pleasure’ will be only futile.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 93:

ननु शास्त्रात्स्थास्नुत्वं भविष्यति । नैवम् । यथावस्थित
वस्तुयाथात्म्यावबोधमात्रकारित्वाच्छास्त्रस्य । न हि पदार्थशक्त्याधानकृच्छास्त्रम्
प्रसिद्धं च लोके

It may be said “The scripture says that it will be everlasting”. We deny this. The scripture can only produce understanding of reality as such. It cannot confer new powers on anything. The point is so familiar to common sense:

The *poorva pakshin* raises an objection. He argues: “You say that the *samskaara* born out of meditation is *anithyam*, since it is born out of ‘repetition’, which is a *karma*. I agree that there is a general rule, viz., ‘*karma palam anithyam*’. But, that is only a general rule. What you say is based only on this general rule. But, any general rule has exceptions also. You yourself accept *uthsargaa* and *apavaadhaa*. If *saasthra pramaanam* specifies certain things, even if contradictory to such general rules, then, based on *saasthram*, we have to accept those things. And, I can show you, that *prasamkhyaanam* is prescribed by the *saasthra*. Sage *Yaagnyavalkya* declares in the *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad* (I.iv.5) ‘*aathmaa vaa are dhrashtavya: srothavya: manthavya: nidhidhyaasithavya:*’ – ‘The Self should be realized – should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon’. The injunction ‘*nidhidhyaasithavya:*’ is *pramaanam* for *prasamkhyaanam*. *Manthra* IV.iv.21 of *Brahadhaaranyaka Upanishad*

(*Saareeraka Brahamanam*) is another *pramaanam*. The first half of the *manthraa* runs: 'thameva dheero vignyaaya **pragnyaam kurveetha braahmana:**' – 'The intelligent aspirant after *Brahman*, to attain knowledge (of the Self), should **meditate upon the Self**'. In this *manthraa*, the term '*pragnyaam kurveetha*' means '*prasamkhyaanam kurveetha*'".

The *poorva pakshin* holds "Since *saasthraa* is the *pramaanam*, the *samskaara palan*, the *aanandhaa* attained, though experiential, will be permanent also".

In the *poorva pakshin*'s view, the *aanandhaa* will be permanent, because of the *saasthra vaakyam*. He continues: "And, in further support of my view, I can say that *saasthraa* talks about varieties of *upaasanaa* - *Hiranyagarbha Upaasanaa*, *Viraat Upaasanaa*, *Isvara Upaasanaa* etc. *Upaasanaa*-s are talked about, in *Upanishad*-s and also in other scriptures. *Katopanishad* talks about *Viraat Upaasanaa*. Lord Krishna talks of *Isvara Upaasanaa* and its *palan* in the 8th chapter (verses 24 & 26) of the *Bhagavadh Githa*. Verse 26 runs: '*suklakraishne gathi hyethe jagatha: saasvathe mathe ekayaa yaathi anaavrutthim anyayaa aavarthathe puna:*' – 'Two paths of the world, known as the bright path and the dark path, are indeed considered to be eternal. **By the former, one (the *upaasakaa*) attains the world of non-return**; by the latter, one (the *karmi*) comes back again'. The Lord, thus, has declared in this verse: '*Isvara Upaasakaa*, after death, will not get back to this earth. He will attain *mokshaa*'. *Upaasanaa* is meditation *karmaa*. Thus, *Saasthraa* itself says that as a result of *upaasanaa*, the *upaasakaa* will go to *Brahma lokaa* and he will get *mokshaa*, which is permanent. That shows, that *upaasanaa*, which is a *karmaa*, is capable of giving *mokshaa*, by taking the *upasakaa*, through *sukla gathi*. *Upaasanaa* is *karmaa* and *moksha palan* is promised. *Upaasanaa* is a type of *dhyaanam* only. Therefore, there is *pramaanam* in the *Bhagavadh Githaa* (because of this verse 26 of chapter VIII), that, *dhyaanam* gives *nithya mokshaa*'".

The *poorva pakshin* further says: "In *Katopanishad* also, it is said (II.iii.16) '*satham cha ekaa cha hrudayasya naadya: thaasaam moordhaanam abhinissruthaa ekaa thayaa oordhvam aayan amruthathvam ethi*'| This *manthraa* refers to the *Upaasakaa*, who goes to *Brahmalokaa*, through *sushumnaa naadi*, acquires knowledge there and gets *krama-mukthi*. '*Amurthathvam*' means 'permanent *mokshaa*'. This *manthraa* also says that the *Upaasakaa* gets *mokshaa*. All these *saasthric pramaanam*-s show that, *upaasakaa*, through *upaasanam* (which is *dhyaanam*), gets *nithya mokshaa*. My *prasamkhyaanam* also falls in the same category. *Prasamkhyaanam* is also *dhyaanam*; *upaasanam* is also *dhyaanam*. If *upaasana dhyaanam* can give *nithya mokshaa*, why cannot *prasamkhyaanam dhyaanam* give *nithya mokshaa*? It can also certainly give".

The *prasamkhyaanam vaadhi* implies all these, in just four words (in this *sambhandagadyam*):

ॐ ननु- But,

ॐ शास्त्रात् - saasthra pramaanaath / because of the power of saasthrapramaanam,

ॐ स्थास्नुत्वं भविष्यति - (dhyaana palan) will be permanent.

The subject '*dhyaana palan*' has to be supplied. '*Sthaasnuthvam*' means '*nithyathvam*'. '*Sthirathvam*' is another word with the same meaning, viz., 'permanence'. '*Nithyathvam*' and '*sthirathvam*' are simpler words for 'permanence'; but, the *Aachaaryaa* prefers to use the more complicated word, '*sthaasnuthvam*'.

The *prasamkhyana vaadhin*'s claim: "*Prasamkhyana dhyaana palan nithyam saasthra ukthathvaath*" |

Up to this (in this *sambhandha gadhyam*) is the *poorva pakshaa*. It is followed by Sureswaraachaaryaa's reply, who says:

ॐ न एवम् - No, it cannot be accepted.

Why not? Because:

ॐ शास्त्रस्य अवबोधमात्रकारित्वात्- Since the function / capacity of saasthra-s is limited only to the revelation of

ॐ यथावस्थित वस्तु याथात्म्य- the nature of the objects as they are.

These are all very, very important technical points. *Saasthram* is, what is termed '*bodhakam*', and is not what is termed, '*kaarakam*'.

To explain: *Saasthram* is a *pramaanam*. A *pramaanam* can reveal only the nature of a thing; *pramaanam* can never change the nature of a thing. In Sanskrit, the 'revealing function' is called '*bodhakathvam*'; the 'changing function' is an action and is, therefore, called '*kaarakathvam*'; whatever does the 'revealing function' is called '*bodhakam*' and whatever does the 'changing function' is called '*kaarakam*'. A '*bodhakam*' cannot be '*kaarakam*' and a '*kaarakam*' cannot be '*bodhakam*'; that is why, it is said that '*jnaanam*' and '*karmaa*' are different, '*jnaanam*' being '*bodhaka janyam*' and '*karmaa*' being '*kaaraka janyam*'. '*Kaarakam*' and '*bodhakam*' can never be identical.

Swamiji elaborates further, with an example. He says: "Suppose I enter a dark room with a torch light in my hand. There are a few objects in the room - a couple of chairs, a table, some books etc. When I direct the light on the various objects, what will the light do? The light will reveal the objects, as they are. Suppose I find that one chair is clean, while the other chair is dirty. The light has revealed the clean chair as a clean chair and the dirty chair as a dirty chair. Suppose I go on throwing the light on the dirty chair; somebody asks me why I do that; I

answer that I want to make that dirty chair clean, by 'lighting' it. The questioner is amused by my answer, just as you are, because it is common sense that, while the light can be depended upon to reveal the nature of the objects as they are, if I desire to convert the dirty chair into a clean one, the light will not do that function. I have to use my hand to do the 'cleaning'. The light, which is a *prakaasakam* or *bodhakam* has to be replaced by a *kaarakam*, the hand. The use of the *jnaanendriyam*, my eyes, should be followed by the use of a *karmendriyam*, my hands. The job of a *karmendriyam* cannot be done by a *jnaanendriyam*; the converse also is true. The job of a *jnaanendriyam* cannot be done by a *karmendriyam*".

Sureswaraachaaryaa, therefore, tells the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*: "Saasthram is a *pramaanam* / a *bodhakam*; therefore, while it can reveal the nature of a thing as it is, it cannot change the nature of the thing. Saasthram cannot change *anithyam* into *nithyam*, by merely saying that it is *nithyam*. *Anithyam* will continue to be *anithyam*. *Upaasana palam* / *dhyaana palam* will be *anithyam*, because the *dhyaanam* you are talking about, the *aavrutthi*, is a *karmaa*. Any *karmapalam* will be *anithyam*. Saasthram cannot convert the *anithyam* nature of the *dhyaana karma palam*, because, *saasthram* is only a 'light', which reveals things as they are".

The *Aachaaryaa*'s logic is: "Scriptures can only produce understanding of reality as such. They cannot confer new powers on anything. So, your claim, viz., 'because of the power of scriptures, the '*dhyaana palam*' will be permanent' is unacceptable".

This may give rise to a question from the *poorva pakshin*: "In that case, what about the *mukthi*, attained by *upaasanaa*, which *is* mentioned in the *saasthraa*-s? I have already quoted verses from the 8th chapter of the *Bhagavadh Githa*, in which it has been stated that *Isvara Upaasanaa* will lead to *mokshaa*. I also quoted the *manthraa* from *Katopanishad*, which says '(upaasakaa) amruthathvam yethi'. *Saasthraa*-s do say that *Upaasanaa* gives *moksha palam*. You are also accepting the concept of '*mokshaa* through *upaasana*' and, you have given a special name also for it. You call '*mokshaa* through *upaasanaa*', by the name '*krama mukthi*'. Then, how can you refuse to accept '*nithya mokshaa* through *upaasanaa*'?"

The *Vedhaanthin*'s reply to this possible question will be as follows: "We have never said and we will never say, that, *upaasanaa* gives *mokshaa*. It never can. We have only said that *upaasanaa* will lead the *upaasakaa* to *Brahma lokaa*, which *lokaa* is also only *anithyam*. *Upaasanaa* cannot and will not convert the *anithya Brahma lokaa* into *nithya Brahma lokaa*. In fact, even *Brahmaaji*'s *chathurmukha sareeram* cannot be permanent. When we say '*upaasanaa* gives *mokshaa*', what we mean is 'the *upaasakaa* goes to *Brahma lokaa*; and, having missed *mahaa vaakya vichaaraa* in this world, will have the opportunity of the *vichaaraa* in *Brahma lokaa*, under the very guidance of *Brahmaaji*, because of the *upaasakaa*'s *upaasanaa palan*'.

“Through the *vichaaraa*, he will acquire *jnaanam* and, as a result, *mokshaa*. But, even in *Brahma lokaa*, he will attain *mokshaa*, **not** as a result of his *upaasanaa*; but, **only** as the result of *mahaa vaakyaa sravanam*. In *Brahma lokaa* also, it is the *mahaa vaakyaa sravanam* which produces *jnaanam*, because *mahaa vaakyam* is a *pramaanam* and that *jnaanam* gives him ‘liberation’, by the understanding that *aanandhaa* is ‘my’ *svaroopam*. This is what we mean by saying ‘*upaasanaa* gives *krama mukthi*’ | In *Brahma lokaa* also, *mokshaa* is attained through *Vedhaantha sravanam* only and not through *prasamkhyaanam*.

“Of course, when the *Vedhantha sravanam* is done in *Brahma lokaa*, there is one advantage. The aspirant's *sookshma sareeram* or mind is extraordinarily pure, because of the earlier *upaasanaa* done by him; and, because of that purity, he has got, what is referred to, a ‘mind like camphor’.

“As is commonly known, human minds are compared to three objects, based on the alertness of the minds (i) camphor (ii) coal and (iii) the stem of the banana plant. Camphor catches fire instantaneously; a piece of coal can be ignited with some effort; but, the stem of a banana plant will not only never catch fire, but, can put out a flame also. In a similar manner, a mind like camphor will receive the ‘knowledge’ instantaneously. A student with a mind like coal will learn with some effort. And, there are some students, who, like the stem of a banana plant, can make the *guru*'s *jnaanam* also dull.

“The *upaasakaa*, who goes to *Brahma lokaa*, would have acquired an alert mind comparable to camphor, because of his earlier diligent *upaasanaa*; therefore, the *guru*, *Brahmaaji*, does not have to repeat his teaching; he says ‘*thath thvam asi*’; the alert student walks away with the conviction ‘*aham Brahma asmi*’ ”

The essence is that *dhyaanam* does not / cannot produce *jnaanam* or *mokshaa*, because *dhyaanam* is a *karmaa*. A *pramaanam* alone can generate knowledge. But, a *pramaanam* also has its limitation; it can only generate knowledge; it cannot change the nature or attribute of anything. So, Sureswaraacharya says “*saasthrasya avabodha maathrakaarithvaath*” meaning “because *saasthram* can only generate knowledge”. ‘*avabodham*’ is the same as ‘*bodham*’ and means ‘knowledge’. ‘Knowledge’ of what? The *Aacharya* says “*yathaa avasthitha vasthu yaathaathmyam*” - “the nature of an object as it is”. ‘*Yaathaathmyam*’ means ‘nature’ or ‘*svaroopam*’; ‘*vasthu*’ means ‘object’ or ‘thing’; ‘*yathaa avasthitha*’ means ‘as it is’. *Saasthraa* can only generate knowledge of the nature of a thing as it is; *saasthraa* cannot convert the *anithya anaathmaa* into *nithya anaathmaa*; *saasthraa* cannot convert *anithya kosa aanandhaa* into *nithya kosa aanadhaa*. Experiential pleasure can never be *nithyam*, because experiential pleasure is *vrutthi vikhaaraa* - dependent on the changes in the mind. The nature of the mind is to change; and, a changing mind cannot have permanent experiential pleasure.

(At this stage, Swamiji ventures into an interesting line of thinking, not particularly relevant here, nor totally irrelevant. He says: "If you enquire further, suppose the mind is in permanent experiential pleasure, there will be problems also, at *vyaavahaarika* level. Imagine that your mind is stuck in a permanent *aanandhaa* mode. Someone comes to you with bad news about himself, that he has been bereaved or that he has lost huge amounts of money in a transaction. You laugh aloud and uncontrollably, because of the permanent *aanandhaa* of your mind. Is that a welcome or wholesome reaction, conducive to healthy transactions?

"From that perspective, we should be thankful that *Bhagavaan* has blessed us with minds which are capable of different emotions, all the *nava rasaa*-s.

"The mind must be flexible and capable of varieties of emotions for both *vyaavahaarika* transactions and spiritual exercises. If mind also is changeless like *Brahman*, that changeless mind can never know "I am *Brahman*". Changeless mind can never know "I am *Brahman*" because 'knowing' is a process, which requires *vrutthi vikhaara*. Therefore, if your mind is not always happy, it is a blessing, because, it proves that your mind is not 'stuck', but, is flexible.

"Swami Dayanandhaa, while once on this topic, established it with an example. He pointed out, then, when a *Bharatha Naatyam* artist is dancing and you are watching the dance concert, if your mind gets stuck in one particular movement of the dancer, you will not enjoy the rest of the concert. *Bhagavaan*, in His infinite wisdom and compassion, has bestowed on the human minds a constantly changing and moving nature. And, that is not something to complain about; on the other hand, it is something to be counted on as a blessing. Because of that 'changing' nature alone, varieties of perception are possible; empathy is possible; when somebody is unhappy, my mind can understand that unhappiness, by having the corresponding change and can empathize with the unhappy individual.

"Mind is capable of experiencing the nine *rasam*-s. And, it is wonderful. Mind is and should be *savikaaram*. Let us understand mind as it is and accept it as it is. When you come across a person mourning the death of a near and dear one, your mind should feel the bereavement of the person and empathize with him. At that moment of mourning, the attitude '*nandhathi nandhathi eva*' is not human. All *rasaa*-s, including the *rasaa* of sorrow, make life a fantastic drama. Go through all emotions. *Vedhaantha* only warns 'do not get stuck in any particular emotion'. Therefore, let the mind have *navarasam*. Understand 'I am *aanandha svaroopaa*;', *as aathmaa*; but, the mind cannot be *aanandhasvaroopaa*: / ever happy | *Saasthram* reveals the 'changing mind' as 'changing mind'; and, it reveals *aanandha aathmaa* as it is. You cannot convert one into another")

Sureswaraachaaryaa explains this further:

ॐ हि प्रसिद्धम् च लोके - Indeed it is a well known fact (that)

ॐ शास्त्रम् पदार्थ शक्ति आधानकृत् न (भवति) - Saasthra pramaanam cannot add a new attribute to an object.

'Aadhaanam' means 'addition'; 'sakthi' means 'a new attribute'. 'padhaartham' means 'object'. In a minor modification of the example (of the dark room and its contents) cited earlier, if the chair has got a red colour, by merely lighting up the chair continuously or looking at it continuously, the colour of the chair cannot be changed. Similarly, *pramaanam* cannot change the *anithyaa* attribute of *karmapalan* and replace it with *nithyaa* attribute. Therefore, the *poorva pakshin's* argument '*saasthra uktham*' will not hold water. *Saasthram* cannot '**do**' anything. It can only '**reveal**'. It cannot change the attribute of any object.

If a *pramaanam* can change a fact, if and when a student who has appeared for an examination, is found to have failed, that 'failure' can be changed into 'success', by merely changing the *pramaanam*. Instead of 'looking at' the printed results on a news board, using the *chakshurindriyam*, a telephone i.e. the *srothriya indiram*, can be used to change the result. But, is the very suggestion not absurd?

Therefore, what is the conclusion here? Ans: "Meditation cannot give liberation, if you are not already liberated". Then, a rather amusing question may arise: "If you are already liberated, can meditation give you liberation?" The answer is obvious, viz., "if you are already liberated, meditation is not required for liberation". But, this may give rise to yet another question to the *Advaita Vedhaanthin*: "Then, why are you prescribing *nidhidhyaasanam*?" The *Advaita Vedhaanthin's* answer will be: "*Nidhidhyaasanam* is meant for assimilating this fact, that meditation is not required for liberation, because 'I' am already free".

Chapter III: Verse 93 –

भावनाजं फलं यत्स्याध्यच्च स्यात्कर्मणः फलम् ।

न तत्स्थास्त्वि इति मन्तव्यं द्रविडेष्विव सङ्गतम् ॥ ९३ ॥

It should never be thought that the result of imagination and that of action will be lasting. It is like friendship with the Dravidians.

This is only re-statement of what has already been said.

ॐ यत् स्यात् भावना अजं फलं - "That *aanandha samskaaraa* born out of *prasamkhyana abhyaasaa*,

'palam' means 'result', and, in this context, refers to the 'aanandha samskaara';
'bhavanaa ajam' means 'born out of *prasamkhyaanam* / *aavrutthi*' |

ॐ यत् च कर्मणः फलं स्यात् - or whatever results from any other action,

'Action' includes all the three types of *karmaa*, viz., *kaayika karmaa*, *vaachika karmaa* and *maanasa karmaa*. Therefore, '*karmaana: palam*' indicates 'whether it is *kaayika karma palam* or *vaachika karma palam* or *maanasa karma palam*'. '*Prasamkhyaanam*' is *maanasa karmaa*. *Dhyaanam* is *maanasa karmaa*. *Upaasanaa* is *maanasa karmaa*.

ॐ तत् न स्थास्त्वि - that samskaaraa will not be permanent'

ॐ इति मन्तव्यं - Thus may you note.

What the *Aachaaryaa* wants to point out, is as follows: "If *aanandhaa* is born out of meditation, if you miss meditation even for a day, naturally, the *aanandhaa* will come down, both qualitatively and quantitatively. If and when you continue to fail to meditate, *pramodhaa* will come down to *modhaa*, then to *priyaa* and then to dullness. Since you are, thus, enjoying the happiness only as a temporary benefit of meditation, the *aanandha samskaaraa* cannot be considered permanent or *nithyam*. On the other hand, *Vedhaantha* declares: "I **am ever** *aanandha*:', whether it is reflected in the mind or not'.

But, it should also be remembered, that *Vedhaantha* never says that you should not go for reflected *aanandhaa* / *kosa aanandhaa*. Even after *aathma aanandhaa*, there is nothing wrong in enjoying *dhaarmic kosa aanandhaa* or working for it. What *Vedhaantha* warns is, that, that joy will be only temporary. For this fact, Sureswaraachaaryaa gives a peculiar example:

ॐ द्रविडेष्विव सङ्गतम् - It is similar to the relationship with the South Indians.

196. Chapter III, Verses 93 (04-09-2010)

Sureswaraachaarya is in the process of refuting the *prasamkhyanaa vaadhaa*. He started his refutation, by questioning the very foundation of *prasamkhyana vaadhaa*.

That foundation, the *prasamkhyana vaadhin's* basic objection, is: "The knowledge generated by *mahaa vaakya sravanam* and our own *prathyaksha anubhavaa* are contradictory. *Prathyaksha anubhavaa* reveals that I am *dhu:khee*; *sravana janya jnaanam* tells me, that I am *nirdhu:khee*. In other words, *saasthra pramaanaa* reveals 'nirdhu:kithvam' as 'my' nature and *prathyaksha anubhavaa* reveals 'dhu:kithvam' as 'my' nature. Because of this contradiction, *saasthra janya jnaanam* becomes feeble. It is like rowing a boat in a river, against the flow of the river; however much effort is put in, the boat will be slowed down, because of the counter flow of the river. Similarly, *saasthra janya jnaanam* gets weakened because of the counter *jnaanam*, generated by *prathyaksha anubhavaa*; therefore, this *sravana janya jnaanam*, weakened by the *prathyaksha anubhava virodhaa*, is not sufficient to 'liberate'. And, therefore, reinforcement of that knowledge becomes a must. The only method of reinforcing that *jnaanam* is *prasamkhyaanam / vrutthi aavrutthi*." This is the contention of the *prasamkhyana vaadhi*.

Sureswaraachaaryaa first attacked this 'foundation' itself, by saying: "*Virodhaa / contradiction between prathyaksha anubhavaa and saasthra sravanam is not at all possible, because prathyaksha anubhavaa deals with anaathmaa, while saasthra deals with aathmaa. How can knowledge on aathmaa be made feeble, by knowledge on anaathmaa? How can the two types of knowledge, on two different subjects, counter each other? In fact, saasthra janya jnaanam about aathmaa, cannot be weakened by any pramaanam in the world, since no pramaanam other than saasthraa, has access to aathmaa. Since, thus, the saasthra jnaanam cannot be countered and contradicted, it is the most powerful knowledge and therefore more than enough for liberation. So, your prasamkhyana vaadhaa is totally inappropriate*".

The *Aachaaryaa* gives further arguments to totally defeat the *vaadhaa*.

The next argument he gave was an *abhyupedhya vaadhaa*: "All right. Let us suppose there is a contradiction and let us suppose *prathyaksha pramaanam* reveals that 'I am *dhu:khee* | In that case, i.e., when *prathyaksha pramaanam* has revealed that 'I am *dhu:khee*, the *dhu:kithvam* becomes a '*pramaana siddham*', which means, 'a fact, revealed by a valid source of knowledge'. It is an universally accepted maxim, that, a *pramaana siddham* is '*abhaadhyam*', i.e. 'one which cannot be set aside or annihilated'. According to you, 'my' *dhu:kithvam* is *pramaana siddham*. It is, therefore, *abhadhyam*. It follows, therefore, that, that *pramaana siddha dhu:kithvam* cannot be removed by any force, including any amount of your *prasamkhyaanam*. The saying goes: '*karpoora dhoolee rahitha aalawaala*:"

kasthoorikaa kunkuma liptha deha: svarna kumbhai: parisishyamaana: nijam gunam munchathi no palaandu:' - 'the onion does not give up its *svaabhaavika* smell, even if stored for a long time amidst fragrant smelling camphor, *kasthoori* etc. or drenched with fragrant waters using golden pots. Similarly, *prasamkhyaanam* cannot remove 'my' *dhu:kithvam*, which, according to you, is *prathyaksha anubhava siddham*'. This was his second argument.

Then, the third argument Sureswaraachaaryaa gave was: "All right. Let us make one more concession, that *prasamkhyaanam* removes the *dhu:kithvam* and brings in *aanandhaa*, because of constant meditation, repeatedly telling myself 'I am *aanandha svaroopaa:*'. In other words, let us assume, that, you generate an *aanandha samskaaraa* in the mind, through *prasamkhyaanam* and that *aanandha samskaaraa* suppresses the *svaabhaavika dhu:khithvam*. Even in that case, the problem will not be solved, because the *aanandha samskaaraa* has been generated by *prasamkhyaanam karma*, therefore, becomes a *karma palan* and therefore, *anithyam*. *Aanandha: anithya: palaroopasamskaaratthvaath, ghatavath*".

This is what the *Aachaaryaa* expressed in verse no. 93 by saying "*bhavanaajam palam yath syatth yathsyaath karmana: palam na thath sthaasnu*" - "The result of *prasamkhyaanam* or the result of any *karma*, will not be long lasting". The aspirant will get some temporary *aanandhaa* during meditation; but, may lose that *aanandhaa* immediately after coming out of meditation. So, he will switch from 'meditation' to 'irritation' and from 'irritation' to 'meditation'. No diligent aspirant will settle for this 'impermanent' *aanandhaa*. Sureswaraachaaryaa gave an example for this impermanence, at the end of the verse no. 93, as 'similar to relationship with South Indians'- '*dravideshu sangatham iva*'. This is his opinion about South Indians; but, the basis for his opinion is not clear.

Sambhandha gadhyam to Verse 94:

यध्यपि प्रत्यक्षादिप्रमाणोपात्तमात्मनो दुःखित्वम् । तथापि
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्योत्थप्रत्यय एव बलीयानिति
निश्चयोऽव्यभिचारिप्रामाण्यवाक्योपात्तत्वात्प्रमेयस्य च स्वत एव निर्दुःखित्वसिद्धेः ।
प्रत्यक्षादेस्तु व्यभिचारित्वात्संभावनायाश्च पुरुष परिकल्पना मात्रावष्टम्भत्वाच्चेति ।

Even if the experience of misery on the part of the Self were to be established by perception etc., still the understanding produced by texts like 'That Thou art' is greater in force. This certainty of its greater force is based on the fact that the text has validity that is beyond contradiction and the subject-matter of the text, namely, the Self, is intrinsically free from misery. But, sources of knowledge like perception are known to go wrong sometimes and misery is conjured up by mere human imagination.

Sureswaraacharyaa comes to another perspective, in continuation of the 'suppositional argument' / 'abhyupedhya vaadhaa'. Sureswaraachaaryaa had said: "Let us assume that *prathyaksha pramaanam* is revealing the *dhu:kithvam* of *aathmaa*. Of course, we had basically objected to the idea, by establishing that when *prathyaksha pramaanam* cannot reveal *aathmaa* itself, there is no possibility of its revealing the nature of that *aathmaa*, *dhu:kithvam* or otherwise. *Kenopanishad* (I.3) declares: '*na thathra chakshurgacchathi na vaaggacchathi no mana:*' – 'The eyes do not objectify that *Brahman*; the organ of speech does not objectify that *Brahman*; the mind also does not'. Every *Upanishad* says that *prathyaksham* does not have access to *aathmaa*. But, for argument's sake, let us assume that *prathyakshaa* had access to *aathmaa*. This is supposition no. 1. As a second supposition, let us further assume that *prathyakshaa* is revealing not only the *aathmaa*, but, it is revealing the *dhu:kithvam* of the *aathmaa* also".

Now, *prathyaksha pramaanam* has revealed *aathma dhu:kithvam*. *Saasthra pramaanam* reveals *aathma nirdhu:khithvam*. Thus, there are two views, revealed by two different *pramaanaa*-s. But, both are *pramaana siddham*. Naturally, there will be a question 'which one of the contradictory revelations, do you accept?'

A mundane example is news carried by current newspapers. Very often, we find one newspaper reporting an event in a particular manner and another newspaper reporting on the same event, in a totally contradictory manner. People, based on earlier experiences, generally consider one newspaper as the more reliable of the two. When, therefore, thus, two contradictory reports are presented, they take the news that had appeared in the more respectable newspaper, as reliable and valid.

Thus, even in *loukikaa* affairs, we come across *pramaanam*-s (sources of knowledge), differing in the quality of their reliability; the example also shows, that, between two contradicting *pramaanam*-s, to arrive at the right understanding, we are constrained to exercise our judgment to decide which one of the two *pramaanam*-s is more reliable. To use an equivalent *Sanskrit* term, we have to see which one of the *pramaanam*-s is '*baleeyaan*' or '*prabhala*'.

In a similar manner, in this case of perceived contradiction between *saasthra paramaanam* and *prathyaksha pramaanam* also, '*pramaana dhvayayo: madhye prabhala dhurbhala vichaaraa*' has to be done, as to whether *prathyakshaa* is *prabhalam* or *saasthraa* is *prabhalam*. Naturally, Sureswaraachaaryaa being a *vaidhikaa*, his view is: "*prathyakshaa* is *dhu:rbalam*; *saasthram*(*sruthi*) alone is *prabhalam*. '*Nirdhushta apourusheya saasthra pramaanam*' is stronger (*baleeyaan*) than '*sadhushta pourusheya prathyaksha pramaanam*'. And, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*, the *Aachaaryaa* details how or why it is so.

What he says, in essence, amounts to the following: “*Prathyaksha pramaanam* has several limitations. It can function only in a particular given range. Whether it is sound or form or colour or smell, beyond a certain range, the corresponding sense organ cannot function. All the sense organs have intrinsic limitations of their own. Their ranges are limited. This is the first point. The second point is, that, externally also, many conditions have to be conducive for their effective functioning. If those conditions are not fulfilled, the sense organs cannot be valid. It is common experience that many optical illusions are generated due to external factors. For instance, the colourless ocean waters appear blue from distances. Stars much bigger than the sun of our galaxy, appear small, the misconception again caused by distance. The third point is that there may be defects in the sense organs themselves; such as cataract in the eyes etc. Defective eyes sometimes result in your seeing things that are not there and not seeing things that are there. Sometimes things are seen doubled. Thus (i) sense organs are intrinsically limited (ii) they are only conditionally valid and (iii) they may have some defects. The problems are not limited to these three factors. Quite often, because of one's state of mind also, one's perception gets influenced. To a virtuous person, another person with similar good character appears more handsome than a person with bad character. In such cases, character conditions the concept of beauty and appearance. Summing up: *prathyaksha pramaanaa* is not ‘definitely’ valid; it is only ‘conditionally’ valid, while, on the other hand, *saasthra pramaana* is *nirdhushtam* and *apourusheyam* also”.

It is possible to use this line of argument for the *prasamkhyana vaadhin*, because the *prasamkhyana vaadhin* also accepts *veda* as *nirdhushta apourusheya pramaanam*. Obviously, we cannot convince a *naasthikaa* (one who does not accept the *Vedaa-s*) or even a modern scientist with this argument.

“Therefore” Sureswaraacharya argues “when *prathyakshaa* reveals something and *saasthraa* reveals something contradictory to what *prathyakshaa* reveals, we should go only by *saasthram*, which is unconditionally valid, rather than by *prathyakshaa* which is only conditionally valid”.

That is said here, in this *sambhandha gadhyam*:

ॐ यध्यपि- Even assuming that

ॐ आत्मनः दुःकित्त्वम् - the sorrowfulness of aathmaa

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादि प्रमाण उपात्तं- is grasped through sensory perception,

By the use of ‘*yadhyapi*’, ‘*abhyupedhya vaadhaa*’ is indicated. ‘*upaaththam*’ means ‘grasped’; the actual word is ‘*upaadhaththam*’ which becomes ‘*upaaththam*’, because of a grammar rule.

Swami Paramarthananda's Lectures on Naishkarmya Siddhi

The *Aachaaryaa* says “Let us assume”. Why assume? Ans: “Because, *prathyakshaa* can never grasp *aathmaa*”| But, as mentioned already, for the sake of argument, he assumes that *prathyakshaa* grasps *aathmaa* and reveals its nature as ‘*dhu:khee*’.

ॐ तथापि - even then,

ॐ तत्त्वमस्यादि वाक्योत्थ प्रत्ययः एव बलीयान् - only the understanding produced by texts like ‘That Thou art’, is stronger.

‘*prathyaya:*’ means *jnaanam* / understanding. What is that *jnaanam* / understanding? Ans: “*Nirdhu:kithva jnaanam* / that ‘I’ am not sorrowful / that ‘I’ am *aanandha svaroopo:*”|

What is this understanding generated by? The *Aachaaryaa* says: ‘*thaththvamasyaadhi vaakyaa uttham*’ - ‘generated by the *sruthi mahaa vaakyaani* such as ‘*thath thvam asi*’| ‘*uttham*’ means ‘born out of’ / ‘generated by’.

‘*eva*’ means ‘alone’/ ‘only’. ‘*baleeyan*’ means ‘stronger’ / ‘*prabhalam*’. The word ‘*baleeyaan*’ is masculine gender, because ‘*prathyaya:*’, which it describes, is masculine.

That understanding of ‘freedom from sorrow of the Self’ received from the *mahaa vaakyaa pramaanam* is more convincing and reliable than the understanding of ‘misery of the Self’, received from the *prathyaksha pramaanam*, because that understanding is generated by the stronger *pramaanam* of the two.

“Knowledge generated by stronger *pramaanam* carries more conviction than the knowledge generated by weaker *pramaanam*” is common sense.

So what, if the understanding from *mahaa vaakyam* is stronger than the understanding from *prathyakshaa*? The answer is obvious. The ‘stronger’ knowledge will knock off the ‘weaker’ knowledge.

ॐ इति निश्चयः - This is our ascertainment / conviction,

ॐ अव्यभिचारि प्रामाण्य वाक्य उपात्तत्वात् - because that knowledge is born out of the *mahaa vaakyaa pramaanam*, which has definite validity;

The *Aacharyaa* only re-asserts his view.

The ‘*saasthra vaakyam*’ has ‘*avyabhichari praamaanyam*’, which means ‘definite validity’. ‘*praamaanyam*’ means ‘validity’; ‘*avyabhichari*’ means ‘doubtless’ / ‘definite’. In contrast, *prathyaksha pramaanam* has only conditional, not definite or doubtless validity, because of reasons discussed earlier, viz., (i) all the sense organs on which *prathyakshaa* depends for its function, have their respective limited ranges (ii) the sense organs themselves depend on extraneous conditions for *their* functioning and (iii) possible defects in the sense organs.

Optical illusions and hallucinations are proof enough for the '*savyabhichaari*' nature of '*prathyakshaa*'.

Thus, *saasthraa* being *avyabhichaari pramaanam* and *prathyakshaa* being *savyabhichaari pramaanam*, *saasthra janya jnaanam* is alone more valid.

The term '*avyabhichaari praamaanyam*' is '*bahuvreehi*' and adjective to *vaakyam*. '*avyabhichaari praamaanyam yasya vaakyasya thath*' is '*avyabhichaari praamaanya vaakyam*' | '*Upaaththathvaath*' means 'because it is grasped / born out of'.

This is the first reason given by Suresaraachaaryaa in this portion of his arguments. To recap the reason: "I am '*nirdh:khee*'" is what *saasthram* has revealed. "I am '*dhu:khee*'" is what *prathyakshaa* reveals. Which is true? Ans: There is not even a wee bit doubt that what *saasthraa*, the stronger *pramaanam*, has revealed, viz., "I am '*nirdhu:khee*'" is the truth. Only if there is any doubt, I need reinforcement through other means. But, since "I am '*nirdhu:khee*'" is a fact, no reinforcement, in the form of meditation is required".

Thus, '*Saasthra pramaanasya prabhalathvaath*' is the first argument.

Then the *Aachaaryaa* gives a second argument. What is that? Ans: "*Prameya dhrushtyaa api aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam*" |

The earlier argument is from the standpoint of the *pramaanam* – '*pramaana dhrushtyaa*' | To present that argument once again briefly: "*Saasthram* reveals the *nirdhu:kithvam* of *aathmaa* / 'freedom from sorrow' of *aathmaa* / *aanandha svaroopam* of *aathmaa* | '*Sadhu:kithvam*' is revealed by *prathyaksha anubhavaa*. Because *saasthraa* is stronger than *prathyakshaa*, the knowledge that *saasthraa* gives would overrule the knowledge that *prathyakshaa* gives".

The following argument is from the standpoint of the *prameyam* – '*prameya dhrushtyaa*' | It is the study of the same two possibilities - '*nirdhu:kithvam*' of *aathmaa* and '*dhu:kithvam*' of *aathmaa*, if any, from *aathmaa*'s own standpoint.

The gist of that argument is as follows:

Aathmaa's nature of 'freedom from sorrow' is not proved by *saasthram* only. it is self-evident also. How do you say this? Ans: Because I experience sorrow only in *jaagrath* and *svapnaa avasthaa*-s, when the mind operates. In *sushupthi avasthaa*, when the mind resolves and therefore non-operational, *dhu:kithvam* or sorrow is not experienced. In *sushupthi*, I am in natural condition and during that *svaabhaavika avasthaa*, I do not experience any sorrow. I may again experience sorrow when I wake up from *sushupthi*, when the mind 'arrives' and operates. And, therefore, sorrow is a conditional / incidental attribute, which comes only when the mind is operational. On the other hand, 'freedom from sorrow' or '*nirdhu:kithvam*'

is the natural condition, which is available during *sushupthi*. Therefore, '*nirdhu:kithvam* of *aathmaa*' is '*svathassiddham*', which term means 'self evident'.

In contrast, the '*dhu:kithvam* of *aathmaa*' is **not** *svathassiddham*. Only in the *jaagrath avasthaa*, when the mind comes and when *prathyaksha anubhavaa* is operational, at that time alone, *dhukithvam* is experienced. Therefore, *dhu:kithvam* is *pramaana siddham*.

To repeat: *Dhu:kithvam* is *pramaana siddham*. *Nirdhu:kithvam* is *svathas siddham*. *Pramaana siddham* means 'experienced only when *pramaanam* operates'; *svathassiddham* means 'self evident'.

Now, the question is "which is stronger between *svathassidham* and *pramaana siddham*?" What was the previous discussion? It was: "which is stronger between *saasthra pramana siddham* and *prathyaksha pramaana siddham*?" and the answer given was '*saasthra pramaana siddham*' is stronger. Now, the comparison is between *svaathassiddham* and *pramaana siddham*, as to which is stronger.

Sureswaraacharya says "'*svathassiddham*' is stronger than '*pramaana siddham*' ". He gives several theories in this context, which theories are only rarely discussed in other *Vedhaanthic* texts. They are unique to '*Naishkarmya Siddhi*'.

Sureswaraacharya is stating one principle after another, some of which are discussed below:

(1) Principle no. 1:

Question: Which is stronger between *apramaana siddham* and *pramaana siddham*?

Answer: *Pramaana siddham* is stronger.

(2) Principle no. 2:

Question: Which is stronger between *dhurbala pramaana siddham* and *prabhala pramaana siddham*?

Answer: *Prabhala pramaana siddham* is stronger.

(3) Principle no. 3:

Question: Which is stronger between *pramaana siddham* and *svathasiddham*?

Answer: *Svathassiddham* is stronger.

And, (1) 'aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam' is 'pramaana siddham' (2) 'aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam' is 'prabhala pramaana siddham' and (3) 'aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam' is 'svathasiddham' also. Therefore, based on all the above three principles, 'aathmana: nirdhukithvam' stands established as the strongest.

Sureswaraacharyaa asks the *prasamkhyana vaadin:* "When, thus, *aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam* is *svathasisiddha poorvaka prabhala pramaana siddham*, why do you require a meditation as reinforcement? Why cannot you claim that fact here and now? What makes you protest?"

To show that *svathissidhaam* is more *prabhalam* than *pramaana siddham*, Swamiji gives an example somewhat in a lighter vein. He says: "In a hospital, a patient, a villager, was declared dead by a doctor. Even as the doctor was certifying the death, the patient woke up. In the newspaper, we do read such news. Even in the mortuary, 'dead bodies' have woken up. In this incident, the patient wakes up and says: 'Doctor! I am alive'. Imagine that the doctor responds to the patient: 'Look. What is your medical qualification? And, what is mine? You are a villager, not even a graduate and you are claiming 'I am alive'. Whereas, I am a reputed doctor with a string of medical degrees from some of the best universities in different parts of the world, with a long experience also. I declare that you are dead'. Now, theoretically the doctor's conclusion is *prabhala pramaana siddham* and the villager's claim of being alive should be weaker because he is without a medical qualification and therefore *dhurbala pramaanam*. But, our conclusion will be, that, even though the doctor is *prabhala pramaanam*, the villager's claim alone is right, since it is *svathasiddham*.

Aadi Sankaraacharyaa refers to the fact of the 'svathasiddham' of 'aathmana: nirdhu:kithvam', in his *Viveka choodaamani* (verse 107): "Yath sushupthau nirvishaya: aathmaanandha: anubhooyathe sruthi prathyaksham eithiyam anumaanam cha jaagrathi" – "Scriptural declarations, direct experience, tradition and inference clearly say that in deep-sleep, we experience the Bliss of the *aathman*, independent of sense objects".

Therefore, when *aanandha svaroopam* of the Self is proved through *prathyakshaa*, *anumaanaa* and *saasthraa* and above all, when it is *svathasiddham*, it does not need any further confirmation through *prasamkhyaanam*. And, among them also, 'Svathasiddham' is the greatest support. That is what the *Aachaaryaa* says here.

Reverting to the text:

ॐ प्रमेयस्य निर्दुःकित्वसिद्धेः स्वतः एव च - Further, the nirdhu:khithvam(freedom from misery) of the Self is self-evident.

'Prameyam' means 'subject matter' and the subject-matter in this context is *aathmaa*, the Self. '*nirdhu:kithvam*' means 'freedom from sorrow / misery'; '*svatha: siddhi:*' means 'self evidently known / established'. The gist of this sentence is "The *aanandhasvaroopam* of *aathmaa* is revealed naturally". (It has already been discussed as to how it is revealed, by consideration of the bliss experienced in deep sleep state). On the other hand:

ॐ प्रत्यक्षादेः तु व्यभिचारित्वात् - Because of the deviant nature of *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani*,

ॐ संभावनायाः च- and also because of the speculative nature of *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani*,

The literal translation of '*vyabhicharithvam*' is the 'nature of being subject to deviations / straying / erring'. The term '*sambhaavanaa*' means 'speculation'. Sureswaraachaaryaa's contention is: "Because they are subject to deviations and speculations and thus indefinite, *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani* are always feeble".

A mundane example of the '*vyabhicharithvam*' and '*sambhaavanaa*' of *prathyakshaadhi pramaanaani* is the archeologists' findings on the 'age of humanity' on this earth. As and when the archeologists find newer and newer data, they keep changing their 'conclusions' (if their continuously changing 'views' can be called by the term 'conclusions'). An archeologist will declare, based on *his* findings, that the first human being came into being in Ethiopia, three million years back. Thereafter, another archeologist will continue the research, comes across another skeleton during *his* excavations and extend this period by another 50,000 years. (Incidentally, there is a humorous saying 'an archeologist is one whose life is always in ruins', punning on the fact that his job is to examine 'ruins'). Not long after, a third archeologist will get some more data and revise the date of the first human again. Therefore, our *prathyaksha janya* knowledge is always *vyabhichaari*.

Another example is the scientists' opinion on the use of coconut oil in food. People in Kerala have been using coconut oil widely in their food, for centuries. Every single food item of theirs will have coconut products as ingredients. A few years back, scientists declared that use of coconut oil in food is unhealthy, resulting in a lot of health disorders. But, over the years, they have been gradually changing their conclusion, step by step, from 'very harmful' to 'harmful' and then to 'not so harmful' and later 'harmless' etc.; and now, they declare that use of coconut oil is, in fact, 'good' for health. Their conclusions have always been based on research conducted for short periods on a few hundred volunteers. They will furnish statistics that 60 % of the subjects reacted in one manner and the other 40 % in the opposite manner; and, based on the statistics, come to their conclusion. But, the statistics leave the consumer wondering as to whether he will fall into the majority group or the minority group. This is the extent of 'reliability' of *prathyaksha pramaanaa*.

Therefore, Sureswaraachaaryaa says “Because *prathyakshaadi pramaanaani* can go astray and because more often, they depend on speculation, they are feeble”.

ॐ (दुःखित्वं) पुरुष परिकल्पना मात्र अवष्टम्भत्वात् च - and because, thus, the perceived misery is based upon the mere mental projection of an individual,

ithi - this is our conclusion.

The word ‘*du:kithvam*, meaning ‘misery’ has to be supplied; ‘*avashtambhathvaath*’ means ‘based upon’.

It is seen that all branches of science are continuously changing their views. No scientific view stands firm for ever and steady. In contrast, *saasthram*, when understood properly, is steady in its views. It is ready to face all the challenges of modern science also.

Therefore, what is the conclusion? Ans: *Prasamkhyaanam* is not required for generating knowledge; *prasamkhyaanam* is not required for refining knowledge; *prasamkhyaanam* is not required for liberation. It is enough if the aspirant understands *mahaa vaakyam* properly.

Chapter III: Verse 93 –

निर्दुःखित्वं स्वतस्सिद्धं प्रत्यक्षादेश्च दुःकिता ।
को ह्यात्मानमनादृत्य विश्वसेद्ब्राह्मणान्त ॥ ९४ ॥

Freedom from misery is self-established. Subjection to misery is established by perception etc. Who can disregard the revelation of the Self and repose confidence in the deliverance of means of knowledge external to the Self?

The three principles, enunciated earlier, have to be recollected. They are very important principles; again, as indicated earlier, they are very rarely discussed even in *Vedhaanthic* texts. To repeat the the three principles: (1) between *apramaana siddham* and *pramaana siddham*, it is *pramaana siddham* which is more powerful; (2) between *dhurbhala pramaana siddham* and *prabhala pramaana siddham*, it is *prabhala pramaana siddham* which is more powerful and (3) between even *prabhala pramaana siddham* and *svathasiddham*, it is *svathasiddham* which is more powerful. In the introductory portion of the verse (*sambhandha gadhyam*) the second principle viz., “between *dhurbhala pramaana siddham* and *prabhala pramaana siddham*, it is *prabhala pramaana siddham* which is more powerful” was used by Sureswaraachaaryaa. In the *slokaa*, he uses the third principle, viz., “between even *prabhala pramaana siddham* and *svathasiddham*, it is *svathasiddham* which is more powerful”.

Swami Dayaanandhaa gives an eloquent argument in a similar context. His argument goes: “Sorrow is unnatural to us; happiness is natural to us. What is the proof? Whatever is unnatural, we *naturally* struggle to get rid of. Whenever there is something unnatural, there is a struggle, which struggle is natural, to get rid of that ‘unnatural’. A mundane example is the modern medical practice of ‘organ transplant’. When any organ in the body, say, a kidney, is transplanted, the doctors meet with a big problem; the system will, very often, reject the kidney, because it is not a kidney ‘natural’ to the body; it is imported. In the same manner, if a foreign particle falls into the eye, there is an immediate struggle to get rid of the foreign matter, because that particle or matter is ‘unnatural’ to the eye. It, therefore, follows, that if I am struggling to get rid of something, it must be unnatural to me; and, conversely, I do not try to get rid of whatever I accept as natural. Now, between *sukham* and *dhu:kham*, which one do we struggle to get rid of? Have you ever seen somebody worrying about his happiness and complaining ‘I have been feeling happy continuously for days and weeks now. I have to go to go to an astrologer to check why?’ Nobody ever does this. But the moment some miserable problem comes up, we rush to the astrologers, because misery / *dhu:kham* is not natural to us. To consolidate this in a question and answer format:

Q. My *svaroopam kim*? Ans: *Aanandha*: |

Q. How do you say? Ans: It is *svathassiddham*.

Q. Why do you say this? Ans: Because we do not try to get rid of it”.

To revert to the text (verse 93):

ॐ निर्दुःखित्वं स्वतस्सिद्धं - ‘Freedom from sorrow’ is self evident.

ॐ दुःखिता प्रत्यक्षादेः (सिद्धं) - ‘Subjection to sorrow’ is revealed through prathyaksha pramaanm.

It should be remembered that, even that view viz., ‘misery of the Self is revealed by *prathyakshaa*’ is only *abhyupedyam* (temporarily accepted/ presumed). We do not really accept that it is the *dhu:kithvam* of the Self, which is revealed by *prathyakshaa*. *Vedhaanthaa*’s firm conviction is that it is only the mind that can be miserable and that the misery of the mind alone is revealed by *prathyakshaa*. *Aathmaa* can never be miserable or sorrowful. But, In this context, as *abhyupedhya vaadhaa*, we are accepting and assuming that *prathyakshaa* reveals *aathma dhu:kithvam*.

Now, which is more acceptable between these two, viz., ‘*svathassiddha nirdhu:kithvam*’ and ‘*prathyaksha pramaana siddha dhu:khithaa*’? Sureswaraachaaryaa answers in the second line of the verse:

ॐ कः आत्मानं अनादृत्य भाह्यमानतः विश्वसेत् - Who will disregard a fact which is svathassiddham and repose more confidence on an external pramaanam?

'aathmaanam', in this context, means 'svathassiddham'; and implies 'nirdhu:kithvam'; 'anaadhruthya' means 'ignoring'; 'baahyamaanatha:' means 'revealed by an extraneous pramaanam' and implies 'dhu:kithvam, revealed by prathyakshaa'. 'visvaseth' means 'will believe / trust / rely upon'.

Sureswaraachaaryaa asks: "Which intelligent person will ignore a fact which is svathassidham and ignoring the svathassidhaam, rely upon a pramaana siddham?"

What is that fact, which is svathassiddham? It is 'aathmana: nirdhukithvam' / 'freedom from misery' of the Self.

"Who will rely more upon paratha: paramaanam than svatha: pramaanam? "is not merely a question. It has an inbuilt answer also. Nobody need go by any external pramaanam, because, "that I am aanandha svaroopam." is svathasiddham / self-established.

ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते

पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

om̐ pūrṇamadaḥ pūrṇamidaṃ pūrṇātpūrṇamudacyate
pūrṇasya pūrṇamādāya pūrṇamevāvaśiṣyate ॥

om̐ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ ॥



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), Panchadasa, Manisha Panchakam, Upadesha Saara, Saddarsanam, Jayanteya Gita, Jiva Yatra, Dhanyastakam, Advaita Makaranda, Dakshinamurthy Stotram, Drg Drsyava Viveka and Naishkarmya Siddhi.

BRNI MEDHA MICHKA'S BOOKS ON SANSKRIT GRAMMAR: Enjoyable Sanskrit Grammar Books- Basic Structure of Language, Phonetics & Sandhi, Derivatives (Pancavarrttayah), 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.

Published by



Arsha Avinash Foundation
104 Third Street, Tatabad, Coimbatore 641012, India
Phone: +91 9487373635
E mail: arshaavinash@gmail.com
www.arshaavinash.in